

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 6 June 2019

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

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

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: TULLOCH ROAD INTERSECTION UPGRADE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:01): I move:

That the 18th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Tulloch Road Intersection Upgrade, be noted.

Tulloch Road is a key collector road in Evanston. The road provides access to and from Main North Road for a local school precinct as well as commercial developments. Access to Main North Road from Tulloch Road is currently unsignalised, and the committee has heard that community campaigning for a signalised upgrade at this intersection dates back to at least 2014. It is understood that currently some motor vehicles wait up to eight minutes at this intersection during peak times.

The intersection upgrade aims to improve safety outcomes for pedestrians and other road users, as well as reduce the current delay to motorists turning right from Tulloch Road into Main North Road. As part of the proposed works, the Main North Road intersection with Tulloch Road and Morrow Avenue will be upgraded, and this will include the duplication of Main North Road on approach and through the intersection.

There will also be a new dedicated left-hand turn lane from Main North Road into Tulloch Road, as well as a new through lane from Tulloch Road into Morrow Avenue. Other features of the upgrade include dedicated bicycle lanes on Main North Road; new signalised pedestrian crossings across Main North Road, Tulloch Road and Morrow Avenue; new and upgraded footpaths; upgraded lighting; and a pedestrian refuge at the intersection of Tulloch Road and the future Barnet Road cul-de-sac.

The estimated total cost of the project is \$7.5 million and the expected time frame for completing the works is the early second quarter of 2019-20. The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project, and the committee has been assured by officials from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure that acquittals have been received from the Department of Treasury and Finance, Premier and Cabinet and the Crown Solicitor that the works and procedures contemplated are lawful.

The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:04): I also rise to speak on this 18th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Tulloch Road Intersection Upgrade. I would like to say that it examined the history of the proposal itself and the efficacy of the application of South Australian taxpayer funds to this Tulloch Road intersection upgrade.

Just in terms of Tulloch Road, it is a key collector road, even though it is smaller. It provides access to and from commercial developments in the area but also the local school, the Gawler and District College, onto Main North Road. Access to Main North Road from Tulloch Road is currently unsignalised. There has been significant public campaigning for a signalised upgrade dating back to 2014. This was on the back of complaints around the intersection from students and parents from

Gawler and District College but also from some of the customers of some of the commercial developments around there, including the Gawler Green Shopping Centre precinct.

The need for the upgrade is in response to this and also increased traffic volumes on Tulloch Road, which are linked to those commercial developments. I mentioned Gawler Green Shopping Centre. There is also a Bunnings and Coles in that Gawler precinct and a Hungry Jack's and Aldi as well, so there is quite a significant volume of traffic there.

This caused there to be, unfortunately, 17 reported crashes at the intersection of Main North Road and Tulloch Road over a five-year period, from 2013 to 2017. Eleven of those had property damage to the cars themselves and, unfortunately, six resulted in injuries. Luckily, they were minor injuries. Of those crashes occurring at the intersection, 74 per cent were right-angle crashes. Quite often cars on Tulloch Road want to turn right onto Main North Road.

Traffic surveys as a result of these crashes were undertaken twice, in March 2015 and February 2017. They revealed a consistent pattern of traffic movements on Tulloch Road. In particular, the studies revealed that 345 cars were attempting to exit Tulloch Road on weekdays, especially during the period of 3.15 to 4.00 in the afternoon, which is of course when many parents collect their children from the Gawler and District College and try to get onto Main North Road to go home.

On some occasions, up to 18 cars were observed queueing to turn right onto Main North Road from Tulloch Road. This is an unsignalised intersection. These 18 cars really exceeded the length of the sheltered right-hand turn there, which caused gridlock for movements on Tulloch Road. All these cars bank up, and the average delays at these times continued even after 4 o'clock and intermittently until 6 o'clock, so it took a while, with this big bank of traffic, for it to actually clear. The reason was that the average turn-right time for a car was about two minutes, so each car would get across in two minutes.

It was observed that sometimes it took eight minutes for a car that wanted to turn right onto Main North Road to actually be able to do so safely. The result was that many of these motorists abandoned their attempt to turn right onto Main North Road and instead tried to turn left onto Main North Road and then, further up, either did a U-turn or went into one of the side streets, maybe Ames Drive, and then did a U-turn to come back down the other way.

Because of this, an upgrade was looked at and advocated for by many people. This is what the Public Works Committee examined. The idea of the upgrade will really be to significantly reduce the delay to motorists turning right from Tulloch Road onto Main North Road and, importantly, improve the safety for road users and also pedestrians. You can imagine that, when 18 cars are queued up, people have to walk in between cars and the like.

Just in terms of placing the intersection, it is located approximately 200 metres north of the nearby intersection of Main North Road, Potts Road and Para Road in Evanston, which is also looking at being upgraded. In terms of the upgrade itself, it will involve the duplication of Main North Road and, importantly, construction of new traffic signals at that intersection of Main North Road, Tulloch Road and Morrow Road.

The Tulloch Road intersection upgrade forms part of DPTI's commitment to continually develop and upgrade the key arterial road network and aims to improve accessibility and connectivity to the road network, Main North Road being the main one, and support growth and investment in the area. As I mentioned before, there is a Bunnings quite close by, an Aldi store, the Gawler Green Shopping Centre, Coles and also the Gawler and District College, so the upgrade will provide both economic and social benefits by connecting people to those services.

It will certainly look to improve safety outcomes for all road users, pedestrians and cyclists by extending the walking and cycling infrastructure in the area and providing additional footpaths and upgraded pedestrian facilities. It will also provide local traffic with safer access to Main North Road, reduce travel times, especially for those trying to turn right, and create efficiency through the signalisation of the turn movements.

It also looks to minimise impacts on the travelling public, business operations and the wider community during construction where practically possible. Obviously, doing these upgrades causes

inconvenience and we have to be mindful of other upgrades in the area as well. The upgrade, as I said before, aligns with the state government's commitment to improve the reliability of the transport system. In terms of the site ownership, Main North Road is under the care and control of DPTI; Tulloch Road and Morrow Avenue are under the care and control of the Town of Gawler.

Turning to some of the design features of this upgrade, they will involve the installation of traffic signals at the Main North Road/Tulloch Road/Morrow Avenue intersection, which will include pedestrian crossings across Main North Road between Tulloch Road and Morrow Avenue. It will involve the construction of a new dedicated left-turn lane from Main North Road into Tulloch Road and construction of a new through lane from Tulloch Road into Morrow Avenue; however, it should be noted that the Morrow Avenue exit will be retained as a left turn only, so you would not be able to turn right onto Main North Road from Morrow Avenue.

There will be new bicycle lanes northbound on Main North Road within the project's scope of works and construction of a new pedestrian footpath on the western side of Main North Road south of Tulloch Road. Footpaths on the eastern side of Main North Road will be upgraded from Ames Drive up to where the upgrade will occur. The new and upgraded footpaths will tie into the footpaths at the intersection of Main North Road with Potts Road and Para Road.

The project also looks at the construction of a new pedestrian refuge and ramps across Barnet Road, near the Gawler and District College at the intersection of Tulloch Road, and a future Barnet Road cul-de-sac. There is new kerbing and guttering on both sides of Main North Road, between Ames Drive and the intersection upgrade, and also an upgrade of the Tulloch Road junction with Barnet Road to ensure that traffic from the college can safely access Tulloch Road. Road lighting will be upgraded to LED lighting for the extent of the works and this upgrade is expected to reduce operating costs, improve visibility and enhance road night-time safety.

We looked at the whole-of-life cost of the project and this intersection being upgraded over two financial years: 2018-19 with a budget of \$2 million, and 2019-20 with a budget of \$5.5 million, giving a total project cost of \$7.5 million. Of that, \$6.5 million is proposed to be construction costs with \$1 million for project and contract management. In terms of the net effect of the work, a cost-benefit analysis was undertaken that looked at the benefits and the costs in terms of the upgrade. It looked at the impact on travel times, vehicle operating costs and road costs.

In light of that, the Public Works Committee examined the written and oral evidence given in relation to the Tulloch Road intersection upgrade. Based on that evidence, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:14): I would like to speak in support of this motion to note the report supporting the upgrade of Tulloch Road. I am glad to report to the parliament that work has commenced on that intersection. I would like to provide some background on how this problem arose and a couple of other matters that have not been raised in the debate so far.

This road was created as a result of the rezoning of the southern part of the Gawler racecourse some years ago. It was rezoned for the purposes of commercial and retail usage, which I supported at the time. It had a long history because the council of the day opposed it. It ended up in the Supreme Court, which chucked out the council's appeal. The proceeds from the sale of the racecourse and a contribution from the then state Labor government enabled the racecourse to be entirely redeveloped, and we now have a state-of-the-art racecourse. In fact, it is probably the best racecourse in the state. It is certainly doing very well.

The issue arose as a result of the commercial and retail development occurring in stages, application by application. As each application was considered—Coles, Bunnings, Aldi—none of them were considered to generate enough traffic in their own right to warrant a developer contribution, but collectively they created a major problem at this intersection. If there is one thing that I need to say it is that there was a flaw, which was partly in the development provisions at the time but also, in my view, between the council of the day and DPTI.

They did not work together closely enough to ensure that the developers made a contribution to this cost. In the end, unfortunately, the taxpayers picked up 100 per cent of the cost of this project

when they should not have had to. Clearly, the cost should have been shared. The developers should have made some contribution. That is water under the bridge, but we need to learn from these experiences to make sure that a situation like this incrementalism is not allowed to grow in other communities so that taxpayers have to pick up the whole cost in the end.

The previous speaker rightly indicated that there was quite a bit of support and agitation to have this intersection upgraded. At one point in time, there were around 60,000 social media interactions about this particular intersection, so it was a major issue. I certainly advocated for it during my last term in parliament, and I am happy to say that I convinced the treasurer and the transport minister of the day to make a significant contribution.

In fact, in the Mid-Year Budget Review of 2017, the then state Labor government made a commitment of \$4 million to this project to make sure that it happened. The second part of the upgrade in that area, including the upgrade of Potts Road, Para Road and Main North Road, is an important project that is starting at the moment. We now move forward.

The project that came to the committee, rather than costing \$4 million, costs \$7.5 million. I understand that the project has been rescoped. I suppose the rescoping justifies the additional \$3.5 million. It includes the footpath from Ames Drive to this intersection, a raised pedestrian refuge on Barnet Road and a deceleration lane of a few hundred metres to turn into. If that is what we get for \$3.5 million, we need to look at the way we do projects. I raised my concern that the cost of the project has unfortunately blown out. Having said that, I think it is a good investment, and we certainly need it.

On a less positive note, one thing that the government is not doing is funding some upgrades of the intersection of Coleman Parade and Potts Road. That is a very important intersection because, as indicated by the previous speaker, part of the project is to ensure that we do not get too much through traffic on Morrow Avenue, which is a residential street. There are some restrictions in that regard, which I fully support.

That means people have to get across to the shopping centre and travel north-south before they get to the shopping centre; they need to either go down into Gawler, almost into Sheriff Street, or to Potts Road. Unfortunately, Potts Road has now been upgraded as part of the Gawler East Link Road—again, something I support—but there will be no traffic improvements at the intersection of Potts Road and Coleman Parade. This government has failed to fund that, and that will be a problem in the future.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No, the project is being built now. Your government is actually finalising the project. You need to accept some responsibility at some time. So that will be a major issue, particularly—

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Light please address his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Perhaps you could call the interjections to order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I intend to do that.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Pederick: You lot don't learn, do you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am still here.

Mr Pederick: You had 16 years to do all that.

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Didn't you learn from yesterday? It is unfortunate that the government has decided not to fund those intersection improvements because it will cause a major problem for those people who live along Coleman Parade. There are a couple of retirement villages as well as a nursing home in that area, and it is something the community will notice. Having said

that, part of the failure has been that the local council has also failed to advocate on that issue—and that was evidence given to the committee.

I would also like to indicate that as part of this project there will be some associated works that will improve the traffic management in that locality and make it very safe for students who attend the Gawler and District College as well as the children's centre. Some of the roads will be closed off and new roads built. Overall, it is a huge improvement to the locality and to road safety.

As mentioned, this intersection will now stop people from turning right and also from using Ames Drive as a rat race to get back on to do a right-hand turn. This project will stop that from happening. I am glad to see the work started and look forward to using the intersection very shortly.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:22): I thank the committee, for its diligent work in bringing forward this report, our executive officers and those members who have made a contribution today, particularly those who are closely familiar with the project because of its proximity to their community.

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: REVIEW INTO THE OPERATIONS OF THE ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT 2013

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (11:22): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Review into the Operations of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013, be noted.

I rise to speak to this report and start by commending the committee and the work it has done so far to formulate that report. I was lucky enough to join this committee late and, for the most part, I have found it to be a convivial and cohesive committee. I joined the committee to make the timetabling possible, and it is pleasing to be part of such a well-meaning committee.

The committee is working towards a common goal, and I believe that goal is to improve the prospects and living standards of the great Aboriginal people of this state—an undeniably exceedingly important goal. The committee is required to review the operations of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act after the third anniversary of its commencement and report that review to both houses of parliament, which is exactly what I have the great pleasure of doing on behalf of lower house members today.

The committee heard a great deal of evidence from affected communities and representative bodies. Six written and 11 oral submissions were received and heard from the community, and I would like to thank all those who contributed to this process. Personally, I would like to particularly thank those who made the effort to give their evidence in person. For some, that meant quite a journey to Adelaide in order to make their submissions heard. Certainly, from a personal perspective, it was really an invaluable experience hearing from those communities directly.

The committee came up with five recommendations, which I intend to touch on in more detail shortly, but I might offer my perspective on a dominant theme to emerge from the evidence that was received by the committee. It felt to me that the majority of those who presented to us desired a greater level of autonomy over the land that currently falls under the charge of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. Evidence of this dominant theme is present in the South Australian Native Title Services' written submission, which is summarised in the report as:

...believing that divestment of ALT lands to native title groups is wanted and the ALT Act requires further changes to provide for a suitable pathway and mechanism for this to occur.

A number of communities explicitly share this view, and I intend to voice their concerns here and now without offering any personal opinion or perspective. The Davenport community from the Mid North shared their concerns with the current ownership model in which the land is held in trust for them by the ALT. They felt that their ability to own a house was compromised under that current model. They felt that this prevented them from becoming self-sufficient and determining their own fate and was inhibiting their community from moving forward.

The Point Pearce community, which is in the electorate that I represent and, it should be noted, are the very people after whom the electorate is named, presented a number of concerns

regarding the ALT model. People at Point Pearce were disappointed that the lease negotiated by the ALT on their behalf was not as good as they perceived it could possibly have been, and they would have appreciated the ability to enter into the lease agreement on their own and to self-determine that lease agreement.

I do not profess to know the ins and outs of their lease agreement, but I do know that the farmer with whom they have entered into the agreement is a good and decent man and would not have ripped them off or treated them poorly. Even with that being the case, the strong point to emerge from the Point Pearce evidence was the desire to self-govern and self-determine.

Mirning community representative, Ms April Lawrie, who has since commenced as the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People and is doing a wonderful job, also explicitly shared her view that the divestment of land back to the traditional owners was now the pathway forward. She used the Far West Coast Aboriginal Corporation as the best example of what happens when a community is given the ability to self-determine. They have gone ahead without government funding and with complete independence. Yalata joined the chorus of communities that shared their desire to own and run their own land.

Perhaps the most persuasive evidence was that received from the Raukkan community, both at the hearing and when we had the great pleasure of visiting their community and talking directly to the people within it. They are an exceptional community with strong leaders who are forging a path that is heading towards economic success. They have their own arable land that is leased out to a local farmer and they have a robust wildflower export business. They are performing so well that they are finding themselves hemmed in, in their view, as too much of their land is held up in trust and not available for development.

They use the incredibly apt analogy that they are the descendants of David Unaipon, who I understand to have been a proud supporter of Aboriginal self-determination and certainly an intelligent man capable of determining his own destiny. In their evidence, they are no different. I present that evidence without comment, only to say that it was a dominant theme that emerged from the communities that presented to the committee.

It is worth noting at this juncture—and perhaps Point Pearce in my electorate is the best example of it—that the usefulness of the ALT has been demonstrated a number of times. Point Pearce has been in significant financial trouble on a couple of occasions and they would have lost their land if not for the safeguard that the ALT provides. That is an undesirable outcome for everyone.

So, while communities from around the state desire greater autonomy over their land, there is evidence that the ALT is working at its primary purpose. ALT presiding member, Haydyn Bromley, and CEO, John Chester, fronted the committee to make that point and made a persuasive argument as to why it was so important. We thank them for their effort in coming in.

With that background in mind, the committee made five recommendations in its report. Importantly, the first one was to acknowledge that no changes to the act should be made without proper consultation and agreement with the traditional owners who may be affected. That is important. We in this place must not try to impose things on those affected but strive to make life better for them in one cohesive effort.

The second recommendation in the report is for an independent, whole-of-state inquiry to investigate ultimate models of Aboriginal land ownership. There was enough unrest or disagreement with the current model that the committee felt it warranted an investigation into what might work better. The recommendations include that the review should consider the best management system that balances the needs of traditional owners and Aboriginal community residents across South Australia. That balance is important and difficult to find.

Thirdly, it recommended that the parliament and ALT work on developing a policy to improve communication, consultation and engagement. That was another criticism from the communities of the ALT that arose during the hearing that was conducted. They often felt that they were not consulted properly and as though they were being informed of what was happening in their communities and not what they wanted to see happen in their communities.

Fourthly, the committee recommended that the government includes measures to improve Aboriginal governance structures, systems and administration for Aboriginal communities situated on Aboriginal lands in the South Australian Aboriginal strategic plan. Finally, the fifth recommendation was that independent analysis be undertaken into the levels of funding provided to the ALT.

It was a productive committee and I would like to thank my fellow committee members: the member for Giles, who I believe served on the same committee in the previous parliament, and the member for Waite, as well as the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. John Dawkins and the Hon. Kyam Maher from the other place.

I would also like to thank Shona Reid, who crafted a large portion of the report that we are noting today. Unfortunately for us in the committee, but fortunately for her, Shona has since departed to take up a role as the Executive Director of Reconciliation SA. I would like to take this opportunity to wish her all the best in her new role. If she brings the same level of organisation, energy and unparalleled knowledge to her new role as she brought to her previous role, Reconciliation SA is in good hands.

We, too, are in good hands with the appointment of Dr Ashley Greenwood, who has started well and has been a real instigator for investigations and inquiries on the committee. I am already looking forward to working with her going forward for more positive outcomes for the local people. It is worth noting that the recent trip the committee undertook to the APY lands, organised by Dr Ashley Greenwood, was a resounding success. We visited quite a number of communities across the APY lands to discuss various issues around housing, education and so forth. We are enjoying Ashley Greenwood's contribution to the committee already.

I conclude by commending the report and thanking those members who did such a wonderful job of crafting it. I take the opportunity once more to acknowledge Shona Reid and Dr Ashley Greenwood for their invaluable contributions to its development.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:32): I rise today to also speak on the report on the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the review that has been carried out by the committee. The committee is charged with a responsibility to carry out regular reviews of the Aboriginal Lands Trust legislation. I do not particularly want to repeat anything that has been said; I think the member for Narungga has been comprehensive in his assessment of the deliberations.

It might be worthwhile providing a bit of background for those members who are not clear about the history of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. It is a history that goes back into the 1960s. When the legislation was introduced into this parliament at that time, it was genuinely groundbreaking legislation. It had not been done anywhere else in Australia and it has been reviewed a number of times since and has been amended. There is a series of recommendations here that have arisen from the committee hearings that I think are very sensible recommendations.

It is probably worth reflecting on what the original thinking was behind the setting up of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I will quote from the report:

In the minds of legislators, the intention of this 1966 Act were very clear, the then Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Walsh Labor Government), the Hon. Donald Dunstan, in his second reading speech, made the following comments:

'[The Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill] takes a significant step in the treatment of Aboriginal people not only in this State but in Australia. The Aboriginal people of this country are the only comparable Indigenous people who have been given no specific rights in their own lands. The Maoris, the Eskimos and the American Indians—

to use the language of the day—

all had treaty rights and ownership and control of lands in their countries. The Aboriginal people in this State, as elsewhere, have had certain areas of land reserved...but these have been Crown lands not owned or controlled by the Aboriginal people and from which they could be removed. It is not surprising that Aborigines everywhere in this country have been bitter that they have had their country taken from them, and been given no compensatory rights to land in any area...[Aboriginal people were] wrongfully deprived of their just dues...(w)e must as far as we can right the wrongs of our forefathers.'

That was the genesis of the legislation. Once again, we can say that South Australia has taken the lead in a number of areas, as it has historically, and I think we should be commended as a state for that. There has been a general consensus within this parliament to try to do the right thing. I think

the committee hearings and the recommendations are once again another example of trying to do the right thing.

The member for Narungga indicated that it is not for the committee to impose on Aboriginal communities in our state, but it is to actively listen. That is why it is important that the first element of the recommendations made is about deep and widespread consultation with Aboriginal people in this state when it comes to the future of the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the lands that they hold. Certainly, we did get a whole range of opinions expressed by both the Aboriginal Lands Trust and organisations from around the state.

That whole issue about not imposing is an important issue. I think the nub of the issue is that the desire on the part of many communities for a far greater degree of autonomy when it comes to their lands is sometimes in tension with the need to ensure that lands are not alienated over time. It is also about how we go about coming up with a model or a framework to ensure that we can respect both of those elements. Leading on from that is the recommendation to call for a comprehensive, fair review to look at models elsewhere in the nation, because there have been in years past various changes and various approaches.

The issue about communication did come up when it came to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and I think there is an issue there. The impression I got, and I think some of the other members got, is that we expect the Aboriginal Lands Trust to do a lot. People, widely spread in this state, expect them to do a lot, but there needs to be a question about whether they are adequately resourced to do the job that they are charged with. I think that is one of the things that needs to be looked at while looking to improve communication.

The issue of governance came up on a number of occasions, and it will come as no surprise that governance standards vary across the state. There are some organisations that are incredibly good and others that need assistance, if you like. When you do get governance right, it makes a lot of other things a lot easier. These days, there is a whole issue about trust when it comes to institutions, but one of the things that does bolster trust is when people feel as though the governance structures that are in place are appropriate.

I think it was a good body of work. I commend all the members who took part. We worked in a manner that tried to seek consensus and we did that. I would also like to acknowledge the officers. I thank Shona Reid for the excellent work that she has done for the committee over an extended period of time, and I wish her all the best in her new role. I have no doubt that Dr Ashley Greenwood will also acquit herself incredibly well in the role.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:39): I also rise to make a few small comments in relation to the noting of this report on the review into the operation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013. I certainly do not want to repeat the words of the member for Narungga or the member for Giles, who I think have covered very well the committee's intentions and its management, but I would like to look at some of the recommendations. I would urge members to look at the recommendations of this committee.

A strong theme from many of the witnesses who came before the committee was the autonomy of decision-making in their communities, and I think that is something that all members of parliament can appreciate. People in general want to make decisions that they believe are in their best interest. How we as a parliament, through this particular act, can further enhance the desire of those communities for self-determination is so important.

Their sense of belonging and the way in which they navigate the world is very important to them and their communities. More importantly, a greater degree of autonomous decision-making will allow a greater level of not only independence but also financial independence to help deal with some of the disadvantage that those communities experience and which they expressed to our committee.

In particular, recommendation No. 4 encourages the government to include in the South Australian Aboriginal strategic plan the development and strengthening of Aboriginal governance structures, systems and administration for Aboriginal communities. I think that is very important. Many of the witnesses who came before the committee expressed that, in some of their communities, there is a lack of governance and a lack of trust, which is seen to be leading to a perception that Aboriginal land is not being as well managed as it should be. Those are some of the key concerns

that we need to consider; that is, how the state government and the parliament look at structures of governance and provide the right training and the right framework for communities living on ALT land.

It was a very informative committee. I would like to thank everybody who came to present as witnesses, especially those members who came from the Far West Coast—from your communities, Mr Deputy Speaker—and across all of South Australia. To touch on the words of the member for Giles and the member for Narungga, I thank Shona Reid for her work as the secretary of that committee for many years. I think she was a fantastic advocate for and passionate representative of her community. I would also like to thank Dr Ashley Greenwood, the current secretary, who has picked up right where Shona Reid left off and is leading the committee in a fantastic manner.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: INQUIRY INTO HERITAGE REFORM

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:43): I move:

That the first report of the committee, entitled An Inquiry into Heritage Reform, be noted.

I rise today to speak about the first report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, entitled An Inquiry into Heritage Reform. Some would say that this is a difficult subject, and I commend all those on my committee and my committee staff for working through the process of this reference.

On 30 July 2018, the Environment, Resources and Development Committee resolved to conduct an inquiry into the current state and potential for reform of local state and national heritage in South Australia. The committee considered a wide range of evidence from 144 written submissions, 29 witnesses and published literature. The committee also visited state and local heritage places and areas in the City of Adelaide council area and in the Adelaide Hills. This inquiry has taken place in the midst of the most significant planning reform South Australia has undertaken for 20 years.

The committee heard from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the State Planning Commission about proposed changes to the legislation that protects local heritage with the implementation of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Further, during the final stages of completing this report, the planning minister, the Hon. Stephan Knoll, gazetted the state planning policies and released for public consultation phase 1 of the Planning and Design Code. The issues surrounding built heritage and the processes to protect heritage assets are highly complex with no easy, one-size-fits-all solution.

In its deliberations, the committee tried to ensure that the outcomes that people were keen to see were included in the recommendations but without being too prescriptive on what these processes should look like. The committee also felt that a staged approach to heritage reform, taking into account the planning reform process currently being undertaken, would be most appropriate, enabling the agencies involved to work collaboratively and with flexibility towards achieving desired outcomes.

The committee heard that heritage is important to the community, and the community expects state and local heritage to be protected from demolition and the impacts of undesirable development. The committee also heard that the community wanted a legislative framework that was simple and efficient and that enabled economic benefits to arise from protecting and investing in the state's heritage assets.

The community was also generally unhappy with the confusing and cumbersome sectorial approach to the protection and management of heritage, and was desirous of change. In particular, the committee heard that the challenges and uncertainties about whether transitioning to the Planning and Design Code would result in improvements to processes were expressed by local councils, who unanimously called for greater clarity, consistency, efficiency and responsiveness from the new policy and legislative framework. The committee concluded that:

- a strategic and statewide reform of heritage processes and legislation was necessary, and that any proposed reforms to the nominations, assessment and listing processes for state and local heritage must result in places and areas that are protected by appropriate policy and legislative tools;
- ongoing collaborative implementation of reforms will be important in providing a future for the protection of heritage in South Australia;
- clarity, simplicity, transparency and accountability were important outcomes to achieve in order to increase community and stakeholder confidence in the processes for nominating, assessing and listing state and local heritage, and for certainty in development outcomes;
- a stable, long-term funding base for management of heritage that results in a carrot rather than a stick approach to compliance be developed and maintained; and
- a review or audit needs to be undertaken, using a statewide collaborative approach to address gaps in the state's heritage listings.

The recommendations in this report highlight the principles and themes expressed in the submissions that called for improvements to the current legislative and policy frameworks. These recommendations are made in the context of providing support to the significant amount of work currently in progress as part of broader planning reforms in South Australia. Specifically, the committee recommended the following:

- state government commence a statewide collaborative and strategic approach to heritage reform through development of a staged process, and that any reforms undertaken must result in streamlined, clear and responsive processes and transparent and accountable decision-making;
- a statewide strategic approach to identifying heritage of local and state significance, involving the community and interested stakeholders, which is appropriately funded by state government;
- an audit or review be undertaken of local and state heritage places and contributory items, with the aim of working collaboratively with community and local government;
- a suitable long-term funding base that incentivises management for heritage and disincentivises deliberate neglect of heritage for the management of heritage should be identified and secured; and
- sections 67(4) and 67(5) of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act should be repealed.

I wish to thank all those who gave their time to assist the committee with this inquiry. I would like to thank the City of Adelaide; the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure; and SA Heritage, which sits within the Department for Environment and Water, for assisting in the organisation of the committee's two heritage tours.

I also wish to thank the current and former members of the committee: Mr Nick McBride MP, the Hon. John Rau (former member for Enfield), Mr Michael Brown MP, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC, the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC and the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC for their contributions to this report. I would also like to sincerely thank the committee staff, Ms Joanne Fleer and Dr Merry Brown, for their very able assistance. I also acknowledge everyone who assisted us with local and regional tours.

This was a difficult inquiry for a range of reasons. Some of the things we saw on our trips did not make any sense. When we see seven cottages that are essentially identical but four may be identified as heritage listed and three are not, that is why we need more clarity in the process right across the board. We saw situations where the facades of buildings were protected to save the front of the building and its image into the future.

One thing that really came to mind for everyone involved in the sector, whether they were planners, developers or just had an interest in heritage, was the great consensus regarding adaptive

re-use. I think it is great that people can see the benefit. We have seen it with the revamp of Old Parliament House and the committee buildings. I think adaptive re-use is the real key to the management of heritage in the future.

Once again, I would like to thank the committee members and staff for their diligent work. I present this report to the parliament.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:52): It gives me great pleasure to follow the Presiding Member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee (member for Hammond) and speak on heritage matters and this reform. Obviously, I sit on this committee with a number of members, and I enjoyed the experience shared by some of our members, one of whom was the Hon. John Rau (then member for Enfield).

Mr Rau was a committee member during most of the heritage review and he had a lot of experience. I really liked the way he knew this subject very well. He shared his experience and discussed accountability to the issues raised by people who were in favour of heritage and those who were in favour of development. I also shared this responsibility with the Hon. Tung Ngo and the Hon. John Dawkins. When John Rau left us, he was replaced by Michael Brown MP (member for Playford), but I do not think Mr Brown took part in this heritage review because he came along later.

I would also like to thank the two staffers, Ms Joanne Fleer and Dr Merry Brown, for their help and assistance, and for their guidance on the heritage tours we took around Adelaide and up to the Adelaide Hills. The committee report was constructed very well, and I thank them both for their assistance.

One of the things I realised about the issue of heritage, which was particularly mentioned by developers, was that no-one likes surprises. Even for those who own an old building and may have done so for many years, a surprise heritage agreement over their building, their land or their assets was not tolerated; it was seen as an issue and a problem. From a developer perspective, a bigger aspect was if a developer looked at a proposal involving an old building and it was never known where this building sat in heritage or what the rules and implications were.

For those who spoke in favour of heritage, wanting to see heritage for some of our oldest buildings right across our suburbs preserved, it was noted that some buildings fell into the heritage category, and they were very pleased about that, but other buildings did not. Some of these buildings could stand right alongside each other, look exactly the same and may even be the same age and type, but there would be two or three buildings that were heritage and two or three buildings that were not.

I can understand the frustration of both parties. I think if one thing came out of this report, it was that everyone wanted to see consistency and transparency in heritage. I think both parties—those in favour of heritage and those in favour of development—would work together if those two aspects were actually constructed, developed and taken further, based on this report and the information we received.

Another thing that was noted was a building that was fit for purpose; both parties were interested in this, but it was probably a little bit greyer to those who were in favour of heritage. We heard from the Chair of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee that he had a hotel in his local area, which was an old hotel like hotels can be, and the owners wanted to develop it into a new, modern facility that was more enticing for patronage, and the heritage agreement did nothing but stall that development and make it really hard for the owners.

This was commonplace in the sense that, when heritage was talked about in development, fit for purpose for old buildings came to the fore. It even got to the point that, if the building was not fit for purpose, the facade of a building was protected but nothing else beyond that. Those who were advocating for heritage thought that was disastrous, but the developers said that they were very much in favour of that sort of outcome but that it was still quite onerous and expensive to work through. But it did happen.

That shows the way development can manoeuvre its way around building and developing further forward but using older buildings to keep the appearance and appeal of street landscapes

with heritage buildings on them. It was a privilege to be part of this review. I think everyone did a terrific job, and I note the review.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:57): I rise to conclude the discussion into the first report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, entitled 'An inquiry into heritage reform'. I want to note briefly a comment by the member for MacKillop regarding the issues we had relating to developing the Bridgeport Hotel. I have seen some of the original diagrams and photographs of the Bridgeport Hotel in the main street of Murray Bridge. It was a fantastic place, but it was butchered throughout the sixties, seventies and eighties with poor development outcomes.

Looking at the development of the site now, it might have been a bonus for the people who are going to redevelop it and build a new six-storey, \$40 million, 4½ star development with 99 rooms in my electorate. That will be absolutely magnificent for everything else that is going on in Hammond, but there will be a bit more on that later today.

This was a very important inquiry. There was a lot of passion, no matter where anyone sat on this debate. Like a lot of things, there has to be a little bit of compromise, a little bit of give and a little bit of take. Let's hope that, as the department for environment and heritage and the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure work through the process, we get a system in place that makes it simple for everyone, whether it be developers, individuals or people at a local government level, and that we get the outcomes we deserve in preserving heritage for future generations while also allowing appropriate development around that.

In closing, I again would like to thank the staff of the committee, Joanne Flerer and Dr Merry Brown, for their vital contribution and their work in putting the report together and making sure that we have good photo shots of the members of the committee in the report. I give the report to the parliament.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (12:00): I move:

That on Tuesday 18 June 2019 standing orders be so far suspended as to enable—

- (a) the Premier to have leave to continue his remarks on the Appropriation Bill immediately after moving 'That this bill be read a second time';
- (b) the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas) to be immediately admitted to the house for the purpose of giving a speech in relation to the Appropriation Bill; and
- (c) the second reading speech on the Appropriation Bill be resumed on motion.

That has been the practice when the Treasurer has been in the other place.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Treasurer be permitted to attend at the table of the house on Tuesday 18 June 2019 for the purpose of giving a speech in relation to the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

Bills

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June 2019.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:01): Section 6 of the Summary Offences Act, which relates to hindering police or resisting arrest, has

been raised as being transferred to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. This is PASA's request, and this is one of the areas in relation to which the Commissioner of Police has differed from the police union.

SAPOL have reasonably supported the retention of resist and hinder under section 6 of the Summary Offences Act. They have recognised that a line needs to be drawn between behaviour that amounts to frustration of the exercise of police authority, like hindering police and resisting arrest, and something more calculated and harmful, like assault. Suffice to say we have accepted the advice of the Commissioner of Police on that matter.

On secondary sentencing, the government has supported this request of the Police Association. The proposal is supported by the Commissioner of Police. It is fair to say that, as I will refer to later, the Law Society raises some question about the necessity for this; nevertheless, it is a reinforcement, an extension, of a provision under our secondary sentencing law which PASA has sought and, if it does nothing else to advance the matters to be taken into account by a sentencing judge, it does re-alert the attention of the judiciary to this important secondary sentencing principle.

PASA had called for an amendment of the secondary sentencing purposes in section 4 to include the need to protect police, other law enforcement and emergency services workers when performing their duties. As I said, we say that is inherent in it. That is an obvious purpose, otherwise it would not be there. But we have added it in, and we note that at least the alerting of this issue is reinforced.

Then there is the creation of a new offence, and here the Police Association called for a new offence with substantially increased penalties for assaults against police, law enforcement and emergency workers, and healthcare workers. From South Australia Police's assessment, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act already recognises assaults against police, prison officers and other law enforcement officers as aggravated. Instead, SAPOL subsequently proposed a new offence relating to bodily fluid offences.

The commissioner is particularly concerned about spitting offences and, although data has not shown a breakdown of the types of assaults sentenced upon in the courts, the government has proactively supported a new offence for bodily fluids, which covers a broad group of emergency service workers and front-line officers.

In the course of considering penalties as a deterrent, which is the thrust of the police union's argument for a new offence with a much greater penalty, the police commissioner has said this is an issue which has not been addressed and he sought a particular new offence for bodily fluid offences. In this regard, we have listened to both. I have spoken to the Police Association representative, Mr Mark Carroll, on several occasions after receiving his correspondence in January, and we have extended the penalties on existing laws. After further discussion, we have extended them further. Most importantly, we have taken up the initiative of the Commissioner of Police and advanced the new offence relating to bodily fluid transmission.

In relation to the expansion of aggravated offences to other workers, only the government's bill covers all front-line emergency workers, including Community Corrections officers, police officers, unsworn police officers, firefighters, emergency medical staff, regional and trauma doctors and nurses, ambulance officers and front-line volunteers. The government bill also allows for these groups to be expanded through regulations. Why have we been able to do this? I suggest, quite simply, because we have taken the time and given the attention to ensure that we consult with all the relevant parties.

Mr Odenwalder: Did you stick the ambulance in?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Read the bill—of course it is in it. Consultation was very important for us. For example, we met with the Australian Medical Association, and I think the then president elect, who is now president, indicated an area that we had not canvassed—that is, the harrowing work and vulnerability of doctors, usually general practitioners, who need to go to some roadside trauma that is very remote from an hospital emergency department to deal with accident victims.

Whilst we might, in the comfort of urban living, see the obvious need to protect those working in emergency department circumstances in our metropolitan hospitals, we need to think a little bit outside the square in this parliament and remember that there are people on the front line, even on a roadside, having to deal with these matters. This is the value of consulting with those professionals who work with them. It was through those consultations that we learned that bodily fluids, including vomit, should be considered.

The psychiatrists who provided submissions to us indicated that vomit was a matter in their daily work that needed to be considered. Probably like most members of the house, I took the view that it would probably be very difficult to vomit voluntarily, that it would be an act triggered by another bodily function and that therefore it was unlikely someone would say, 'I'm going to vomit over this person. I will just proceed to do so.'

In fact, again by consultation, what has been explained to us is that someone may vomit, but unfortunately some of our front-line people are exposed to the person placing their hand in it and then attempting to smear it over the front-line worker. Obviously, that is behaviour that, if deliberate, is completely unacceptable. Again, we do not recognise the significance of this or the frequency of it occurring unless we actually speak to people at the front-line services.

The valuable advice given by the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation was also quite illuminating. They put a case to us that all nurses anywhere, any time, should be able to be the subject of this type of legislation, but for the reasons explained, and I think this is consistent with the opposition as well, the cohort we are attempting to deal with here is those who are at front-line services.

It is fair to say that for some personnel it is a daily occurrence; others, perhaps in a quiet suburban practice, might not be exposed to the same risks. Some police officers, for example, whether they are working in the local police station, travelling around doing traffic duty or, of course, trying to deal with the arrest and detention of persons who are suspected felons, in any part of the spectrum, are regularly and frequently exposed to risk and for others, of course, it depends on the environment they are in.

One of the matters raised by the nurses federation was this question of being exposed to unruly behaviour. For example, a patient at a hospital might be quite compliant and accepting of advice and assistance, but there might be a very distressed or angry relative who is attending with the patient, who the nursing staff are having to manage as well as attending to the medical needs of the patient. I think it is always illuminating for all of us as members of parliament, no matter how experienced we think we are in matters, to go to the coalface and meet with those who represent people who on a daily basis expose themselves to risk for our benefit.

Finally, on the increase in the maximum penalties, although assaulting a police officer is an aggravated offence under the criminal law, an increase in the maximum penalties for those offences was supported by the government in amendments before the house, and they will be dealt with in committee. Although across the country the legislative schemes for offences committed to police vary, the government has brought South Australia in line with New South Wales, with the passage of this bill, as much as possible, as requested by the Police Association and supported by SAPOL. The new maximum penalty for a section 20 police assault will now be seven years' imprisonment with the passage of this bill.

Further, can I bring to the attention of the parliament the submission received from the Law Society of South Australia. I should say that I am no longer a member of the Law Society of South Australia, but I remain a member of the South Australian Bar Association; I just place that on the record. In relation to this matter, yesterday I received quite a lengthy submission from Ms Amy Nikolovski, who is the President of the Law Society of South Australia. She sets out a very different approach in relation to how we manage the protection via the criminal law of our emergency and front-line workers. I quote:

The Society does not condone assaults on police officers and/or other frontline emergency workers. These people play an important role in our community and it is understood their occupations place them in a position of vulnerability. As such, this is reflected in the criminal law in South Australia under a number of existing provisions. While the Society appreciates the need to deter this type of behaviour, it considers that the legislative mechanisms to deal with these types of offences are already in place.

They go on to make comments about various aspects of the bill in relation to the new initiatives, namely, the further offence involving use of human biological material. Can I try and, I hope respectfully paraphrase their position because, like that of most lawyers it is pretty long. Firstly, in relation to an amendment to section 5AA, which is the aggravated offences provision, in short, the effect of the amendment to section 5AA(1)(k), they say, 'appears to clarify that an aggravated offence would apply whether the victim working in a prescribed occupation, was working on a paid or volunteer basis'. But they generally otherwise see that as really an unnecessary extension.

In relation to the increase in penalties, they make a pretty valid point that there are significant numbers of other provisions under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act that make provision for serious assault against one of the emergency workers: section 19(2), making unlawful threats to cause harm; section 20, which is the assault that has been frequently traversed in this debate; section 24(2), recklessly causing harm; and section 29(3), acts endangering life or creating risk of serious harm, where an act or omission is likely to cause harm.

Obviously, the society acknowledges that there is significant pressure from some in the community for stronger stances to be taken in respect of assaults on police and emergency workers, but, in particular, the very valid submissions put to us via the Police Association and the Commissioner of Police and then added to by other emergency worker representative bodies. In short, on this aspect the Law Society takes the view that the current law already provides for higher penalties than the basic offence and, therefore, raises the obvious: apply it.

If you really want to press for more serious penalties, then charge people and prosecute people and seek the conviction of people who are already covered by that. There are a huge number. During the time I have been in the parliament, I remember a special offence, for example, that was introduced to provide a 10-year sentence if you shoot presumably in the direction of a police officer. You do not have to hit or injure them; you just have to shoot. I did not oppose that at the time it came through the parliament.

I make the point that it is the type of thing added on to our criminal law which makes it a suite of different laws which provide very severe penalties. I referred to them in my second reading contribution, and I will not list all those matters. The society, as is their wont, have identified what they see as a drafting error in clause 8, in particular the use of the words 'unlawful threats', which should, in their view, read 'causing harm'. I will have our people attend to that, if that is correct. I thank them for bringing that to our attention.

On the question of the offence involving the use of human biological material against emergency workers, and this is the creation of the new offence where a person spits at, throws or otherwise applies blood, saliva, semen, faeces or urine (and we are about to add vomit) towards a prescribed emergency worker in the course of their duty, it is proposed that will carry a five-year sentence.

In their submission, the Law Society very strongly take the view that, by virtue of a penalty, this is excessive. I think they have made the point throughout their submission, which is probably unnecessary anyway, that it is excessive. They refer to a case that I think is worth reporting to the parliament, and I suppose it always highlights where we need to take into account the advice of those who are actually out there doing these jobs and bringing to our attention where we might inadvertently be introducing laws that might be unreasonably severe, especially in relation to penalty. I will read this as a direct quote:

The Society notes the case of *R v Wilson* [2016] SASFC 139 which involved an appeal of a sentence with respect to spitting at a police officer on the grounds it was manifestly excessive. In this case, the defendant while on the floor of a police cell spat and his spittle hit the lower trouser legs of the police officer. A charge was laid under section 6(1) of the Summary Offences Act and a sentence of 12 months imprisonment given.

The appeal was upheld by the Chief Justice on the basis that a term of imprisonment, which is half the maximum penalty for the offence of assaulting police, is unreasonably severe when one appreciates the overall circumstances of the offending in this case (i.e. there was no danger of any significant insult given the spit was not directed at a bodily area sensitive to the transmission of infectious disease). The 12-month sentence was reduced to eight weeks on appeal.

This case demonstrates the appropriateness of this type of offence being captured under the existing legislative provisions in particular, section 6(1) of the Summary Offences Act and allowing the Court to determine on the facts of the case an appropriate penalty. These issues are further discussed below.

I will not go any further, but I will explain that the Law Society had also raised the question of expanding the definition of human biological material to include vomit. I think I addressed their proposition that vomiting normally occurs involuntarily earlier in my response of the circumstance where it can be applied, or attempt to be applied, to the person via, perhaps, their hand.

On the repeal of section 6(1) of the Summary Offences Act, we ourselves have raised the benefit of retaining the hinder and resist positions, and we maintain that position. They go further to say that it is an important option that is available and highlight some aspects, which include the question of the police prosecutor's capacity to negotiate in relation to these matters.

When the Police Association raised with us the question of abolishing any police bail, I said to Mr Carroll at the time, 'Well, look, it's your members who actually are the ones doing the investigation and may be arresting the party in those circumstances, and they are the ones who are granting bail. If you think that there's a problem with that, where they have assaulted a police officer, then I think you need to speak to your members about the approach that they are taking in relation to these cases in granting bail if it is so offensive, or there is such a danger, as a result of there being an assault on a police officer.'

I can see that through the discussion on the development of this bill that aspect seems to have been abandoned. Frankly, it is for good reason. We do need to give the police, even when one of their own has been hurt or assaulted, the power to make the decision to grant police bail bearing in mind that, in relation to police bail—which is the right to give the person the right to leave custody and then remain on bail until they are called to court to deal with their matter—they always have the opportunity to keep the person in custody and then take them before a court, where the party might apply for court bail. In any event, I think the foolishness of progressing down that line seems to have been identified during the course of our discussions, and I note that that has been abandoned.

Going back to the Law Society's submission, on the Sentencing Act they make the very reasonable point that the secondary sentencing principles that are outlined are really not added to any further. It is unnecessary as a deterrent, as it is already a secondary sentencing purpose. I do not think I need to detail that any further.

Another case they bring to our attention is one that I think is worth at least advising the house about because I suppose it raises the obvious circumstance where people do silly things but they might be under the duress of their own mental ill health. The Law Society reports this:

In the recent case of *Police v Dodd*—

which is a Magistrates Court matter of 30 April 2019—

Magistrate Forrest chose not to impose a sentence of imprisonment on a defendant for assaulting a nurse. The Magistrate took into account the facts of the case, in particular the serious mental health issues of the defendant. There are a number of reasons why sentences of imprisonment are not imposed, or not imposed to the extent that might be expected on a face of a matter. In the view of the Society, these reasons do not reflect any deficiencies with respect to the current legislation that require amendment. They simply reflect the complex nature of offending and why it is appropriate for the Court to have a broad discretion to take into account the individual circumstances of each case and sentence accordingly.

I want to add for clarification that we are not talking about someone who is unfit to plead; that is, they have a cognitive impairment sufficient that they are unable to understand the seriousness of their conduct and therefore avoid conviction altogether. Those people have an avenue of being dealt with for their support and treatment in a different highway, I suppose.

I think every member of this house would appreciate, as a local member, the significant level of mental health issues in our community and how from time to time they do impede the reasonable conduct of our citizens. To conclude, the Law Society states:

The current legislative framework recognises assaults against police officers and emergency workers as being serious in nature and they are subject to higher penalties. In our view the measures proposed by the Bill are unlikely to achieve their objective in changing behaviour. However, they are likely to have a disproportionate effect on

Aboriginal people, as well as those with mental health and/or substance abuse issues, who are already overrepresented in the criminal justice system.

That is the position of the Law Society. We respect it. I appreciate their advice. If they are right on the drafting matter, we will remedy it. But it is fair to say that the government have taken the view that we need to send a refreshed message to the judiciary and to the prosecutors, whether they are police prosecutors or the DPP, as independent as they may be. Judges and prosecutors are independent of interference from the executive, but they do need to receive a powerful refresher from the parliament, and that is what this bill will do. I am proud to say that it is this government who is progressing it.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr ODENWALDER: I would like to just make a couple of remarks before I go to my question. There are some amendments, as has been noted, and I will probably need the Chair's advice on how we proceed procedurally with those amendments, as it gets complicated. Indeed, some of the clauses I will be supporting initially will be changed substantially by an amendment I make later on. It may get messy, but we will deal with that as we get there.

I want to follow the Attorney's lead in her remarks about the Law Society in stating that I am no longer a member of the Police Association of South Australia. I sadly gave up my membership of that august organisation upon entering this place, but I still have enormous respect for the work they do—as indeed I do that of the Law Society, as often as I disagree with their views on my private member's bills and indeed some of the views expressed in their latest publication.

Obviously clause 1 is the title and it is about assaults on prescribed emergency workers. The Attorney made some remarks, and I think she said that only the government bill protects a broad range of workers, implying—as she has in the media—that our bill protects police and that is all, that we have only listened to the Police Association and that we have not consulted widely. I have consulted over the course of this.

I have consulted primarily with the Police Association, that is true, as they have been the ones agitating for this since October last year. I have had very lengthy discussions with Mark Carroll, as I understand the Attorney has, but it is absolutely false to say that only the government bill covers other workers. It was disorderly for the Attorney to refer to another bill in this place but, since she has, I will continue that conversation.

I want to refer to the consultation, which the Attorney has told us has been broad and deep. I want to know, first of all, if the Attorney will table any written submissions she has received from the various groups she has described. I am particularly interested in seeing any submission from the Ambulance Employees Association. I am sure that all of us welcome some change and some move in the right direction in this area. However, for many of these organisations—and I know for a fact that for at least three of them these laws do not go far enough—they certainly do not adequately address the sentencing around these types of offences.

I am keen to see the written submissions from these organisations, particularly the written submission, if there is one, from the Ambulance Employees Association, and the written submission from the Public Service Association, although I notice, belatedly, that there were some concessions in some of these amendments to the Public Service Association—I assume that is what they were—as there were concessions to other groups. That is fine and perfectly reasonable for the Attorney to do in terms of heading in the right direction toward framing some good legislation.

Over the course of this committee debate, I want to try to get a handle on what the policy underpinnings are for this bill. It seems very confused, and it seems as if the government has come quite late to this debate. It was obviously triggered by the Police Association's first calls in October, I think, and there have been various iterations of what they want and what they say they want and what they say they need. I am sure that the Attorney has had similar conversations as I have had

with the Police Association, but we have arrived at a point where we need to make some decisions in this parliament.

I want to make it absolutely clear what the policy underpinnings of the Labor Party's position are on this—that is, to protect police and emergency workers from assaults and injuries by criminals, to properly protect them and to properly make sure that they are punished appropriately by the courts. It is that simple. I would have thought that the policy underpinnings of the Attorney's bill would reflect this, but it seems that as it has grown and developed it has taken on a life of its own and the Attorney has been playing catch-up, adding in bits and amending on the run, and I think the policy underpinnings have been a little lost.

Perhaps at this point I would like the Attorney to clarify what the basic policy underpinnings of the government's position are to inform the later stages of the committee debate and I also seek whether she will table those submissions, if indeed they are written submissions.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In relation to the consultation process, I do not have any written submissions from the Ambulance Employees Association. I have a number of other written submissions. It is not the practice of the government to provide copies of those unless they are published by the organisations themselves. We would not be as disrespectful as that. The Law Society have consistently always placed their submissions to former attorneys and to me online. Often, in opposition, as shadow attorney I received copies sent direct.

So I did not feel that it was in any way going to cut across their position to provide a copy to the opposition yesterday, particularly as it had arrived so late in the course of the progress of this matter; otherwise, it would be discourteous and against precedent for us to provide it. I will say that I had direct meetings with AMA representatives, including a psychiatrist, an emergency department worker and the president; Mr Nev Kitchin from the PSA and other officers of his union, which covers a number of our public sector employees; and Australian nurses federation representatives. I think three were present on the day.

We canvassed not only examples for consideration during the course of their requests but also some other ancillary matters—such as, for nurses, the circumstances in which they want to have a safe workplace for their employees, which, as the member will appreciate, is a field very strongly dominated by women. I think we even touched on things such as progress in relation to nurses being accompanied in the event that they are in the outback and have to attend a remote circumstance of emergency health. Again, I think that we have been as open as we can about who we have consulted. Of course, it is up to the opposition to consult with these people as well and to seek advice.

Obviously, I have correspondence from other persons, including the volunteers association in respect of the Country Fire Service and a number of others. So, no, I will not table any of those matters, but it is open for the member to consult with them. Can I say that, in relation to the assertion that the particulars of this were put to the opposition in or about October last year, it is absolutely correct that I regularly meet with Mr Carroll on behalf of the Police Association about the issues of concern for them. He is right: on my notes, in the latter part of last year I met with Mr Carroll to deal with the question of police assaults.

He indicated to me that he would put in writing exactly what the Police Association was seeking. At our meeting, he referred to interstate penalty issues. I said that I was happy to look at them if he could list all the ones that he wanted me to look at. I have given the date of that correspondence, but it was something like 16 January this year, after which we started working on it straightaway. It is true: it was triggered by the diligent work of the Police Association—great. We are not critical of that at all, but what we have done is broaden that to all emergency workers.

When the member says that this is exactly consistent with what the opposition is doing, as a result of our consultation we have identified and foreshadowed that we will propose to include Community Corrections officers and Community Youth Justice officers, whereas the opposition's proposed legislation that I have seen has some identified fields and then 'as prescribed'. We do not have that detail from the opposition. Maybe the public have it. There may have been commentary made about it, but we say that we have significantly expanded it for the very reasons I have outlined.

Finally, in relation to putting exactly what the position of the opposition is, yesterday in the parliament I heard the member for Elizabeth say (I will paraphrase this) that, although he thinks that

this legislation should be strengthened in the ways that he has outlined, he will otherwise support this bill. Last night, I heard on television the Leader of the Opposition make the statement that they would not be supporting this. So I think it is reasonable that, as a parliament, we do know exactly what the opposition's position is, that they make it abundantly clear what they want, if they are going to say, 'Yes, we would like it stronger,' which is how I understood the member for Elizabeth yesterday, 'but if we don't get this we still indicate our support'. I think the words were, 'The government might use their numbers to get what they want.'

That is fine; it is a perfectly legitimate position to put. However, if it is the alternative—that is, 'If we don't get what we want in the amendments we seek,' there will be some spit-the-dummy approach like the Leader of the Opposition's statement on the television last night—let's be open about exactly what is going to be happening.

Mr ODENWALDER: I feel I must respond to that.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Excellent, no worries. I want to make the Labor Party's position absolutely clear on this: we are supportive of legislation that properly protects police and emergency workers and properly punishes those who injure police and emergency workers.

I apologise if I am being slightly disorderly here, but there is another bill in this house that outlines exactly what the police and the Ambulance Employees Association tell us they need for starters. Our position is to come in here to work with the government to bring this bill up to scratch, to rescue this bill, because it does not do what emergency workers are telling us it should do. It may do what the AMA wants, I do not know—I confess that I have not spoken to the AMA—but it certainly does not do what the police say they need.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I have not said we will support this bill. I have said there are provisions that I will not try to amend in this house and I will be seeking to make amendments to other clauses, and I think I outlined in my second reading that I absolutely reserve the right to do quite another thing in the upper house. I have not at any stage said that we will support this bill. What I have said is that we will support legislation that adequately protects police officers and adequately supports appropriate punishments for those people who would injure police officers and emergency workers.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, do you have any further questions on clause 1?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: He has actually spoken three times now—

The CHAIR: No, he has spoken twice.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: He has spoken three times.

The CHAIR: No, twice.

Mr ODENWALDER: But I did not ask a question.

The CHAIR: You did not ask a question, but I am counting it as two.

Mr ODENWALDER: I did ask particularly about the Ambulance Employees Association and, if she is willing to, I would like the Attorney to go into what discussions she has had with them. I understand there were no written submissions from any of these groups, and I want to ask the Attorney to go into any discussions she had with the Ambulance Employees Association, whether they, or any of the other groups consulted, were unhappy with the bill before us today and, if so, what was the cause of their unhappiness.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have not had any discussions directly with the Ambulance Employees Association. In respect of any objection by other parties, I think the submissions that were presented to us were more to expand, which we have accommodated, and then to deal with other issues. As I said, the nurses' union was looking to have further conversations with the government about how we might better support the protection of nurses in their work place, irrespective of whether they are assaulted or spat at and things of that nature.

In relation to objections, I think I have outlined, in every detail, the difference between the Commissioner of Police's view and the Police Association's view, because obviously there were very significant differences in relation to their submissions to us, and where we have acceded to the requests of either.

On my assessment, we have added a very serious contribution. We have probably given about eight out of 10 of what the Police Association wants, some of which we are not so sure is going to have much benefit or effect, but we are accepting of the principle that the refreshing of that aspect to the judiciary and future people who are in charge of prosecution will be useful. I do not think I can add anything further.

Mr ODENWALDER: To clarify, you said you did not speak directly to the Ambulance Employees Association. I asked if any of the groups consulted were unhappy. You told us a bit about how the Police Association are unhappy. I am quite aware of that. I want to know if any of the other groups you consulted expressed any unhappiness and what the causes of that unhappiness were. I do not think you addressed that.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not think I can add anything further. I cannot recall any coming in and saying, 'We don't want to be in the group,' or, 'We are not happy about the way this is being dealt with.' I think the amendments reflect that we were adding in response to those consultations, so I think it is fair to say that the reverse would apply; that is, several of the stakeholders were interested in our expanding further the definition of emergency worker for the purpose of their being exposed to risk and being protected from it.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, I am going to put that clause.

Mr ODENWALDER: I cannot clarify further?

The CHAIR: Do you need further clarification? I think the Attorney clarified as much as she could last time.

Mr ODENWALDER: Is the Attorney telling us that, after consultation and adding bits and pieces and tacking things on, only the Police Association are now expressing any misgivings about this bill at all? Are all other groups completely happy and satisfied that this serves their needs?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, I refer to my previous answer. I would hope the opposition spokesman would recognise, though, that the Law Society have actually given a very damning indictment of this. I do not want to be dismissive, as though they do not exist in this discussion or this question, but I want to place on the record that they have a very strong opposition. Nevertheless, the representatives of emergency workers welcome it and we are pleased to provide it.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr ODENWALDER: I appreciate what the Attorney is saying about other groups and other types of emergency worker. The reason my amendment leaves so much of that up to regulation is that these things do change. It is an ever-changing field of professions that may or may not be considered front-line and individual sections within classes of professions may, from time to time, be affected and may need to be included within the class of prescribed worker.

The impetus for this legislation came from the Police Association. While I appreciate that other workers are put at risk, the police are doing this daily, as the member for Lee pointed out yesterday. Everything they do is risky. There were 771 assaults last year, and the Attorney outlined some other statistics. The number is consistently very high and too high. It has grown by 8 per cent this year.

Given that the main group that has been agitating for these types of changes is so unhappy with the end result, why has it taken the Attorney-General so long to bring this bill to parliament? Why not just frame a bill that the Police Association are not particular happy with and bring it in? It has taken since October last year to disappoint the Police Association.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Firstly, can I just say that, in respect of the assertion that it has taken such a long time to address, January this year was the first time we had the log of claims of what they wanted, and we have been dealing with it ever since. We have dealt with it in a responsible and considered way and we have identified significant aspects of it, although we have assented to most. We have identified some deficiencies in it, we have expanded it and we have consulted with others.

I think it behoves the member to remember that we here in the parliament make the laws in relation to all these matters, not the Police Association, not the Law Society and not some individual who comes to us and we think, 'We respect these people, therefore we are just going to top and tail it, put it into a bill and rush it through the parliament.' That is not our job.

Our job as a parliament is to do these things properly and, as a responsible government, to introduce legislation that is workable, that is going to be effective and, in this case, that is going to be a deterrent to obnoxious behaviour in the community. That does take a little bit of time. It took us some weeks to do that, and I do not shy away from that. I ask: if this is such a serious problem—and it was, frankly, back in 2012-13, when there were 880 police assaults in the state for the year—what on earth was the member for Elizabeth's party doing about this matter for 16 years? Frankly, not very much.

I raised this question with the Police Association. I said, 'Okay, you have given me a log of claims. I'm happy to look at them, along with the other things that we meet about which are pertinent and important to your members, Mr Carroll. What did the previous government do about it?' He said, 'Well, we raised these concerns on a regular basis.' I asked, 'To which ministers?' There were various police ministers; we know that. They had a pretty high turnover, that is for sure.

The reality is that the previous government did nothing for 16 years, at a time when police assaults in this state were 100 a year more than they are now and 200 more than the year before last. We have acted expeditiously and responsibly, and I think we come to the stage where we have considered what the Police Association initiated. We explored the development of how that might apply to others, just as we did when the previous government came marching in with legislation to require a person who spat at or bit a police officer to submit to a test for the purposes of an assessment about whether they were carrying biological fluids that would transmit a disease.

What did we have to do then? As the opposition, we responsibly looked at it. We went to other parties who were at risk, such as nurses in the emergency departments. We said, 'We think this has merit. If a police officer is trying to take somebody off the steps of Parliament House and arrest them for some disorderly behaviour and they get bitten or scratched, they shouldn't have to wait weeks and weeks to be tested for any full-blown condition that is transmitted to them. They shouldn't have to go through that.'

We agreed with that and we worked on it. We worked with nurses and we said, 'What is the situation for you and other emergency workers?' We brought in amendments to this parliament and we said to the government of the day, 'This has to be expanded.' Ultimately, they agreed to it. They were not too keen on it to start with, I might say, but they did agree to it in the end.

I would have thought, frankly, that the first thing the opposition would do in relation to the requests from PASA would be to say, 'We think that has some merit.' It must have, otherwise the member for Elizabeth would not have brought in a bill setting out their log of claims. Would you not think that they would have gone much further than that and included all the other areas of emergency service front-line workers in the state? No. From memory, they just did police, MFS, CFS, SES and, I think, ambulance workers. That was it. I think that is grossly inadequate. Nevertheless, fortunately they are not in government; we are, and I am proud to be presenting this bill.

Mr ODENWALDER: The Attorney knows that her last claim is false and that I have referred time and time again to other emergency workers who will be prescribed by regulation if either my bill or the opposition's amendments are enacted. Of course, the previous government did respond to assaults on emergency workers and the whole introduction of aggravated offences. I will be generous and say that the government's bill has taken since January to bring to the house, which is worth noting.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: No, that's not right; it would have been May.

Mr ODENWALDER: I said it has taken since January.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: It was 10 May.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, it has taken since January—since. It has taken that long to bring this bill to the house, and all it does, essentially, is tack a year onto the aggravated offence penalty—aggravated offences that were brought in by the Labor government. That is the main crux of this bill, and the inherent weakness of it is that that is all it does. It makes an amendment to the Sentencing Act, which I have referred to and which we will come to later, which our amendments and the bill in my name support, but that is all it does.

It adds some classes of workers to the list of prescribed workers rather than leave them to regulation, as is currently the case. It tacks a year onto the penalties for aggravated offences and then it introduces this whole new thing about human biological material, which is fair enough in itself. As I have addressed in my second reading contribution, which we will get to later on, it is absolutely fair enough to clarify that for the police commissioner. As you have stated, he is the person who wanted to see this enacted.

But an argument could be made that those things were already within the criminal law anyway and that the assaults the Attorney has been describing in some of her previous remarks on nurses and so on are already assaults. It will be interesting to see a breakdown of the number of assaults on emergency workers, whoever they may be, a breakdown of who is subjected to attacks from biological material.

The Attorney knows that her central claim, that the previous government did nothing to protect police and emergency workers, is false. We did that work on aggravated offences, some penalties of which the Attorney has seen fit to tack an extra year onto. The member for Lee, in his role as minister for transport, enacted legislation that looked at vulnerable workers—transport workers and those types of people. It is always a central tenet of the Labor Party's work to protect workers, whatever they do, and police and emergency workers have a particularly dangerous and specific job and they deserve better protections.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

Petitions

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale): Presented a petition signed by 108 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reverse its decision to discontinue the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme from 31 December 2019 and to continue the scheme indefinitely, akin to other Australian jurisdictions, or engage with the disability sector in helping to create a new scheme enabling South Australians the transport freedom and flexibility they deserve.

SERVICE SA MODBURY

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

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

*Parliamentary Committees***ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:02): I bring up the third report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2019-20.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Members***MEMBERS' BEHAVIOUR, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

The SPEAKER (14:03): Before I move on to questions without notice, I wish to make a short statement about the behaviour of certain members. It is obviously my duty, amongst other things, to maintain order and decorum in the house. However, I remind members that they, too, share in the responsibility so that the house can function in an orderly way without damaging its reputation.

As Speaker, I must take account of the state of opinion amongst members in deciding the standards that the house, its members and staff seek to impose. The state of opinion may be gauged by several means: by informal consultation, discussion at the Standing Orders Committee and, occasionally, more systematic canvassing of members' opinions.

On Tuesday this week, I noticed during grievances that the member for King raised a number of issues concerning the behaviour of certain members in this chamber. She made some very compelling points concerning intimidation, aggression and disrespectful behaviour, which she described as 'out of step with community expectations'. Given the behaviour displayed by certain members in this chamber over the last couple of sitting days, I would have to agree with the member for King's observations.

Both sides of this house should take heed of her comments and reflect on what has occurred in the chamber over the last few months. I will continue to do my duty to maintain order and decorum in the house as best I can, but I do seek the cooperation of all members in doing so. We have all been privileged to be elected to this place. With that privilege comes the responsibility of acting with respect and consideration. I ask all members to bear this in mind as we go forward.

Finally, I draw members' attention to yesterday's date, 5 June 2019, which represents the 130th anniversary of the opening of the House of Assembly chamber.

*Question Time***AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT**

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:05): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier now advise the house of the cost to taxpayers for a stay at the Palazzo Versace?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:06): It will all be disclosed as per the guidelines—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which have been in place for quite some time.

The SPEAKER: Before I move on to the member for Lee, I call the following members to order: the member for Kavel, who has been doing it all day, as well as the member for Playford and the member for West Torrens.

AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:06): My question again is to the Premier. Did the Premier stay in a room, a suite or a condominium at the Palazzo Versace?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:06): I stayed in a room.

AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:06): My question, again, is to the Premier. Were any other accommodation options suggested by the government travel services provider?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:06): It wasn't something that I selected myself, but I know that my office would have gone for the lowest cost room at the conference venue.

AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:07): My question again is to the Premier. Were other accommodation options investigated by his office?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): I have just answered that question.

THOMAS FOODS INTERNATIONAL

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall government is delivering enabling infrastructure for Thomas Foods International's expansion of its South Australian operations?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:07): I can, and I do note the member for Hammond's overflowing joy as a result of this announcement. He is not a small man so, when he comes at you with a big bear hug, that sort of thing sticks with you.

This is a fantastic day for South Australia and, in particular, for the people who live in and around Murray Bridge. They have lived under a cloud of uncertainty for the past 18-odd months as the future of the largest employer in Murray Bridge is determined. What we had this morning has put paid to any of those concerns about the long-term future of Murray Bridge. Two thousand jobs will be at the new plant once the plant is fully operational—a fantastic outcome for South Australia and a fantastic outcome for a whole host of people I would like, Mr Speaker, with your indulgence, to outline now.

Can I also, in relation to this, say that this has been quite a long road in terms of the negotiations that this government has had, both with Thomas Foods and the federal government, to come together to build what is essentially one of the very few new plants of its type built in the country at any time over the past number of decades. If I look at plants right across South Australia that slaughter stock—whether that be beef, sheep or pork—there has not been an investment of this size or scale for many, many decades.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the question was about enabling infrastructure the minister is responsible for, not for Thomas Foods investment.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. Minister, you have begun with certain background information. I ask you to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is extremely important.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Thank you; I will hear the minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In that context, I would like to not only thank the member for Hammond but also the federal member for Barker and the federal government for their help in this endeavour. But can I say that getting to the package of works that we have put together actually doesn't just involve enabling physical infrastructure, so we have put together a package of money for enabling road infrastructure as well as a package of \$10 million together for enabling utilities infrastructure, whether that be gas, whether that be electricity, whether that be water augmentation. There are a number of legacy assets that are also being used from the existing Murray Bridge site.

Can I say that the concerns that Thomas Foods had weren't just about enabling physical infrastructure: they were about support from a government that was keen to see South Australia move forward. The two largest concerns that were raised were around skills, and can I say on that front that I know that the work that the Minister for Innovation and Skills has done—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this is debate. The question was about enabling infrastructure.

The SPEAKER: Yes. Look, I have heard two points of order about debate. I understand the sentiments and where they are coming from. I have asked the minister to come back to the substance of the question. Saying that, I think that most of the comments are quite germane, but if I hear the minister deviating to a level that he shouldn't, I will uphold the point of order. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I suppose this is what happens when you look at things in a very narrow prism, Mr Speaker. Getting this deal done was around more than just physical infrastructure. The enabling infrastructure is also about the infrastructure that government puts on the table to be able to ensure that Thomas Foods can make this decision with confidence, and skills are an essential part of that enabling infrastructure.

The ability to have a government that will sit down and work with a business like Thomas Foods to make sure that they have the skills to be able to process the stock is extremely important. But also, more than that, the issue was around getting access to labour in the first place, and the announcement made by the Premier, together with the Prime Minister, around Designated Area Migration Agreements has also given great confidence—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: again, debate. The question was about enabling infrastructure.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order and, as I said to the member for Lee, I am listening very carefully. I still think that the minister is speaking within the confines of standing orders, but I will be listening carefully.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The Designated Area Migration Agreement was a very important part of us being able to persuade Thomas Foods to make this massive unprecedented investment here in South Australia. This announcement today is about Thomas Foods, but it is actually about a whole lot more than just that one company. In fact, we know that plants of this size do underpin entire industries right across our country, and so for those producers of cattle and sheep and other small stock right across our state now know that they can have the confidence to invest in their businesses knowing that they've got a strong competitor in Thomas Foods which is going to bid for their product.

AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:12): My question again is to the Premier. Did the Premier require an additional refreshment room during his trip to the Gold Coast?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): No. All of the expenses related to the attendance at the conference.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will tell you what I didn't claim as an expense: going out for oysters, as recently appeared on the Leader of the Opposition's information that he provided from his office expenses. Office expenses that have recently been reported by the Leader of the Opposition's office include oysters at the Maid. What were they like? Did you have them kilpatrick or were they natural? I hope they were from Coffin Bay; I know that the member for Flinders is quite interested in that. There was also another office expense that the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —put on the taxpayers of South Australia recently.

The SPEAKER: Premier, can you please come to the substance of the question, thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just outlining, sir, different expenses.

The SPEAKER: Yes. You have made your point.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was interested to note that the Leader of the Opposition is billing taxpayers for sushi and Vietnamese rolls as office expenses.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of the order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't know how this really fits into an office expense.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Premier, please be seated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What did you have on your cold roll the other day?

The SPEAKER: Premier, be seated! The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, it is for debate and defying your ruling, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And you questioning me is also out of order. You should know better as the father of this house, and if you keep going you will be leaving. Thank you, member for Lee. I uphold the point of order and ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question. Has he finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No refreshment room, sir.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the government's Future Adelaide advertising campaign in *The Advertiser* will cost \$1 million?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:14): I don't have details of what our advertising campaign specifically will cost, but we have made no secret whatsoever of the fact that we want to promote South Australia interstate. We want more and more people coming from interstate to visit South Australia but also to invest in South Australia and, most importantly, to move to South Australia.

There are plenty of people who have left South Australia in recent years. I think they had given up hope in South Australia under the previous regime, and now we are seeing some of those people come back to South Australia. We want to turbocharge that return to South Australia, whether these are people returning because they have left or whether these are new people. Each year, we have a measure—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the question was about the cost of the advertising campaign.

The SPEAKER: Yes, yes. I think the Premier is canvassing issues that are relevant to advertising, so I will not uphold that point of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I don't have the exact dollar figure, but we are very keen to be advertising in those jurisdictions and, yes, there will be money spent in those jurisdictions. Can I say very specifically that we are looking to reduce the net interstate migration, which blew out to over 7,000 people per year net. That's the difference between those leaving and those coming back: it blew out to more than 7,000 per year. I was very excited to look at the most recent statistics in this area, which showed a 31 per cent decrease in that net interstate migration. Yes, we will be spending money to promote South Australia in interstate markets.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has finished his answer. The member for Lee.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:16): My question again is to the Premier. Do government advertising guidelines permit images of himself or any other member of parliament appearing in paid advertising campaigns?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16): I don't have those guidelines with me at the moment, but I am happy to consult those guidelines. I think we will certainly not be returning to the previous practice under the previous government, where we were constantly being bombarded

with the Labor Party's images of themselves emblazoned on our television sets and hearing their voices on radio.

Mr Duluk: It was awful.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is quite disconcerting when viewers are home at night having dinner with their family and they see a politician popping up. This is not something which is a mainstay of our advertising practice but, with regard to the guidelines, I am happy to look at them and provide them to the member.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house how good the Morrison federal government win is for infrastructure and transport in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Before I hear the minister, the member for Lee has a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The question contains debate.

The SPEAKER: To ask how good the Morrison government's win is for South Australia? I am going to uphold the point of order and I am going to move on to the next question. The member for Flinders, and then I will come to the member for Lee.

DOG FENCE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries—

Ms Luethen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If you want to rephrase the question, you will get another go.

Mr TRELOAR: My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house on the progress to rebuild the South Australian Dog Fence?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:18): I thank the member for Flinders for that very important question. I know that he knows how important the dog fence is here in South Australia. As a sheep producer, he knows that his constituency is very, very reliant on the dog fence. What I might say is that, after a collaboration, the Marshall Liberal government, the Morrison Coalition government and the industry have come together to raise \$25 million to rebuild 1,600 kilometres of a 2,150-kilometre fence.

What I will say is that the bigger picture is that it is a piece of national infrastructure. It's a piece of infrastructure of significance. It's a fence. It's somewhere in the vicinity of over 5,500 kilometres long, nationally, and it does make a difference to many people's lives, making sure that dog fence is in good shape.

We have seen fit to bring that \$25 million to fruition through a collaboration of governments and industry and to get on with the job of rebuilding the fence. The industry's contribution as part of that commitment will safeguard an industry that is under siege at the moment. Previously, in the 2016-17 year we saw approximately 10,000 lambs taken by wild dogs. In the 2017-18 year, it has been reported that over 20,000 lambs have been taken by wild dogs.

Today's market price for lamb is at a record high: \$8.50 a kilogram for lamb at the moment. We also have the value-add of the wool industry and the skin industry, which has been severely impacted by wild dogs. I know that the member for Stuart is very keen to see the fence replaced. His constituency is now thinking that they have a government that is prepared to support the industry. The red meat sector, the wool industry and the skin sector, all have the ability—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —to now have a government that cares about their industry and cares about those pastoralists who have been lying awake at night wondering just how many sheep, how many lambs, how many calves, how many animals are going to be taken by the wild dogs. It's a \$4.3 billion livestock industry that has been heavily impacted. It's about a \$5.4 billion industry here in South Australia, with the combination of the wool and the skins, that now has a government that is looking to put infrastructure in place to safeguard those industries.

The Minister for Infrastructure has just outlined this government's commitment to Thomas Foods International, a great South Australian family business here in South Australia that is now reinvesting in South Australia. Several hundred million dollars are going to be put on the table for that new rebuild.

What the dog fence program will do is safeguard livestock, safeguard the viability of those pastoralists. It also underpins the \$5.4 billion industry here in South Australia as one of our leading economic drivers in the food sector, not only domestically but export. Thomas Foods exports to 84 countries around the world, just like many of the processors do, and we have a number of large processors here. The dog fence is about protecting young and vulnerable animals—sheep, lambs, calves, goats—and Australian wildlife. Not only are the dogs taking those animals but they are moving south, so it is more important than ever that we rebuild that fence, renew that fence—the 1,600 kilometres of fence that needs to be rebuilt.

I am sure that industry is now looking to raise the money. The state government have put their \$10 million on the table, as has the Morrison Coalition government. It's great news for the livestock industry and it's great news for South Australia—#RegionsMatter.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier's department responsible for government advertising guidelines?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): The cabinet would be the ones who would ultimately determine those, but they probably would have been developed in the Premier's department, yes.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:22): Supplementary: were these guidelines updated earlier this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): I will find out and I will bring an answer back for the member who is asking the question.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Will an image of the Premier or any other member of parliament appear in the future Adelaide advertising campaign?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): I will make that inquiry and I will come back to the house.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house of the impact of a continuing Morrison federal government on infrastructure and transport for South Australia?

The SPEAKER: That question is in order. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:23): How good is the Morrison Liberal government? It certainly is fantastic news for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And very, very good news for South Australia that the 11½ per cent—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It depends if you're a journalist being raided, I guess.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. For that 11½ per cent of total share of funding that we were able to secure by sitting down and negotiating, like a bunch of mature adults, with the Morrison Liberal government, we have been able to make sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated for one moment. The member for Reynell and the member for Light are called to order. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Caught in the crossfire. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned for a second and final time, and the member for Kaurna is called to order.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light definitely said something then, and he is called to order and warned. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There was a degree of concern, certainly a high degree of concern on my behalf and this government's behalf, in relation to the impact of the Morrison Liberal government not continuing with the massive haul of money that we have been able to secure for infrastructure projects here in South Australia.

After the return of the Morrison Liberal government and the return of ministers McCormack and Tudge in their respective positions as well as minister Cormann in his position, it is fantastic to be able to reaffirm the commitment to that massive amount of money and the way that we are working together to make sure that we can get this massive injection of funds out the door, seeing bitumen on the ground as soon as possible.

Whilst we did see a commitment on the north-south corridor as well as on the Brighton Road, Hove crossing by the federal members of those opposite, what we did not see was a commitment to any of the other projects here in South Australia. For the Torrens Road, Ovingham level crossing, we now have security that that project will go ahead. For the intersection upgrades at Portrush-Magill, Fullarton-Cross as well as Springbank/Goodwood/Daws roads, people will now know that those infrastructure upgrades will go ahead.

The Glen Osmond-Fullarton Road intersection, which the member for Unley has been harassing me about for a long period of time, will now continue to go ahead, as well as projects in Labor-held electorates, especially the intersections that I spoke about the other day on Main North Road, McIntyre, Kings, Grand Junction and Hampstead. Those projects will go ahead, no thanks to the help of the continuing federal Labor opposition.

More importantly, a massive amount of money is going to be injected into regional roads in South Australia. Again, this is fantastic for somebody who resides in country South Australia, who

has had to wait for 16 patient, long years to see anybody willing to invest in country roads. The duplication of Victor Harbor Road between Main South Road and McLaren Vale, the \$55 million for—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: In 2025.

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

Mr Basham: You told my wife you didn't want it.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: He had 16 years to try to get something done and, quite clearly, couldn't.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: We duplicated your stupid Southern Expressway.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Also, the \$55 million towards Horrocks Highway, which I know is an issue very close to the heart of all of us on this side of the chamber, South Australians can now have the confidence that this project will continue to go ahead.

TASTING AUSTRALIA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier's image and a message from him appear in the Tasting Australia festival program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28): For some reason, the member for Lee thinks that the Tasting Australia program is some sort of political advertising. It is actually an excellent event that is funded by the taxpayers of South Australia. It is common practice, not only here in South Australia historically but, I would think, just about everywhere, that there would be a message from senior leaders who are commending the program to the people who are considering that event. This is exactly where we find ourselves with a petty, desperate opposition in South Australia with nothing useful to pursue, so now they are worried about messages from political leaders for the Tasting Australia—

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

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, it is, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the question. It was respectfully about an image and what it may have appeared in, a Tasting Australia advertisement. The Premier has finished his answer.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Why are there funds available for government advertising and the Premier's travel habits but not for public sector pay increases?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: that question was argumentative at least and was disorderly.

The SPEAKER: 'Why do funds exist for something but not something else?' If I uphold that—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Assuming that the first something, sir—

The SPEAKER: Yes. If I do uphold that point of order for, say, having opinion or argument, I also disallow the respective minister an opportunity to rebut the claim. I have the point of order. It is one of merit. I will allow an answer. Can we have the question again, please.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Why are there funds available for government advertising and the Premier's travel habits but not for public sector pay increases?

The SPEAKER: I will allow that question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): Government advertising is much reduced under the new administration. I am extraordinarily happy to provide that level of detail.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: It's publicly available.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is publicly available, as the Deputy Premier points out, but I'm happy to provide that. We have been extraordinarily prudent with the dollars we have spent on advertising. It doesn't mean that we will never spend money on advertising, because we think it is important to promote the state, but what we won't be doing is spending taxpayer dollars on overt political advertising, as we saw was the common practice under the previous government.

With regard to travel, I am very happy to put my travel costs and our government's travel costs up against those opposite. It's very easy to do that comparison, and now that the member for Lee has suggested it to the house I am happy to ask the department to have a look at the travel expenses, for example, for the member for Lee in the past and perhaps his friend the member for West Torrens, who seemed to go on an extraordinarily expensive trip.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: It was \$74,500.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was \$74,500, I am informed by the excellent Minister for Innovation and Skills in South Australia, which was taken just a few weeks before the election—

Mr Brown: Mr Beverly Hills Hilton himself.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —so I'm happy to do that. But the question really talked about whether or not there should be any expenses and, of course, the issue regarding public sector leave loading increases. I'm happy to address that issue because I think it is an important issue.

We know that the Employment Tribunal applied a 3½ per cent loading to leave provisions for people in the public sector. We also know that this is significantly higher than the increases that have been accepted not only here in South Australia in recent times and under the previous government but nationwide. The Treasurer has seen fit to query that. That is a decision that is currently—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —before the Supreme Court, and we will abide by the decision. The way that it's being characterised, that we are wanting to knock out the \$31 increase, is completely incorrect. All we are doing is querying whether the 3½ per cent increase is in order. We have made that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —query and we will abide by the decision that is forthcoming.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:32): I have a supplementary arising out of the Premier's response. Will the Premier now release his expenses from his time as the leader of the opposition?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33): No, that wasn't the practice at the time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated for one moment. The member for Playford can leave for 30 minutes under 137A. He was on two warnings, and I believe he may have led that cacophony.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It wasn't the practice in the house. We complied with all the guidelines that were laid down by the previous government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We operated within the extraordinarily slim window of expenses that the previous government saw fit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right are called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will give the opposition some credit because just before the last election they did increase the amount of money paid to the leader of the opposition's office and they did refurbish the leader of the opposition's office.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's true!

The SPEAKER: This shouting will stop or members will be departing the chamber. The Minister for Child Protection is called to order for her interjection and the member for Wright is warned. Is the Premier finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The opposition is correct: it was called for because the arrangements, in terms of the money that was going to the opposition leader's office and the condition of the offices, were not suitable. All I was commenting on was the timing.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Just before—that's right.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They had 16 years to increase that amount and they had 16 years to improve the standard of the offices for the opposition leader, but they only chose to do it in the lead-up to the 2018 election.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on key environmental initiatives that will assist in restoration and conservation projects in regional communities, including on Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:35): I thank the member for Narungga for his question. One of the great joys of being the Minister for Environment and Water in South Australia is being able to get out into regional South Australia and see some of those great environmental assets that we have in the regions and also understand what makes regional communities tick and see if we as a government can support them in their conservation activities and in their economic outputs as well.

It has been great to visit many regional communities across South Australia since becoming the minister and, in particular, heading over to the Yorke Peninsula and the Copper Coast part of our state last week and spending a couple of days with the member for Narungga, getting to understand his community and some of the challenges and also opportunities that we face from an environmental point of view.

This government is very keen to see nature-based tourism work hand in hand with economic developers, conservation outcomes and increased biodiversity in our regions. Particularly when you go to the Yorke Peninsula-Copper Coast region, you see a whole range of models or examples of activity that feed right into these areas where primary production and economic development, whether that be our visitor economy or service industries, are coming together to take advantage of the great natural environment that we find particularly in regional South Australia and also conservation outcomes.

There is no greater example, in my view, than the Great Southern Ark project, which is a project that has been around for a couple of years but is starting to build momentum. It is a partnership between the Department for Environment and Water, the federal government's National Landcare Program and then a range of NGOs, including Zoos SA, the World Wildlife Foundation, Birdlife Australia, the Fauna Research Alliance, Conservation Volunteers Australia and Yorke Peninsula Tourism.

This project really is very interesting. A 26-kilometre fence will be constructed across the foot of Yorke Peninsula with the aim to remove some very significant feral pests, both in terms of plant life and animals, from the landscape. That landscape includes the stunning Innes National Park, and it includes over 100,000 hectares of primary production land as well.

This project is a research project, but an active research project, looking at opportunities to remove pests from the landscape, increase the resilience through bettering the biodiversity of that landscape and also improving the primary production values of the landscape as well by introducing native species, which would have historically been found in the area, that will benefit the primary production outcomes. These are the sorts of great projects that, when we get back to basics with natural resources management and work closely with communities, we can actually deliver.

Another such project, and one which I would like to see come to life in the future, is in the member for Flinders' electorate: the Wild Eyre project. I am very hopeful of being able to expand that landscape-scale restoration project because when we get these projects right they not only contribute to the primary production value of the landscape and the biodiversity of the landscape but they also become destinations for visitors and improve our visitor economy as well.

Regional South Australia means so much to this government. We are keen to invest in it, we are keen to support it, and to support regional communities because we know how much they contribute to the diversity, vibrancy and economic development in our state.

MEMBER FOR KING

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:38): My question is to the member for King. Can the member for King provide any evidence for her accusations regarding the conduct of members of the House of Assembly she has alleged under parliamentary privilege?

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: There are standard procedures in relation to the matters for which members have been responsible to the house. Asking a member about—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Quite frankly—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —matters in a grievance debate is unprecedented.

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated. I have put the member for West Torrens on notice that I do not require his assistance when deliberating on a point of order. I have asked him repeatedly to stop that. He will now leave for the remainder question time.

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

The SPEAKER: The point of order is that the member for King is not responsible to the house for that question.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sir, I also rise on a point of order: standing orders provide you with the discretion to determine whether a member is responsible to the house and may be asked questions with regard to that responsibility, and I ask that you now so rule.

The SPEAKER: Yes, questions relating to public affairs may be put to ministers and questions may be put to other members but only if such questions relate to any bill, motion or any other public business for which those members, in the opinion of the Speaker, are responsible to the house. I make the ruling that the member for King is not.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: She's not responsible for her own comments?

The SPEAKER: The member for Light can leave for the rest of question time. Would the opposition like another question? The member for Light can leave and the member for Badcoe can have another question.

The honourable member for Light having withdrawn from the chamber:

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. When will the tender be advertised for a financial counselling service to replace the department's soon to be axed financial wellbeing counselling service?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:41): I thank the member for her question. That's an operational matter and I am not responsible to the house for that.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:41): A supplementary then, sir: why has a tender not been advertised, considering the minister told the house in estimates last September that the tender would be advertised within nine months? You were responsible then.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe, you know that sort of commentary is also out of line and disorderly. I'm calling it out. You are on notice. Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:41): I will bring an answer back to the house.

SKILLING SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is growing our skilled workforce and strengthening the economy?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:42): Yes, I can. Thank you very much to the member for Davenport for his interest in skills in South Australia. Our challenge, of course, is to build a workforce with the skills to propel our economy into the future. Under Skilling South Australia, we are helping more people get the skills and qualifications they need to build careers. In any modern economy, there are some skills and levels of experience that we need right now but we simply don't have. Critical skills shortages are holding back economic growth, exports and employment in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government is ensuring that our workforce is skilled and equipped to meet industry's demand.

On Friday, I addressed industry at a CEDA event, outlining our initiatives to grow South Australia's skilled workforce, particularly crucial as our economy rapidly diversifies into new and emerging industries like defence, space, digital, cybersecurity, health and ageing, and of course, renewable energy. There are many businesses, particularly in rural and regional areas, that want to grow and expand but struggle to attract the skills that they require, particularly in agriculture, food production, tourism and aged care.

We heard the great announcement this morning in this house about Thomas Foods: 2,000 South Australians being offered jobs over the coming years. Production is starting at the end of next year. I am pleased that as a department we have been working with Thomas Foods in order to help them train their existing staff and potential staff. I also visited the Minister for Transport's electorate to visit engineering firm, Ahrens. I heard about their skills programs—40 apprentices and trainees. They want more but they don't have enough tradespeople to employ more apprentices and trainees.

Skilled migration can of course breathe new life into the economy and local communities by introducing much-needed capabilities and experience that is currently lacking. New Designated Area Migration Agreements (DAMAs) will help increase our local skills base, create jobs and fill workforce skills gaps. Local businesses will be able to sponsor skilled overseas workers for positions that they are unable to fill with local workers, assisting them to expand their businesses and create new local employment opportunities.

The DAMA program, which commences on 1 July, comprises two agreements: the Adelaide Technology and Innovation Advancement Agreement and the South Australian Regional Workforce Agreement, which covers the entire state. Concessions to standard visa requirements, such as pathways to permanent residency, will help employers attract the right people. Concessions under the DAMAs recognise local salary rates and cost of living, allowing employers to respond to local market conditions.

It's important to understand that migrants will never be paid less than local workers doing the same work. Conditions of employment for overseas workers must be in accordance with those offered to Australian workers. It might surprise many in this chamber that even superannuation payments are a requirement for migrant workers. Many employers will tell you how much more expensive it is to actually go overseas for workers—they would much rather find those workers here—but many of them are forced to do so in order for their business to grow. They can employ more local South Australians as they have the right skills in place.

Employers must demonstrate that they can't get a local worker for the job and that that job can't be filled by an apprentice or a trainee. We welcome skilled migrants as a critical part of supplementing our ageing workforce, meeting skills shortages and increasing our population. DAMAs will help South Australia attract the skills we need to grow our economy and to mentor and develop the next generation of workforce here in South Australia.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How many clients of the department's financial wellbeing counselling service will be transferred to a new service provider on 1 July?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:46): As I have said, I will bring back a full and comprehensive response regarding the future of financial counselling; however, what I will say is that, as part of the 2018-19 budget, the department reviewed its services and programs to ensure that they were aligned with the core business of keeping children safe from harm and neglect. This review highlighted the opportunity to restructure the delivery of financial counselling services.

In relation to financial wellbeing services, there are currently three departmental core areas of service delivery. These will all continue to be addressed in the future. There is reunification, which is working with front-line families, including supporting families to re-establish and maintain safe, healthy and financially stable home environments. There are carers working with children, setting them up for success. Currently, foster carers are already provided with financial counselling services via their foster care agency. That is part of their contract. There are also kinship carers, who are currently receiving financial counselling help through the department.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The third area is young people transitioning from care. We have already instigated foster care payments and kinship care payments to the age of 21 to enable those young people to stay in a family environment where they will learn financial budgeting, cooking and all the life skills that they need from their family for longer—something that the Labor Party, in their 16 years, did nothing about. We also have—

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Minister, be seated for one moment. There is a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: For debate, sir. She is clearly debating.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully. Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I am clearly indicating how we are providing financial counselling services to our young people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right! Member for Kavel, you can leave for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for Kavel having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I have the point of order via the member for Lee. I am listening to the minister's answer. I believe the content is germane to the question. I have written the question down. Member for Lee, I am listening to the answer carefully.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Other services that exist to help our young people transitioning from care are via the CREATE Foundation. They have a peer mentoring and also a Sortli app. We have also increased the funding to Relationships Australia. They also have a GOM Central app. Support is also available through both South Australian and commonwealth-funded programs, including TILA, which allows for \$1,500 for a young person to set up their home.

There are also the Dame Roma Mitchell funding grants. I recently signed many letters for young people who are applying for grants to help with their future life, whether that be through education or setting up their homes. We have also funded a pilot program in the regions in Upper Spencer Gulf with Uniting Country, and that is a peer mentor group of young people who have lived experience of transitioning out of care, to help new young people transition to get help, to get work, to enrol in education.

So there is a lot that is being done under this government in order to give people financial stability, and there will be more announcements coming.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: given that the minister was reading directly from a document, I ask her to table that document.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is that if the minister was reading a public document, that it be tabled. On my view of it, member for Kaurana—and I always appreciate your points of order—in fairness to the minister, she was perusing what were notes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I don't believe that she was reading.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition can leave for the rest of question time as well for commentary during my deliberation. This is completely unacceptable.

Mr Malinauskas: Yes, it is.

The SPEAKER: It is completely unacceptable. It is not on. I have put members on notice.

The honourable member for Croydon having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: We will move to the member for MacKillop and I will come back to the member for Badcoe. I would like to give the opposition over 20 questions today. But these points of order—some of which, in my humble opinion, may start to deviate into a soft nature—if you want to keep calling them you may, but I am trying to give you more questions today.

ANZAC SPIRIT SCHOOL PRIZE

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house in relation to the 2019 Premier's ANZAC Spirit School Prize?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:51): I'm very pleased to have this question from the member for MacKillop, and hot off the press is some good news for some students in the electorate of MacKillop, which I will come to shortly.

I know that this is a prize that is supported by members right across this parliament. I'm sure that members across this parliament appreciate the opportunities that teachers in their schools give

to students in their local areas to be able to participate in this prize, to engage with our service men and women, returned service men and women and, indeed, potentially historical service men and women, family members and others who have served our country so that they can better understand what the ANZAC spirit is and what it is to be a key part of Australian history, and to understand it.

This year, more than 1,000 years 9 and 10 students across South Australia took part in the ANZAC Spirit School Prize, and 16 of those students have been successfully chosen to participate in a 14-day study tour to Vietnam later this year. This is an opportunity for all 1,000 students to be able to undertake studies and do research on individual service men and women, soldiers and nurses, people who have given for our country and made sacrifices during those two significant conflicts in particular. Previously, it was World War I. During the centenary of ANZAC those were highlighted.

This year, the poster featured Sir Ross and Keith Smith, Wally Shiers and their other crew member in the centenary year, recognising their extraordinary flight across the world. That's relevant here, too, because 1919 was the year after the end of the First World War. One of the themes they were looking at was the way the nation recovered and the way the spirit of the nation was supported by the Prime Minister's prize offered for that trip around the world. That's one of the things students considered. Indeed, World War II subjects were also available.

I am really pleased also to note this year that the entries submitted by schools for judgement have been submitted to the RSL Virtual War Memorial to contribute to that. But on to the winners. I am really pleased that the member for MacKillop has asked the question. I can advise him that the Kingston Community School has provided two of our winners this year: India Little and William Wiseman. Indeed, the Meningie Area School has been honoured with Charli Medlows' performance, but members right across this chamber can be pleased with the performances of their local students.

We also congratulate Sophie Baker from the Central Yorke School, Melissa Campbell from Glenunga International High School, Laura Cassell from Xavier College, Matilda Cotton from Glenunga again, Lily Farrell from Loreto College in Marryatville, Montana Foster from the Wudinna Area School, Liam Kay from Cardijn College, Shreyas Khanna from St Peters College, Sophie Lipman from Loxton High School, Ryan Schwarz from Endeavour College, Elise Tukur from Roxby Downs Area School, Daisy Yates from Saint Martin's Lutheran College in Mount Gambier and Tabitha Zdanowicz from the Loxton High School.

All these students are worthy of our congratulations, and I think that they will be joining all the previous students who have gone on this trip on 5 July when, at Ayres House, we will be holding a reception for many of those students who have undertaken those study tours. I think that it is going to be an amazing group of young South Australians who have done this work over the last decade and a half or so. Their research and their participation in the community have added to our state's understanding of ANZAC, but I think that this trip, and this prize in particular, is an aspirational opportunity for so many young people to give some thought to what this country has been built on over the last one hundred years of that ANZAC tradition and what feeds into that spirit.

PAIRING ARRANGEMENTS

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:55): My question is to the member for Hammond. Was he directed to dishonour the pair agreement reached with the opposition on 12 February this year?

The SPEAKER: Pairs are a private arrangement. The member for Hammond is certainly, member for Lee, in my opinion not responsible to the house for that answer, but I will give you another go at a question if you would like one.

PAIRING ARRANGEMENTS

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:56): My question is to the Leader of Government Business. Did he direct the member for Hammond to dishonour the pair agreement with the opposition on 12 February this year?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, with regard to pair arrangements, they are a private arrangement and I uphold my earlier answer. I have given you another question. Previous speakers

may have held such repeat of a question to be a naming offence. I do not. I have given you another go. I am moving to the member for Florey, and I will come back to the member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker, I must object to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Well, if you would like to object to my ruling, you can do so via the relevant motion.

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER'S RULING, DISSENT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:57): I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: It is moved. It is a 10-minute debate.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sir, it is with the greatest reluctance that I find myself in this position making this point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —to the house. Over the last two days, we have had members who have been asked questions who do not usually receive questions, starting with you, sir. It is highly unusual, although not unprecedented, for a Speaker to be asked a question in this place, and you in answering that question, or indeed those questions, obviously took the view under standing order 96 that you were sufficiently responsible to the house for that matter and you furnished the house with answers. Certainly, that was much appreciated by the opposition.

At the commencement of question time today, sir, unsolicited and unexpected and pursuant to the regular order of business at the commencement of question time, you made statements reflecting on a contribution that the member for King had made, and I would put it to you, sir, elevating that to a matter of public interest by introducing those comments, or further commenting on the member for King's contribution at the beginning of question time, arguably, perhaps, the most public of all of our proceedings during the course of a parliamentary sitting day.

And then further questions were put today to members who are not ministers, pursuant in the mind of the opposition to standing order 96, starting with the member for King, about the basis of the comments that she made earlier in the week, and then my question (in the singular) that I asked the member for Hammond, again clearly about a matter of public interest, and that is the dishonouring of a pair agreement, which is a very, very significant convention of any parliament.

Indeed, I am aware of only one other Australian jurisdiction where this has occurred. This occurred in Victoria, where the then leader of the opposition, Mr Matthew Guy, dishonoured a pair agreement reached with the Andrews government. That was such a matter of public interest that it was reported in Victorian newspapers. Not only was it reported in Victorian newspapers but it was such a matter of public interest that the Premier of South Australia retweeted the fact that his Liberal colleague had undertaken this action in the Victorian parliament.

So I put it to you that questions regarding the member for King's comments and questions regarding the granting or dishonouring of a pair agreement are in the public interest, sir. It is not so much that the opposition and I question your ruling about whether a member is responsible to the house for answering those questions, but it is the inconsistency in the treatment, sir, of your rulings, between your choice to answer the questions put to you and your decision on the rulings not to allow the answering of the questions by the members for King and Hammond that so aggrieves us.

As I said at the commencement of my contribution on this matter, it is with a heavy heart and great reluctance that I find myself doing this because, unfortunately, towards the conclusion of this parliamentary sitting week things have become so significant and so grave that we feel on this side that we must draw a line in the sand because this seems to be a growing pattern of behaviour, where we feel, sir, on this side that we do not receive equal treatment from you when it comes to the interpretation of standing orders on this side.

I raise this matter of dissent, and I do so in preference for raising this grievance in any other form according to standing orders. Let me make that clear—that I have chosen this way rather than either of the other avenues available to the opposition to raise a grievance about this. It has become clear to us, through this pattern of behaviour principally around the conduct of question time, that we do not receive the same treatment on this side of the chamber as those do opposite. Only earlier today, sir, during the course of question time did we have you exercise your authority under standing orders to complain about the member for West Torrens providing commentary during the receipt of a point of order from those opposite.

In the 15 or so months since the last state election, there has rarely been a point of order made in this place without additional commentary made principally by the member for Morialta and, failing that, the member for Bragg. You have never taken umbrage at that, sir. You have never taken umbrage at that, let alone disciplined a member to the extent where you felt that they needed to leave the chamber. That is clearly iniquitous, sir—that is clearly iniquitous.

I appreciate your making the point to us earlier that you would like to see better conduct in this place, particularly during the course of question time, as we all would, sir, and I am sure you would see it if we were all treated equally. But the fact is that you only need to look back at some of the statistics that can be borne out of question time to note that it is a regular occurrence for the majority of question time to be given over to the asking and the answering of government questions rather than opposition questions. That understandably chafes at members on this side of the chamber.

We have one hour per day of parliamentary time to hold the government of the day to account, and when half that time or more—and, indeed, going back to last year, in May it was 43 minutes—of the hour of question time was dedicated to the asking and answering of government questions, we are unable to do our job properly. We are prevented from doing our job properly, and when we are removed from the—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Member for Lee, be seated. The member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order: pursuant to the standing order 135, paragraph 1—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr TEAGUE: —if a member elects to adopt a course of this nature, the member ought do so at once and identify the decision to which he has dissented. What has emerged in the course—

The SPEAKER: I believe, respectfully, the member for Lee has done that, member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: What has emerged in the course of the remarks of the member for Lee is that this matter has been premeditated. It appears to have been caucused—

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, with all respect, that is a bogus point of order and you can leave. But if there is a vote, obviously any member who is ejected can come back for a vote, but you can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Heysen having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I gratefully appreciate your making that particular ruling because certainly when points of order or contributions have been made by members opposite in all contexts of the proceedings of a parliamentary day, whether it is during the time of the making of a point of order, whether it is the asking of a question, whether it is making a second reading contribution, or whether it is even during the committee stage of a bill, those on this side of the chamber are constantly subject to bogus points of order.

The remedy for that meted out by your predecessor, the former member for Croydon, was just the punishment that you meted out to the member for Heysen, yet in my mind, in my recollection,

this is the first time that we have seen that. It does not feel that we are getting equal treatment on this side of the chamber—at least until this occasion, until right now.

It may be of some comedy to those opposite to see members of the opposition repeatedly ejected under standing order 137A. It may even be a matter of some comedy for those opposite to see their colleague the member for Kavel ejected from this place under that same standing order. Combined with some of the other treatment that members of the opposition receive in this house—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport, please.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —for example, during the time which is allocated to private members' motions and private members' business, repeatedly members of the opposition, except for the crossbench of course, having all their business almost every single day adjourned when it comes up for contributions in a manner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —which I have never witnessed before—

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you are starting to digress.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: You are starting to digress.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —in near 16 years of my time in this place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: So, Mr Speaker, contrary to the contribution from the member for Heysen, not only have I placed my motion of dissent on your ruling in context but I have placed it in the broader context of the treatment of members on this side of the chamber since the election.

It is no small matter of importance to us when we have to return to our electorates and explain to them why we have had minimal or no opportunity to raise the matters of import that they have sought us to raise because at every single juncture members opposite use whatever means possible to silence us and to use, unfortunately in this case, the powers of the Chair to ensure that we have little opportunity to do our job, either in holding the government to account or in representing our electorates.

That is why I ask all members now to draw this line in the sand, to make sure that we do not have a repeat of the behaviour on all sides that we have seen in the last week and to behave with a little more equity and a little more fairness and a little more reasonableness.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:08): Sir, your ruling was wise, of course, and the government supports your ruling and your continued role in the job of Speaker. I think you are doing a great job. I think that one of the key things that the member for Lee failed to do was make a case in relation to the specific ruling that was made just before. Instead, he spent almost all his time traversing a range of what he described as context grievances from the opposition. Therefore, in that spirit, I think it is reasonable that we reflect on some of the points he has raised that are slightly broader.

I want to start with this idea that he has done so with a heavy heart, this feigned reluctance, this appearance that he is so aggrieved—

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Member for Lee, I did give you some scope. I hope that this point of order is a good one.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He said that I made my remarks with a feigned sincerity. I take great offence at that. This is a most grave matter, which I have already made clear to the house I have raised with great reluctance.

The SPEAKER: I ask the minister to not personally reflect as heavily on the member for Lee.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I withdraw the term 'feigned'. I think I said 'feigned reluctance' or 'feigned sincerity'. At any rate, I withdraw whatever term it is that the member for Lee was clearly deeply personally offended by. I am very sorry for that offence. The fact is that the member for Lee said that he has been in this house for 16 years, and for many of those years he was obviously part of a government that was. When he was in Mr Foley's office, learning the standards of the house that Mr Foley thought were most appropriate, I am certain that he learned those lessons well at the feet of Mr Foley.

The line in the sand that the opposition so objects to is the fact that the Speaker today has said that the member for King raised some important points earlier in the week: the idea that standards in this house need to be raised, the idea that standing orders should be respected and the idea that the schoolchildren who come to observe us in this house should have role models and representatives in this house they can look up to and not be ashamed of, thinking, 'If my mates in the class were doing this, I wouldn't be very proud of them.'

That is the standard that is expected of us all as role models and members of parliament. That is the line in the sand that the member for Lee seems to be concerned that you wish us to stick to, sir. The member for Lee, and previously the member for West Torrens, expressed great concern that the member for King had suggested that behaviours in this house that she had seen demonstrated were of concern, without, to my recollection, identifying any specific member. I am sure that other people have witnessed those behaviours as well. I have certainly witnessed some of them over the years.

She did not make an accusation against a single member. She instead took the opportunity to call on us all to raise our standards, to reflect on behaviours and to ensure that our community can be proud of our conduct. As Speaker, sir, you have decided today to make a statement that raising standards is worthy, that standing orders are worthy of being considered, and you asked members on all sides of the house to reflect on that. I note that, during your comments, some members said that it was outrageous, or words to that effect, that you were asking for these things. You, sir, in an act of benevolence in my view, decided not to pull them up at that stage, although you would have been well within your rights to do so.

The member for Lee reflects on rulings of former Speaker Atkinson. I thought that Speaker Atkinson comported himself during his time in a manner that was certainly of interest. There were novel rulings. The term 'bogus point of order' I think has its genesis in rulings of Speaker Atkinson. I did not hear it under Speaker Breuer or others beforehand during my time in the house. Speaker Atkinson had an interesting time. Sometimes he would give the opposition 10 questions in a row and then the government of the day four questions in a row.

The question of how many questions we have had was brought up by the member for Lee. My notes say that the opposition has had 20 questions today. It is possible that I am off by one or two; a couple were ruled out of order of course. If they want to ask yes or no questions, then they are obviously going to get shorter answers, if that is the level of questioning that they wish to pursue. But the idea that somehow the time allocated for question time under this Speaker has been anything other than considerate to the opposition and the crossbenchers is absolutely laughable and does not stand the scrutiny of any comparison with previous regimes at all.

There were days when Speaker Atkinson would allow 10 questions. There were days when he would allow 35. There were days when he would give over the first half an hour of question time to the opposition and most of the second half to the government. Indeed, I fell foul of Speaker Atkinson on one occasion because I took umbrage at the idea that he had allowed what I thought were five or six questions in a row from the government. It turned out it had only been three or four in a row from the government at the time.

In my observation, the Speaker we have today has offered the opposition more or less three questions to every government question in a consistent fashion so that the opposition may prepare their question time accordingly. They may prepare their tactics without interference from the Speaker, without the Speaker deciding that he has a particular minister who he does not mind receiving more questions in a row than before.

I am sure that all former members of cabinet would have noticed that procedure. When certain ministers were under pressure, they maybe had fewer questions offered and certain ministers were allowed further questions, as long as those questions were to that minister. Some members observed this. From the opposition benches, we were potentially more concerned that some of our members would not be given the call at the callous whim of the Speaker if that was what he wanted to do. If we wanted to give the member for Unley a question, we tried to give him the top two or three questions to make sure that he would actually get that question in before the end of question time if we wanted to give him a run. Those were the ebbs and flows—the tides—of debate.

I quite enjoyed Speaker Atkinson's time in the chair. He and I had a mixed relationship. He threw me out quite a lot, but I did not take it personally because that was how the parliament was going. The fact that the member for Lee claims that the opposition has been unfairly treated does not bear scrutiny compared to previous parliaments.

You, sir, I think have been fair in your application. It hinges on one particular statement that the member for Lee made that I think bears further concern and that was his suggestion that disorderly behaviour has been equal between both sides of the house but the response to it has been unequal. I challenge that significantly because the opposition know in their heart of hearts that, when they come into this chamber, they are encouraged by their colleagues, I am sure, to be boisterous and rowdy. You see these orchestrated activities taking place. There are occasional interjections from government members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —and sometimes members of the opposition say very, very funny things and people laugh. Sometimes people say shameful things and, in accordance with standing orders, people might say 'shame' or they might agree with something that is said and they say 'hear, hear'.

Sir, I have noted you call to order or warn government members when they have strayed from those standing orders, as you have for members of the opposition. The difference is that members of the opposition do so after almost every question that they ask; they do so repeatedly, and it seems sometimes that they do so in a coordinated fashion. Sometimes we have members who have written speeches. They put those speeches into interjections and then claim concern when they shout on the way out. Those are the behaviours that I think should be reined in and that you have been reining in, and I welcome the fact that you do so for government members as well as opposition members.

I dispute the suggestion that there has been any inconsistency in treatment. I think it is an outrageous suggestion and I do not think the facts bear it out, which brings us back to the ruling in question. The Speaker has determined that pairs are a private matter. That is a matter that is certainly my understanding of the case.

We researched the issues relating to whether public statements put on the record previously about constitutional votes requiring absolute majorities not attracting the same pairing arrangements any more than quorums have, combined with the fact that the federal Labor Party has written letters confirming that they do not consider absolute majorities—required votes—to be ones that pairs are relevant for. That was my understanding, to be very clear about the question.

It is one that has not been universally applied because sometimes, when the matter of whether the absolute majority or not would be determined by a pair has not been in question, the government has granted pairs on those occasions. There were a few last year that have been ventilated by the house. There was one that was brought up by the member for Playford and a few others that were identified.

My understanding, on the advice of the Clerk, is that standing orders are not relevant when it comes to pairs and that they are a private arrangement between the parties. It is obviously desirable if the parties can come to agreement on that, but at this stage we have not. We may in the future. We may not. That is a matter for those opposite, but for the moment the parliament is functioning and it is functioning well.

Those opposite are seeking to raise the temperature of the debate at every turn and I do not think you have seen that response from members of the government this week. I think members of the government this week have behaved to a standard that, whilst not perfect, has been, by and large, in accordance with standing orders. Most members of the opposition have done so as well, although some have not, and you have warned them or called them to order and, when necessary, applied sanctions under 137A. Sir, the government and I believe that your rulings have been fair, equitable and reasonable and should stand. We certainly oppose this self-serving motion.

The SPEAKER: The question, as I wrote it down, is that the ruling of the Speaker be disagreed to as it is inconsistent with previous examples. It has been moved by the member for Lee and it has been seconded.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 19
Noes 24
Majority 5

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

Boyer, B.I.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Motion thus negatived.

Question Time

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:25): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Since 4 September 2018, how many of the 59 full-time equivalent staff in the financial wellbeing counselling service have left?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:26): I thank the member for her question. It's good to see that she is interested in the wellbeing of the staff, as I was, and I have been working with the CE and the department to ensure that all staff are looked after. I will bring back a full and comprehensive answer to the house.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How many staff in the Department for Child Protection will lose their positions in the financial wellbeing counselling service on 30 June this year?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:26): As I mentioned, I will bring back a full and comprehensive answer to the house.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Energy in his capacity as the minister responsible for questions on health and wellbeing. Are general practitioners working with the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network always informed when their patients are taken off public elective surgery waiting lists and admitted to private hospitals for their surgery?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:27): I will get a full answer from the Minister for Health on that. I apologise that I haven't got that level of detail available in my head right at this minute. Member for Florey, I know you are very genuine about health issues in your electorate. I will come back to you with an answer to that specific question.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:27): A supplementary: what additional costs are being incurred by the outsourcing of elective surgery?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:27): I suppose there is an assumption in that question that there are additional costs. But, again, I am more than happy to come back to the member with an answer from the Minister for Health.

RABBIT CONTROL

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:27): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is addressing the impacts of rabbits on agricultural land?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:28): Yes, I certainly can. I thank the member for Waite. I know that he has rabbit incursions in his electorate in the foothills of South Australia. What I can say is that recently in Mount Barker, I was very happy to announce a new Rabbit Control Coordinator in South Australia. His name is Josh Rosser.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: No, it's not Peter the Rabbit: it's Josh. The position has been funded in a partnership thanks to \$260,000 from the federal Liberal government through the Agricultural Competitiveness White Paper. We know that the then minister Joyce had developed a white paper about the invasive species across the nation, none more so than the rabbit. We know that we are now working with landowners to wipe out areas of the destructive environmental pest and the amount of damage that it is doing, not only to agriculture and horticulture but also to our environmental assets.

I am sure the Minister for Environment is deeply concerned about the damage it's doing to his parks and his assets—some \$30 million of damage across the state on an annual basis. What we are going to see is that the rabbit coordinator is now going to move around the state and coordinate with landowners, farmers, agriculturalists, horticulturalists and environmentalists to coordinate an approach to this destructive pest. We are seeing now that we are using some of the different methods, such as ripping, fumigation and, of course, the calicivirus that has been in train for a number of years.

The rabbit coordinator will work with landowners to make sure that we have a very much coordinated approach. He is travelling the state, and there have been significant reports on newly

planted horticulture—grape vines, trees and nurseries. That puts the cycle of those trees and vines back four to five years in some cases. We know that some of the rootstocks, once they are chewed, never recover and can never be used out in open field. We know that the destruction on fence lines, the destruction they are incurring, particularly with agricultural crops, is having a significant impact on our economy.

Again, I would say that the landowners are being called upon to make sure that they let the coordinator know when there are significant sightings or impacts of rabbits so that we can actually implement a collaboration, an approach, that will better destroy this invasive pest. I am advised that the coordinator is about to release approximately 300 vials of the RHDV1 K5 calicivirus strain. That is the latest strain that is about to be released into our natural environment to combat the invasive species.

We know that, once upon a time, myxomatosis was a viral strain that was released, and it had a significant impact on rabbits, but today the calicivirus continues to evolve. With the release of those 300 vials, we hope to see the destruction of such an invasive pest. Josh Rosser is travelling the state, and I appeal to every landowner and every environmentalist: if you have rabbit pressure, contact him through PIRSA so that we can attack the rabbit instead of the rabbit attacking us.

TONSLEY RAILWAY STATION

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:31): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why did Goldthorpe Planning arrange a listening-post event for Monday 10 June at the Tonsley station, given that Tonsley trains do not run on public holidays?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:32): I thank the member for her question. I would note that there are actually a number of workshops and drop-in sessions and other ways for people to get involved, and next Monday is one day. Here is the thing about the Tonsley train station: the people who use it live pretty close to it and so, even though the trains may not run, the people who live in proximity to that station, who would be the people who would walk to, ride to or be dropped off at the station, would be in proximity.

We also know that it's a time when people may not be at work, so it's an opportunity to capture a different audience, as opposed to an audience who may be caught at different times of the day or night. I can reassure that there are a number of ways, in person as well as online, to be able to get information. I think that the consultation process we are undertaking is first rate.

MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:33): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development and Primary Industries. Minister, can you please explain why regional communities are having to put a minimum contribution of \$50,000 if they are to submit an EOI for consideration for prioritisation for round 5 of the South Australian Mobile Black Spot program? With your leave, Mr Speaker, I will explain a bit further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: A letter from the minister states:

On...24 May 2019, I opened an Expression of Interest...process to help decide which sites will be prioritised for Round 5 of the [mobile black spots]. Communities are invited to submit an EOI demonstrating how their site will support economic growth, and a minimum community contribution of \$50,000...This process will enable us to gain a better understanding of the communities' coverage needs, as well as improving each application's chances of success.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:34): I thank the member for Frome for his important question. Yes, round 5 expressions of interest are out there. I think it's important to note that round 5 is an early tranche of the latest commonwealth, state government and telco partnership collaboration. It is done for the simple reason that the previous government ignored blackspots here in South Australia.

What we have seen over the first three rounds is that South Australia received 20 towers out of some 860 towers nationally, and I think that's been a disgrace—an absolute disgrace. Obviously,

the previous government thought there were no blackspots in South Australia or that there were no telecommunications issues in South Australia. What I would say—

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

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. I have given the minister some time to elicit some background information, as I do from time to time. I ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Coming back now to round 5, the blackspot program is an initiative that, as I said, is a collaboration between the commonwealth government, the state government and the telcos. With round 5 and round 6, \$160 million is being put on the table by the commonwealth. The remainder of the \$10 million commitment that the state government committed to our dedication to address the blackspot issue has been run. In round 4, we saw 29 towers in South Australia awarded to regional areas. Round 5 is open now.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Point of order: relevance. I asked about the contribution of communities of \$50,000.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order, member for Frome. With respect to the member for Frome, you were granted leave, you inserted some facts into that question and so you could expect a fair bit in the answer. I have pulled up the minister once to come back to the substance of the question. Minister, please get to the point.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Addressing the member for Frome's concern about the \$50,000, that was a public ask of how they could progress their way up the priority list to have their area, their businesses, their communities, given more priority when it comes to those towers.

When it comes to assessing those towers, it is done by the commonwealth government and by the telcos. You would very well know that everyone in South Australia who has blackspots and grey spots needs the telecommunication connection, and they are looking for a leg up. They are looking for ways that they can progress their tower, their concern, up the list. That ask came from the community and so we have responded to the communities concerned. We have given them the option that if they would like to see their tower prioritised then they might, perhaps, make a contribution.

It's not saying that they have to make a contribution. If they wish to make a contribution they may do so. If they don't want to make a contribution, that is entirely up to them. To date, we have had a number of applicants who are very forthcoming. They don't actually have to put the money up-front. It's an initiative where they put an expression of interest up first. They now have the option to put that application in with the commitment that they will put up to \$50,000 with that application to prioritise their blackspot tower.

So that is round 5. That is what has been asked of the community. The telcos, the commonwealth government and the state government are working in collaboration to make sure that we address many of those blackspots.

The SPEAKER: On my notes today, for what it's worth, there have been 25 non-government questions and eight government questions.

Grievance Debate

ELECTION COMMITMENTS

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:38): I rise to speak about how those opposite are travelling—slowly, it seems—with achieving their big pre-election promises to South Australians of lower costs and better services, about their upcoming budget, which will also be a measure of their performance against that pre-election mantra, and their huge hike in fees, which directly contradict their phony lower cost promise, a slogan that obviously fits well onto a corflute or a DL that we now know is bereft of any substance whatsoever. Less than a year ago, the Treasurer said, in relation to his budget characterised by cuts, closures and privatisation:

This budget will reduce the cost of living for struggling families by cutting...taxes and charges.

Reducing the cost of living for struggling families certainly fits with the mantra—not their reality of lower costs—and is a fine aim to have. As inequality grows here in SA, as wages growth stalls, we should aim to lower the cost of living for those who are doing it tough.

Unfortunately, those opposite have shown through last year's budget, and through their deep passion for increasing fees, charges and taxes on everything, that they have no care for how South Australian families, including those who are struggling, will meet the cost of living. Their nasty fee increases do not discriminate. They are indeed one of this government's best examples of inclusion. There is a little something and sometimes a big something for everyone, with everyone sharing the pain.

Their higher charges for car parking will greatly impact both staff and the general public when they park at our SA metro hospitals to go to work, visit a loved one or for their own treatment. Staff negatively impacted include nurses, doctors and allied health professionals, and also deeply hurt are cleaners, orderlies, catering attendants and admin staff.

A hospital cleaner working 25 hours per week earns just \$570 take-home pay, and through some pretty tight budgeting they pay their rent or mortgage, feed their family, meet the cost of utilities and get their kids to school. These workers will now be slugged an additional \$13.95 per week to park at work—\$27.91 per fortnight or \$725.66 per year. Those workers who pay \$561 per year to park at work will now pay \$1,287 to do so. These workers are very unhappy about this and would like to say to this government, 'Don't park your problems with us.'

This is a horrific increase in costs for some of the lowest paid workers who rely on their government to lower, not increase, the cost of living, an increase that is completely discordant with their utterly meaningless 'lower costs' election promise, an increase that sits alongside their cruel cash grab for \$31 a year—not a week—scheduled pay increase for public servants. I can just hear the Premier and those opposite advising that, if it is all just too hard, let them catch the bus, but these are of course also the workers who will be hardest hit by this government's cuts to public transport because, if they do not drive their cars, they are the ones who will need to use those bus routes that this government has ruthlessly slashed early in the morning and very late at night.

The general public will of course also be included when they are slugged by this parking increase, with fees rising by over 20 per cent in most hospitals, and the general public, when not suffering higher costs associated with visiting a loved one, is expected to bear a raft of other increases: car rego will be up by 5 per cent, admin fees by 42.8 per cent, driver's licences by 4.5 per cent, admin fees by 17.6 per cent and, if you are a tradie, you will be hit with a 10 per cent increase in contractor licence and registration fees.

Lower costs they said, better services they said. 'Lower costs' and 'better services' they indeed plastered everywhere—a deeply misleading, untruthful promise from a government incapable of empathising with South Australian people trying to make ends meet. It is pretty easy to forget about them, I guess, when you are in cosy comfort at the Palazzo Versace listening to the dulcet tones of 'The Mooch'.

I fervently hope that the Treasurer with ice in his veins might melt some of that ice with a shred of compassion ahead of next fortnight's budget, but, as with the hopes of many South Australians, I fear that my hopes for them may be dashed.

THOMAS FOODS INTERNATIONAL

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:43): Today is the day of a momentous announcement not just for Murray Bridge, Hammond, regional South Australia and South Australia as a whole but for Australia, and I do not say that lightly. The announcement today of Thomas Foods and the rebuild of its new multispecies, world-grade facility at Murray Bridge is something I have longed for since 3 January last year when we saw the terrible fire that burnt down the factory.

I had news that we were making this announcement yesterday afternoon. I went up to my office here, and my staff, Greg and Jessica, were there. To be fair to her, Jessica has not been with me long and she is based in Adelaide. I said to Greg, 'I need to get the Bollinger out,' and he looked at me. He had forgotten the conversations I had had around why I would be getting Bollinger out.

He said to me, 'Is it your wedding anniversary?' I said, 'No, it's bigger than that.' He looked at me and he said, 'What?' I said, 'There are a lot more people involved than that,' and he said, 'TFI.' We did have a man hug—let me say that—because it is something my office and I have been working hard to secure for this state. That is how good it is. To be fair to my wife, I mentioned that conversation to her first thing this morning, and she agreed with me.

What I will say is that the conversations had in the last 17 months have been respectful. Whether it was me liaising with the company, with David McKay, whether it was me talking to cabinet ministers, whether it was me talking to the Premier, whether it was me talking to Tony Pasin, the federal member for Barker, whether it was me talking to Brenton Lewis, the mayor of Murray Bridge, they have been healthy, respectful conversations. All of us, including the cabinet and the whole party room on this side, had the one ideal—that we needed to secure what will be, with this build, the 2,000 jobs situated in Murray Bridge.

Mr Bell interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I note the interjection from the member for Mount Gambier. We had to work hard for this because the predators were circling. The predators were circling from within the state and from outside the state. I must make the comment that the commitment from Thomas Foods from day one was to Murray Bridge. Darren and Chris Thomas have stuck to their word, regardless of the predatory behaviour of some.

It is an absolutely fantastic announcement. It will be world class and it will be the newest and best facility in Australia, if not the world, when it is built, with top animal welfare standards, top workplace safety standards and top environmental standards on a greenfield site close to Murray Bridge. With pain comes opportunity. I note that when Chris Thomas and his business partner, Bob Rowe, came to Murray Bridge 20 years ago, they took a leap and have since spent over \$300 million in the region and in their meatworks. This is another step that his son Darren and the company are taking to secure the future of processing meat in Murray Bridge for this state and this nation for the next 50 years. This is world-beating; this is just huge. I am so, so excited that this announcement has been made today.

However, I do want to make a few quick comments about what happened after the 3 January fire. I got in touch directly with former ministers Bignell and Picton, and we stood side by side for the press conference the next day. I will say that the former government got on board supporting Thomas Foods while they were in power and supporting the transition of sheep into Lobethal. I salute the Adelaide Hills Council for the work they did in getting B-double access with the transport department and everyone else.

I salute what our government has done since coming to power last March to make sure that we secured this facility, with our assistance in road infrastructure and utilities, so that we can have this world-class facility built in Murray Bridge and provide the vital 2,000 jobs and the 4½ thousand jobs behind that.

Time expired.

LIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:48): Today, I would like to talk about a couple of the projects in my electorate and some activities undertaken by volunteers across our state. I was recently invited to officially launch the Fund My Neighbourhood project undertaken by the Gawler Uniting Church. They were successful in getting funds through the Fund My Neighbourhood program under the previous state Labor government, and they have built a community garden and a children's playground.

I would like to commend the people involved in the church who have brought this project to fruition. As I said at the official launch of the project, it is good to see that some of our churches are now back at the centre of community life. For some time now a lot of people have not seen churches as part of community life, and these activities that provide a range of facilities and services around the faith organisations certainly are to be supported. A lot of people worked very hard to bring this project to fruition, all being volunteers, and they have been very successful in doing so.

Another Fund My Neighbourhood project I would also like to commend, amongst many others in the community, is the one undertaken by the Gawler Apex club. They applied for a grant through the Fund My Neighbourhood program to upgrade the furniture at Apex Park in Gawler. The club received high-level support from the community and were successful in obtaining a grant for the requested amount of \$20,000.

With the funds available and support from the Gawler council, they replaced all the older furniture with modern, eco-plastic and recycled plastic furniture. They also installed additional park benches and a special table and chairs that had wheelchair access. The key part of this project was to ensure that our parks are much more inclusive, particularly for people with disabilities. I commend Apex Park for taking that initiative. Apex Park is very happy with how the furniture looks and the way it works. One thing they did say is that without programs like Fund My Neighbourhood this project simply would not have occurred.

Mr Speaker, as you know, the incoming Marshall Liberal government decided to axe this very successful program. I say 'successful' because it did something that a lot of other grant programs did not do: it empowered local communities to do something themselves. The communities themselves had to find a project and, importantly, the communities had to then convince other members of the communities that this project should take priority over others.

That was something new and novel. I must confess that when I first heard about the program I was a bit sceptical, but I am a convert. I was a convert as soon as I heard how it could work. What it does is activate those volunteer groups in our community to go out and fight for those projects, whereas in the past it has been a very passive process, where people put in applications and some public servant, a bureaucrat in the city, decides whether you get a yes or a no. In this case, it was actually the community voting for priorities in the community.

I must say that our community of Gawler was very successful. We attracted about \$1 million worth of funding from Fund My Neighbourhood and 15 projects got up in my town. That is an indication of how strong the volunteer sector is in my town. That is the simple truth. These people worked hard, they worked together, they supported their own community and we got 15 projects and a \$1 million worth of investment in our community. We improved a range of local projects as a result of that. As I said, it is a great program. It is unfortunate that it was axed by the incoming Marshall Liberal government. When I talk to various community groups, they are still aggrieved by that budget decision.

In the time I have left I would like to talk about another project. This one is not in my electorate, but it has a history in my electorate, and that is the Pichi Richi Railway Preservation Society project. On the weekend, I was fortunate enough to be invited to the official relaunch or welcome back of the Pichi Richi Railway Yx141 locomotive, which is now the oldest working steam locomotive in South Australia. It was originally built 127 years ago in 1892 as the Y141 in the James Martin and Co. foundry in Gawler.

It was modified in 1911 to produce more power and then it was renumbered the Yx141. After that, it spent most of its working life at the South Australian Railways Port Lincoln division until being retired in 1959. It was stored there for four years until it found its way into the playground in Port Lincoln in 1963. It was then rescued by the Pichi Richi Railway Preservation Society, renovated and put back on track.

REGIONAL RAIL CLOSURE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:54): To continue in that vein, following the member for Light, I, too, am going to talk about trains.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: You don't have them in your area anymore.

Mr TRELOAR: We do not now and that is exactly what I am going to talk about. Sadly, last Thursday, 30 May, the final train passed through Cummins and delivered its last load of grain into Port Lincoln on 31 May, bringing to an end more than 100 years of rail service to Eyre Peninsula. Unfortunately, it reached the end of its line. It was a system that was inextricably linked with the settlement of Eyre Peninsula. It was a sad day for many who had grown up with the rail system, which has provided an important service to the residents of Eyre Peninsula.

It was a sad and significant end to a line that has serviced Eyre Peninsula for more than 110 years, with the first line extending from Port Lincoln to Cummins in 1907. In many ways, the die was cast decades ago. In 1997, Genesee & Wyoming, known as GWA, purchased the Eyre Peninsula line from the then commonwealth government. In the early 2000s, the ownership structure of our storage and handler changed from a grower-owned cooperative that we knew as SACBH to a commercial entity. The bulk-handling facilities are currently owned by Viterra, a Glencore company.

It has often been stated by the Minister for Transport that only one-third of the Eyre Peninsula grain crop is currently hauled by rail, with two-thirds already getting to port by road. It is critical to remember that the crop will be delivered to the market, rail or no rail. The focus is now shifting from the rail line itself to the need for additional spending on roads and related infrastructure. Estimates vary, but Viterra itself is suggesting an extra two trucks an hour on our roads.

An upgrade to parts of the line was made in 2004 when, through a combination of funding from federal and state governments and the operators, a \$41 million road and rail package extended the operational life of the line. Part of that investment was a \$2 million grower-funded levy. A significant contraction of the rail service occurred at this time, with Wudinna and Kimba becoming terminus stations. In 2017, the state government and GWA commissioned a freight report suggesting a number of options going forward. High-level discussions took place. Unfortunately, by 2018, the two businesses involved, Viterra and GWA, were unable to come to a contractual agreement to continue using rail to transport grain.

The result is that between 500,000 and 750,000 tonnes, the amount currently hauled by rail, will now transition to road. There is always a human side to such decisions. Unfortunately, 30 to 40 jobs have been lost in the area following the rail closure, bearing in mind that, once upon a time, the railways on Eyre Peninsula employed over 600 people. On the flip side, there will almost certainly be extra work for our truckers. After playing a critical role in the settlement, transport, communication and even social activities of Eyre Peninsula for more than 100 years, I, for one, will be sad to see the trains go.

There are several stakeholders at the table, with local, state and federal governments all being asked to consider funding streams for our roads at relatively short notice. This issue has consumed much of my time and the time of many others for the past 12 months. I am pleased to say that the state government will partner with the federal government to invest \$32 million to upgrade our local roads to help cater for the increase in freight movement. Obviously, there is input from council, Regional Development Australia and the trucking industry itself, which will be critical in deciding and determining where this money will be spent.

Aside from the grain task, GWA also owns and continues to operate the rail from the Kevin mine site west of Ceduna into Thevenard. Gypsum from the mine is loaded onto ships bound, for the most part, for the building industry on the eastern seaboard. This service will continue, given the mine life at Kevin is expected to be at least another 200 years. A number of new port facilities have also been proposed for various sites around Eyre Peninsula. It will be interesting to see how these develop and how they might change the way grain flows across Eyre Peninsula.

Many people gathered in Cummins the other morning for a 10.30 send-off to the final train. Schoolchildren came across, ladies ran a trading table outside the front hall, ABC regional broadcast from the town hall and a few speeches were made by various dignitaries. It was sad in a way, but it was a wonderful send-off. The train drivers came off the train and were presented with a small token of appreciation from the community of Cummins and from the community of Eyre Peninsula as a whole.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:59): Parliamentary privilege is something that we, as parliamentarians, should all fight for and cherish. It is something that is granted to very few Australians. In the commonwealth parliament, in the House of Representatives, about only 1,200 people have had the benefit of parliamentary privilege and there have been even fewer in the Senate. In this place, there has been a slightly longer period of assembly and slightly longer periods of privilege, but privilege has been something that we have fought for. Of course, with privilege comes responsibility.

I was stunned today, Mr Speaker, to hear your opening statement before question time, and I make no reflection on you or your rulings, other than through the appropriate methods that standing orders allow. On Tuesday, the member for King made some rather remarkable accusations, I would say, about members of the House of Assembly, which led to the Speaker making a statement to this house basically, I think, verifying those statements.

I attempted today to ask questions. The Speaker ruled that questions of members regarding statements they have made in this house they are no longer responsible for, which I think is a unique situation in our Westminster parliamentary democracy, but I accept that ruling.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Point of order: I believe the member is reflecting on your decisions.

The SPEAKER: It is a fine line, minister, but I am prepared to allow the member for West Torrens to get it off his chest. If I would like to respond, I will, but thank you, minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not getting it off my chest, Mr Speaker. I am simply stating a fact that we are now the only parliament in the federation that says parliamentarians are not responsible for statements they make to the house.

Those statements were extraordinary. Attempting to link the scourge of family violence to behaviour in this chamber to make a partisan political point, which was then reinforced, I think demeans us all. In fact, I will go further. If the member for King is prepared to back up those statements, she should walk out of this parliament, without the protection of privilege, and make those statements again and accuse her colleagues in this house of the very thing she has accused them of here under privilege—of threatening behaviour, of feeling unsafe in the chamber while the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker or his representatives are in the Chair.

I have never once seen a member threatened in this parliament. Indeed, the house is established with a blood line to ensure the safety and protection of parliamentarians, but apparently the member for King has evidence—I have not seen that evidence—evidence that is so overwhelming that it led the Speaker to make something of it today.

The member for King said that people in this chamber thump the table. Well, thumping the table is the only accepted practice we have to show acceptance of a matter, but she says it has been done in a threatening way. I have never seen that once in this parliament. She also mentioned non-verbal behaviour—whatever that means—such as indicating hanging or slitting throats when a person is speaking. Most alarmingly, this disrespectful behaviour is occurring when there are large groups of children sitting in the gallery. Who is thinking of the children? Apparently, not the opposition.

I think these accusations are completely offensive to the house and the good governance of the house. They are a poor and immature way of making your point, but the member for King has provided no evidence to the house—none. I was not in the chamber when she made these accusations, otherwise I would have risen to my feet and asked her to withdraw.

I have been here for 22 years. There has been robust debate across the chamber, but I have never seen a Liberal MP, a Labor MP or an Independent MP threaten anyone. Every member who comes to this house comes to this house with the best of intentions. Every member who comes to this house comes wanting to do the right thing by their community, but the member for King has passed judgement on all of us because she claims these things have occurred, yet provides no evidence.

Making these accusations under privilege is scurrilous and cowardly. The member for King should make them outside this chamber and name the people and provide the appropriate evidence that these things have occurred. I would be fascinated to know what process anyone has gone through to try to verify these things before any statements were made to the house, but of course we will not ask any questions of that. No member in this house has acted disrespectfully. I have never seen it and we have rules to govern the house.

ROCK LOBSTER FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:04): I would like to draw attention to an issue affecting one of our state's most valuable industries: the rock lobster fishing industry. Port MacDonnell is known as Australia's rock lobster capital. The town on the South-East coastline is home to one of the largest

rock lobster fishing fleets in the Southern Hemisphere. However, it has been 13 years since the harbour was last dredged and now years of build-up of sand and seaweed is causing major problems for the fleet.

The levels are so bad that fishermen are struggling to get their boats in and out of the harbour, they are having trouble refuelling at the designated area and there has been damage to engines. Every time they refuel, fishermen have to clean out their cooling intake filters because they are completely clogged with debris, most particularly seaweed. A number of times, both fishing and recreational boats have had their engines overheat whilst out at sea because of this problem, which is potentially a major safety issue if rough weather were to strike.

Jeremy Levins, who has been a rock lobster fisherman for 30 years, said the problem has been getting worse and worse over the last five years. At low tide, he said that there is barely a foot of water below his boat and that in rough weather sometimes he has trouble actually manoeuvring into his mooring. He is replacing parts on his boat years before he should have to. Recently, there have been meetings to decide what to do about the problem with representatives from the Department of Planning, Training and Infrastructure who are responsible for the upkeep of the harbour. The solution is dredging the harbour, but there are additional issues, such as where to dispose of the waste.

Approval has to be granted by the EPA and studies have to be undertaken to determine the impact on shore and marine life. If it can be disposed offshore, the cost would be around \$1 million, but onshore that cost could be as much as \$3 million. It could be as long as 12 to 18 months before a decision is made. Since the breakwater was built by the state government in the late 1970s, the fishermen have collectively paid between \$60,000 and \$90,000 a year in mooring fees for roughly 65 boats in the harbour. The channel was last fully dredged in 2006.

For the last 13 years, Port MacDonnell locals have had to pay close to \$1 million in fees to the state government, which ironically is roughly the cost of dredging the harbour. To me, this is a major safety issue. Fishermen need to be able to use the harbour safely. Before this escalates, there needs to be some action by the state government. The town needs a permanent and ongoing solution. The rock lobster fishing industry generates around \$280 million for the South Australian economy each year and provides hundreds of jobs, both direct and indirect. Ensuring the continuity of one of our state's most valuable industries should be a priority for our state government.

In metropolitan Adelaide, millions of dollars are spent maintaining what is considered to be vital infrastructure. In my opinion, this is vital infrastructure for Port MacDonnell. The state government has just announced over \$52 million in funding to protect against coastal erosion on the state's coastline. Of this, \$48 million is going to metropolitan coastlines, including \$28.4 million for one project: a sand recycling pipeline from Semaphore to West Beach. By comparison, just \$4 million has been allocated for regional coastlines across all regional South Australia.

This is another example of disparity between our metropolitan and regional areas. I call on the state government to support the residents of Port MacDonnell and the fishing fleet of Port MacDonnell and ensure that the breakwater and harbour are dredged free of seaweed so that the rock lobster industry can operate in a safe and effective manner. Any assistance that can be provided to speed up the approval process with the EPA and DPTI would be greatly appreciated by the residents of the South-East.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) (NO. 2) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:10): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend various acts the administration of which is committed to the Attorney-General. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:10): I move: That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) (No. 2) Bill 2019 makes miscellaneous amendments to various acts committed to the Attorney-General. It addresses a number of minor or technical issues that have been identified in legislation.

Judicial immunities: parts 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 15 and 18 of the bill make minor amendments to a number of acts to clarify that a judicial officer has the same immunities from civil and criminal liability as a judge of the Supreme Court. Under the common law, a judge of the Supreme Court enjoys immunities from civil and criminal liability for acts done in the performance of judicial or quasi-judicial functions. The same immunity from civil and criminal liability extends to other judicial officers at common law, and there is no distinction between superior and inferior courts.

The immunity of a judicial officer from civil and criminal liability under the common law continues to apply, despite any express statutory reference in legislation to the contrary. Notwithstanding, there are a number express statutory references in various acts which currently refer to certain judicial officers only having immunity from civil liability.

The bill amends section 33 of the Coroners Act 2003, section 46 of the District Court Act 1991, section 36 of the Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993, section 15 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, section 44 of the Magistrates Court Act 1991, section 110C of the Supreme Court Act 1935 and section 26 of the Youth Court Act 1993 to affirm the position under common law that judicial officers have the same immunities from civil and criminal liability as a judge of the Supreme Court.

Criminal Procedure Act 1921: part 3 of the bill responds to an issue regarding inconsistencies between the penalties that currently apply in relation to a breach of an order made under section 180 of the Criminal Procedure Act 1921 and a breach of a firearms prohibition order made under section 45 of the Firearms Act 2015. Section 180 of the Criminal Procedure Act allows the court to make a range of orders where it is satisfied that a firearm or offensive weapon was used in, or facilitated, the commission of an offence. Relevantly, this may include an order under section 180(1)(g) that a person is subject to a firearms prohibition order within the meaning of the Firearms Act.

In the event of a breach of an order under section 180 (including a firearms prohibition order), the Criminal Procedure Act imposes a maximum penalty of \$500 or 12 months' imprisonment. This is to be contrasted with section 45 of the Firearms Act, which imposes maximum penalties ranging from \$50,000 or 10 years' imprisonment up to \$75,000 or 15 years' imprisonment in the event of a breach of a firearms prohibition order.

The bill, therefore, amends the Criminal Procedure Act to increase the maximum penalties that apply in the event of a breach of an order made under section 180 so that, in the case of a breach of an order relating to a firearm, the maximum penalty is \$50,000 or 10 years' imprisonment; in the case of a breach of an order relating to an offensive weapon, the maximum penalty is \$10,000 or two years' imprisonment. As a result, a person who breaches an order relating to a firearm under the Criminal Procedure Act will be subject to a substantially higher maximum penalty, which is proportionate to the penalties that currently apply under the Firearms Act in relation to a breach of a firearms prohibition order.

Similarly, a person who breaches an order relating to an offensive weapon under the Criminal Procedure Act will also be subject to a higher maximum penalty, which is proportionate to other maximum penalties that currently apply for related offensive weapon offences under part 3B of the Summary Offences Act 1953.

Evidence Act 1929: part 6 of the bill amends the Evidence Act 1929 to clarify that, for the purposes of the act, a reference to a victim in section 29A and in section 67H is taken to apply to a victim or alleged victim of the offence. Section 67H defines 'sensitive material' for the purposes of division 10 of the Evidence Act. Under section 67H(1)(a) of the act, sensitive material is taken to include the audiovisual record or the transcript of any such record of the interview of a witness. Currently, section 67H(3)(b) only refers to a victim of a sexual offence and does not include an alleged victim of an offence. As a result, there is a risk that the prerecorded interview of an alleged victim of a sexual offence may not be considered to be sensitive material for the purposes of the act.

This would mean that the safeguards designed to protect the highly sensitive interviews of young children or persons with a disability may not apply until after the offence has been found proven. This is clearly contrary to the intent of the legislation to protect the evidence of vulnerable witnesses. The bill amends section 67H(3) so that the audiovisual record or transcript of interview of an alleged victim of a sexual offence is taken to be sensitive material. A similar amendment is also made to section 29A of the Evidence Act to remove any doubt that the provision applies to a victim or an alleged victim of the offence.

Next, we have the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2018. Part 9 of the bill amends the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2018 at the request of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption. It ensures that councils are subject to the same obligations as public sector agencies under section 12 of the act. Section 12 of the act imposes an obligation upon the principal officer of a public sector agency or council to ensure the existence of designated responsible officers.

Section 12(4) further provides that a principal officer must prepare and maintain a document that sets out the procedures for a person who wishes to make an appropriate disclosure of public interest information to the agency and for officers and employees dealing with the disclosure. Currently, section 12(4) of the act only refers to the principal officer of a public sector agency, and not a council. This is inconsistent with parliament's intention, as evidenced in the explanation of clauses of the Public Interest Disclosure Bill 2018, that councils would also be subject to the requirement to prepare a document of the kind contemplated by section 12(4). The amendment therefore ensures that the obligations under section 12 that currently apply to public sector agencies will also apply to councils.

Next is the Sentencing Act 2017. Part 10 of the bill amends the Sentencing Act 2017 to remove the current \$20,000 monetary limit on compensation that is able to be awarded by the Magistrates Court when convicting a person of an offence. Section 124 of the Sentencing Act currently enables the court to make an order requiring a defendant to pay compensation for an injury, loss or damage resulting from an offence of which the defendant has been found guilty. Section 124(6)(c) provides that the Magistrates Court may not award more than \$20,000 in compensation unless a greater amount is prescribed by regulation.

Since 1 July 2017, there is no longer a limit on the amount of compensation that may be awarded by the magistrates of the South Australian Employment Tribunal when convicting a person of a criminal offence. The removal of the cap was an inadvertent consequence of the transfer of jurisdiction over industrial offences from the Magistrates Court to SAET. As a result, there is now an inconsistency between the powers of the magistrates of the Magistrates Court and those of SAET in respect of the amount of compensation that may be awarded. The bill repeals the monetary limit on compensation that may be awarded by the Magistrates Court to ensure consistency with the compensation that may be awarded by SAET.

Next is the Serious and Organised Crime (Unexplained Wealth) Act 2009. Part 11 of the bill amends the Serious and Organised Crime (Unexplained Wealth) Act 2009 to extend the operation of the act for a further 10 years. Section 36 of the act contains a sunset clause, which provides that the act will expire 10 years after the date of its commencement, on 29 August 2020. If the act is allowed to expire, South Australia will be the only jurisdiction without an unexplained wealth scheme in place to deter serious and organised criminals from bringing unexplained wealth into the jurisdiction. To ensure the continued operation of the scheme, the bill extends the operation of the act for a further 10 years, so that the act will not expire until 29 August 2030.

Part 12 of the bill makes a minor amendment to the definition of 'premises of a participating body' in the Sheriff's Act 1978, at the request of the Chief Justice, in order to better provide for the security of the courts. The amendment expands the boundaries of the court premises to include the precincts and immediate environs of those premises, adjacent car parks and footpaths, the laneways between or abutting the premises or place and the entry and exit points of court buildings.

Next is the Spent Convictions Act 2009. Part 13 of the bill makes a number of minor changes to the Spent Convictions Act 2009. Firstly, the bill repeals a number of uncommenced provisions of the Spent Convictions Act moved by former member, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, which, if enacted, would allow for a young person (of or below the age of 25 years old), with an immediately spent conviction,

to apply to a qualified magistrate for an order that a prescribed exclusion under clause 14 of schedule 1 of the act does not apply in relation to that conviction.

The Vincent amendments sought to acknowledge that there may be exceptional circumstances in which the immediately spent conviction of a young person should not have to be disclosed to an employer or potential employer. However, the amendments proposed by Ms Vincent are impractical and fail to recognise that the Spent Convictions Scheme is not specific to the particular offence committed by the relevant person but, rather, the context in which the offence relates to the workplace in which they are currently employed or seek to be employed.

A finding of guilt in relation to a minor drug offence may not be considered particularly concerning to an employer seeking to employ a person as a landscaper, but may be concerning to the potential employer of a pharmacist. If enacted, the amendments would likely lead to persons with immediately spent convictions seeking an exemption from a qualified magistrate as a matter of course.

The Hon. Kelly Vincent, when moving these amendments to the former government's bill, had foreshadowed the haste at which they were made and the potential need for them to be reviewed, particularly to consider whether such oversight was necessary. While both the former government and the Liberal opposition at the time supported the bill passing as amended, further consideration of the amendments show that they do not recognise the role of the Spent Convictions Scheme and utmost need to protect vulnerable people in South Australia. It is therefore the government's view that it is appropriate that these amendments should be repealed.

Secondly, the bill also amends the Spent Convictions Act to ensure that certain uncommenced provisions of the act made by the Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Act 2017 and the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio No 3) Act 2017 are able to come into operation as intended.

Thirdly, a further consequential amendment to the Spent Convictions Act is made to correct a drafting error in the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio No 3) Act 2017 to ensure that spent convictions for historical homosexual offending cannot be disclosed in any circumstances, unless required by regulation.

Next is the Summary Offences Act 1953. Part 14 of the bill amends the Summary Offences Act 1953 to clarify that, for the purposes of a notice issued under section 21OD of the act, which has yet to commence, the notice applies to land within a designated area that is within 20 kilometres of a boundary of a relevant prescribed area.

Section 21OD of the act enables the minister to declare an area of land as a 'designated area' for the purposes of certain drug-running offences. Under section 21OD(3), a notice 'cannot include within a designated area land that is more than 20 kilometres from the boundary of a prescribed area'. A potential difficulty arises if the terms of section 21OD(3) are interpreted literally, as this may mean that, in order for land within a designated area to fall within the scope of the notice, no part of the land can be more than 20 kilometres from any boundary of a prescribed area.

In the event that a court applied a literal interpretation of section 21OD, there is a risk that a notice issued under the act could be deemed invalid. This would likely impact the ability to prosecute persons seeking to unlawfully supply and transport liquor in certain prescribed areas. The bill therefore clarifies that, where a notice is issued under section 21OD, the notice applies to any part of the land within the designated area that is within 20 kilometres of a boundary of a relevant prescribed area.

Next is the Surveillance Devices Act 2016. Part 16 of the bill addresses an omission in the transitional provisions of the Surveillance Devices Act 2016 to ensure that material obtained contrary to section 4 of the former Listening and Surveillance Devices Act 2016 continues to be an offence under the current act. Section 4 of the former act made it an offence to use a listening device to record conversations without the participant's knowledge except as permitted by the act. The Surveillance Devices Act commenced operation on 18 December 2017, replacing the former Listening and Surveillance Devices Act. Since 18 December 2017, Part 2 of the Surveillance Devices Act has regulated the lawful use of devices and recordings.

Where an unlawful recording is made contrary to part 2 of the Surveillance Devices Act, section 12 of the act prohibits the use of the material gained. Relevantly, section 12 makes it an offence for a person to knowingly use, communicate or publish information or material derived from the use of a surveillance device 'where obtained contrary to part 2 of the Act.' As a result, it appears that section 12 would not currently prevent a person from using information or material, which, at the time it was recorded, was gained contrary to the former act. To address this issue, the bill amends the Surveillance Devices Act so that material obtained contrary to section 4 of the former act continues to be an offence under the Surveillance Devices Act.

Next is Trustee Act 1936. Finally, part 17 of the bill amends the Trustee Act 1936 at the request of the Public Trustee to enable the Attorney-General to approve a trust variation scheme under section 69B of the act to alter the powers of the trustees to manage and administer a relevant charitable trust. Section 69B(3) of the Trustee Act currently enables the Attorney-General to approve a trust variation scheme to alter the purposes for which property may be applied in pursuance of a charitable trust, where the value of the trust property held in trust is low (i.e. below \$300,000 or a limit prescribed by regulations).

This has created uncertainty as to whether the Attorney-General possess the power to approve a trust variation scheme which would allow capital to be applied where the trust instrument provides for the use of income only. In circumstances where there is uncertainty, section 69B(4) of the Trustee Act confers a discretion on the Attorney-General to refer an application to the Supreme Court. The Public Trustee advises that an application to the Supreme Court to vary the trust is often a costly and lengthy process.

The option for a trustee to apply to the Attorney-General for the approval of a scheme provides a more efficient and cost-effective method of varying the trust than offered by application or referral to the Supreme Court and is consistent with the approach adopted in New South Wales. The bill therefore amends section 69B of the Trustee Act to allow for the Attorney-General to approve a trust variation scheme altering the powers of the trustee of a relevant charitable trust. Where the application raises questions that should, in the Attorney-General's opinion, be decided by the court, the act preserves the ability for an application to be referred to the Supreme Court for appropriate determination.

This concludes the matters that are the subject of the portfolio bill. I commend the bill to members. I am happy to read the explanation of clauses, unless leave is granted for me to insert them. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses.

Leave not granted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can table them, if you want to.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I table the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend various acts for the purpose of vesting jurisdiction in the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, to make associated amendments to the Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920, the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989, the Residential Parks Act 2007, the Retirement Villages Act 2016 and the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 and for other purposes.

Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:32): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statutes Amendment (SACAT) Bill is the next in a series of bills conferring jurisdiction on the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal. SACAT was established in March 2015 and initially conferred with jurisdiction to deal with housing disputes, including residential tenancy disputes; guardianship and administration; consent to medical treatment; advance care directives; and mental health.

Following passage of the Statutes Amendment (SACAT No 2) Act 2017 in late 2017, SACAT took on the functions of reviewing a wide range of administrative decisions, including in areas of local government, land and housing, taxation and superannuation, environment and farming, energy and resources, and food safety and regulation. This was stage 3 of SACAT expansion. This bill comprises the fourth part of a planned five-stage program to confer jurisdiction upon SACAT.

In particular, this bill will amend various acts to transfer to SACAT the functions of the South Australian Health Practitioners Tribunal under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010; the disciplinary functions of the Architectural Practice Board under the Architectural Practice Act 2009; and the disciplinary functions of the Veterinary Surgeons Board under the Veterinary Practice Act 2003. It also includes a raft of administrative reviews currently exercised by the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court under the:

- Air Transport (Route Licensing—Passenger Services) Act 2002
- Architectural Practice Act 2009
- Boxing and Martial Arts Act 2000
- Building Work Contractors Act 1995
- Controlled Substances Act 1984 (and eventually Controlled Substances (Pesticides) Regulations 2017)
- Dangerous Substances Act 1979 (and eventually Dangerous Substances (Dangerous Goods Transport) Regulations 2008)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: I call your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The administrative reviews continue, as follows:

- Electoral Act 1985
- Gene Technology Act 2001
- Hairdressers Act 1988
- Health and Community Services Complaints Act 2004
- Health Care Act 2008
- Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010
- Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013
- Motor Vehicles Act 1959
- Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995
- Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003
- Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995
- South Australian Public Health Act 2011
- State Lotteries Act 1966
- Tattooing Industry Control Act 2015
- Training and Skills Development Act 2008; and

- Veterinary Practice Act 2003.

In relation to the transfer of the work of the Health Practitioners Tribunal, this has always been intended for transfer to SACAT at the appropriate stage. At the time of enactment of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law, the relevant jurisdiction was conferred on the generalist civil and administrative tribunals already in existence in various states and territories.

As South Australia did not at that time have SACAT, the specialist Health Practitioners Tribunal needed to be established. The forthcoming retirement of the president of the Health Practitioners Tribunal is an ideal time to effect this planned jurisdictional transfer to SACAT and consequent dissolution of the Health Practitioners Tribunal. The bill will also transfer to SACAT the disciplinary functions currently exercised by the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court under the:

- Building Work Contractors Act 1995
- Motor Vehicles Act 1959
- Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995; and
- Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995.

From the Supreme Court, the bill will transfer to SACAT the function of hearing reviews against certain hospital licensing decisions of the minister under the Health Care Act 2008. From the Magistrates Court, the bill will transfer to SACAT the functions of dealing with reviews and applications for approvals in relation to applications for change of a child's sex or gender identity under the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996, as well as appeals against licensing decisions under the Employment Agents Registration Act 1993. The bill also confers on SACAT certain existing reviews by ministers under the Architectural Practice Act 2009 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959.

Lastly, the functions of determining equal opportunity complaints and exemption applications under the Equal Opportunity Act 1984—that is the jurisdiction at one time exercised by the former equal opportunity tribunal and currently by the South Australian Employment Tribunal—will be transferred to SACAT by the bill. The jurisdiction of the former equal opportunity tribunal had been transferred to the South Australian Employment Tribunal by the former government in 2017.

While many complaints of discrimination are employment related, many are not, including complaints of discrimination in areas such as goods and services, accommodation, education, clubs and associations, sale of land or granting of qualifications. For this reason, the bill will transfer the equal opportunity jurisdiction to SACAT, which is a more appropriate fit for these matters and consistent with arrangements interstate.

However, in circumstances where a discrimination complaint is related to other proceedings on foot in SAET—for example, the discrimination complaint is factually linked to a workers compensation claim—the bill provides the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity or SACAT with the power to refer the discrimination complaint to SAET so that the two proceedings may be heard together by SAET. This will avoid delay and prevent unnecessary double handling. In addition to the amendments to confer additional jurisdiction on SACAT, the bill also addresses a number of anomalies identified in previous conferral acts and makes other changes requested by SACAT to address uncertainty and increase efficiency in legislation used by SACAT.

The bill amends section 93A of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 to extend the offence of disrupting proceedings to disruption of hearings conducted by telephone or video link. SACAT has advised that merely hanging up in these circumstances does not adequately address the problem.

The bill amends section 22 of the SACAT act to provide that assessors are to be appointed by the Attorney-General on the recommendation of the SACAT president, rather than by the Governor on the recommendation of the Attorney-General, as is the current practice. Currently, ministers appoint assessors for use in District Court proceedings under their particular acts. In light of this, and since acts contemplating the use of assessors generally require panels of multiple

assessors to be appointed, the requirement for Governor appointment for each assessor will become overly burdensome.

The bill amends section 90 of the SACAT act, which deals with public access to documents and other material received by SACAT, to address uncertainty in the terminology. References to 'material admitted into evidence' and material 'taken or received in open court' will be replaced since it is not always clear when material falls within these terms due to SACAT's procedural informality.

The arbitrary restriction on access to photographs and video recordings under section 90 will also be removed in favour of permission being required by SACAT to access material of a sensitive nature, regardless of what form the material takes. Photographs are not always sensitive in nature, particularly the many photographs submitted to SACAT in tenancy matters, and SACAT's permission should not always be required to access such photographs. The bill also addresses a number of anomalies in legislation conferring jurisdiction on SACAT.

The bill repeals section 121 of the Residential Parks Act 2007 and schedule 1, clause 2 of the Retirement Villages Act 2016, which allows for applications to vary or set aside tribunal orders. This is consequential to the previous repeal of the equivalent provision contained in section 37 of the Residential Tenancies Act 1995. Section 37 of the Residential Tenancies Act was repealed by the Statutes Amendment (SACAT No 2) Act 2017 as well as an equivalent provision contained in the Housing Improvement Act 2016 on the recommendation of the Hon. David Bleby QC in his statutory review of SACAT.

This was due to abuse of the provision in circumstances where other provisions in the SACAT act are sufficient for revisiting orders to make non-substantive changes. The provision was being used inappropriately to avoid the need to apply for internal review where there was disagreement with an order made by the tribunal. In repealing those provisions, it was overlooked that the Residential Parks Act and Retirement Villages Act also contain the same provision, which will now be repealed for consistency. Finally, in terms of addressing anomalies, the bill amends section 10(3a) of the Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920 to fix a minor drafting error arising from the SACAT No. 2 act.

I commend the bill to the house, and I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is sought; is leave granted? Leave is not granted. Attorney, you may read it or table it.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is alright. I will do neither. It is a document that is usually helpful to the opposition, but as they do not want it I will invite the opposition spokesperson to contact my office to get a copy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney, the Clerk has suggested to me that then means there is no explanation of clauses.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the situation then and we will leave it at that.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

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

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 3.

The CHAIR: Are there any questions on clause 3, member for Elizabeth?

Mr ODENWALDER: I will go straight to clause 4.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 3, after line 5—Insert:

(1a) Section 5AA(1)—after paragraph (c) insert:

- (ca) the offender committed the offence against a community corrections officer (within the meaning of the *Correctional Services Act 1982*) or community youth justice officer (within the meaning of the *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016*) knowing the victim to be acting in the course of their official duties;

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 contains a number of offences that have an aggravated form. An aggravated form of an offence will have significantly greater penalties than the non-aggravated form of the offence. Section 5AA and regulations made under section 5AA set out the circumstances that are aggravating factors under the act.

These include certain workers who are victims of the offending while in the course of performing their duties. They are generally emergency services workers and include police, other law enforcement and other front-line healthcare and emergency workers. The bill will add workers in training centres to this list. This amendment will also add Community Corrections officers and Community Youth Justice officers to this list.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can the Attorney explain the inclusion of this particular class of worker in the bill when there are others at the end that can be prescribed by regulation? What are the criteria by which the occupation or the worker or the class of worker gets included or excluded from being specifically mentioned in this particular bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In relation to the first, which is workers in training centres, we were advised by the drafters that it remained unclear whether they were captured or not. We want to make it crystal clear. In relation to Community Corrections officers and Community Youth Justice officers, my recollection is that they were identified during the course of the consultations as being necessary because they are in training centres and therefore under a different legislation. They are not Correctional Services officers. They are analogous to that. There are corrections officers in prisons. We call them different things in training centres, so we wanted to be clear that they were added in.

Mr ODENWALDER: So these are not corrections officers who visit someone's home to check on parole conditions and those sorts of things?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They can.

Mr ODENWALDER: I wanted to clarify that. In that case, and I assume this was done in consultation with the PSA and with advice from the PSA—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am trying to remember exactly if it was the PSA. It may have been raised by Mr Nev Kitchin, but certainly it was raised during the course of consultation.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given that then, I assume—and maybe I make the assumption wrongly—that they are included specifically because the nature of their job requires them to be front-line workers, in the sense that they go to people's houses and serve papers and warrants and that sort of thing. Why are other people who conduct checks on dangerous people or serve papers, such as Sherriff's officers and those types of people, not specifically included in that, but are presumably possibly included in the regulations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is a possibility to consider that. We have not had any request from Sheriff's officers or indeed the Chief Justice, who is responsible as the head of the Courts Administration Authority for the Sheriff's Office. They certainly have not raised it. I suppose it is exactly the same as someone who might be delivering registered post mail. Nobody has come to us from Australia Post to say, 'Our posties might be at risk, so could you add them into the list.'

However, we have made provision in the act that, if a case is presented that we capture a front-line worker, then there is capacity to prescribe by regulation. I am further advised that, in relation

to draft regulations, amongst those being considered for insertion are the employment as a court security officer, which would cover the Sheriff's Office, employment as a protective security officer, which would cover all the people who work in this parliament for security purposes, and employment in a training centre as an employee (in other words, they are obviously working in a children's prison as such), and the police support work.

Mr ODENWALDER: My question still stands then. The Labor amendments and the Labor bill have been criticised by you and the Premier for prescribing certain workers and only being specific about police within the legislation. Why then have you cherrypicked certain occupations and left others to the regulations?

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: No, I am serious.

Mr Pederick: No, I am not laughing at you.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay, good. I appreciate it. Why have you cherrypicked certain occupations to include in the legislation and left others to the regulations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think it is fair to say that perhaps the member misunderstands what the government's bill attempts to achieve. We have identified people who, through consultation, have been brought to our attention. We have listed those people in the act. We see that as important. We have identified a couple of other areas that it seems parliamentary counsel might have thought were picked up, but to be absolutely clear, we are going to cover them.

The third aspect, which is the reason that we have a prescription power, is to enable for the future flexibility of inclusion. The concern that the government has for the opposition's bill is that they have simply identified four or five key areas and then left everything else to prescription, so it is clearly nowhere near as comprehensive as the government's identified position of those who are clearly to be included. The capacity to prescribe for the future is to do exactly what is intended by most of these circumstances to enable flexibility to supplement the legislation's applicability without it having to come back to the parliament, but clearly within the rules of subordinate legislation.

Amendment carried.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given what the Attorney said before, I appreciate the fact that the bill leaves open the possibility of regulations which allow the future flexibility of the act. I understand that entirely, and that is the thinking behind that particular part of my amendment, too. Since you already have some of those professions—you just read some into *Hansard* that you were considering for the regulations—why would you not amend the legislation today to include those that you have already considered for regulation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think when we come to the parliament with a body of work, we need to bear in mind that, while some things have been brought to our attention and we have put them in regulation, they have not had the consultation of the opposition as to these aspects. Draft regulations are not usually distributed before the passage of legislation.

Mr ODENWALDER: Did you say 'are' or 'are not'?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: 'Are not'—in fact, frequently, when I was sitting where the member for Elizabeth is sitting in these matters—

Mr ODENWALDER: To be fair, it was slightly to the left.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, during committees I sat there for a very long time, I can assure you. Draft regulations were not even a twinkle in someone's eye at that stage. In a purer sense, they are not prepared obviously until the parliament has expressed its will by passing the statute. But in a practical sense, obviously, it is important to bring along the machinery/operational provisions of laws, namely, regulations, as expeditiously as possible, if one wants to implement the reforms that are in the statute.

I am indicating to the member that in draft regulations at this point it is anticipated that they will be considered. I suppose we are giving a heads-up. But remember that subordinate legislation

can be challenged by the parliament, so if there was any concern about any of those that are foreshadowed, then of course, there will be the proper opportunity of the parliament to challenge them. In that sense, there is sometimes a fine line between that and bringing something into the statute straightaway.

But in a circumstance where there has been little notice of that, I think it is reasonable that they stay in the regulations and that you, and any other member of the chamber, will have an opportunity to challenge them if for any reason you felt that they were inappropriate.

Mr ODENWALDER: I apologise if you covered this at the very beginning of your answer, but when will the regulations be available for parliament to peruse? Are you saying that will be after the passage of the bill? At what point after the passage of the bill? What sort of consultation does the Attorney-General intend before those regulations go to the Legislative Review Committee, for instance? When will the list be available?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I can only give you usual practice, but I can tell you in relation to this legislation that we have started the preparatory work. We are not doing that in any way to presume the will of the parliament. Nevertheless, we think it is important to try to have these things progress as expeditiously as possible. Sometimes regulations, when drafted, are identified by the relevant agencies to implement them, for example, that there is a practical impediment.

If I were to give one example of a similar nature, it would be when there were changes to the law in relation to intervention orders and the power of police officers to issue them on an interim basis. The government of the day took some two years to draft and implement the regulations to bring about the proclaimed new law to be operational on the basis that it was going to take significant time to prepare and train police officers for the purposes of this new area of responsibility. I remember that one particularly because I was critical of it taking so long, given the domestic violence problems we had in the community.

Nevertheless, that is an example of where it can take a long time. I do not know at this point how quickly that will occur, but the usual process is that once they have gone through the process of consultation within our agencies, approval by cabinet, they are then tabled in parliament and there is an opportunity to challenge. The Legislative Review Committee can become seized and investigate any that they see fit, and then I assume the 14-day rule still applies. Otherwise, they will come into operation.

Mr ODENWALDER: Will the Attorney-General consider occupations that are well outside what we might think of as emergency workers? I am thinking of educators who might go into a prison to work or social workers who might go into a prison or social workers who might go to a house of someone on parole or something like that? I am referring to someone you would not consider a front-line emergency worker.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We have not had that put to us specifically, those categories, that I am aware of. For example, in a youth training centre the Department for Education has a school service at one of the campuses—it may be at both campuses, actually. I have seen that, and they come in and operate as a classroom facility. They also work in rooms to do training, such as cookery and other skills in mechanical work and the like. So there are other people who come to visit prisons. We have not had any request to consider those for inclusion.

In those circumstances, we already cover the Community Youth Justice officers because, a bit like the adult Community Corrections officers, they visit people at their home. So we can see that that is a continued supervisory role: while someone is either in home detention or in custody, there is a similar role. However, if there are areas of occupation that the opposition thinks should be included, and you have not put them in your amendments for whatever reason, we are happy to receive any further advice on that.

The only other area that I can think of immediately is in relation to nurses, who were putting to us that perhaps all nurses should be covered. I made it very clear to the representatives at the time that, although we were looking at nurses who are working in an emergency situation of identified significant risk—that is, where people are being removed from ambulances at the Royal Adelaide Hospital emergency department or are drug or alcohol affected—we were not considering situations outside that environment. However, we fully acknowledge that nurses are the subject of volatile

situations even outside that. They might be at a local clinic, or they might be visiting someone in a home hospital situation, which is now becoming quite common.

I do not have it with me, but they provided me with a booklet during the course of our consultation, the Victorian *10 Point Plan to End Violence and Aggression* in the workplace, as part of their discussion with me that nurses, midwives or healthcare workers in other jurisdictions had looked at this issue. They asked me to look at it. I welcomed that initiative, but in my view it was not appropriate to put it in this legislation.

The CHAIR: One last question. I am being generous.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you, I appreciate your forbearance. This is more broadly about clause 4, in that it does amend section 5AA about aggravated offences. This will come up again soon, I am sure. Did the Attorney-General ever at any point consider the inclusion of standalone specific offences around assaults on emergency workers? I assume you had conversations with PASA about it. Was there any point at which you or your office considered it and then discarded it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think it is fair to say that all the submissions presented by the Police Association were indeed considered by the government. We placed high value on the passion with which the association put their case on behalf of their membership. I think there was one occasion when Mr Carroll apparently made a public statement suggesting that if judges or politicians were the subject of heinous conduct, including being spat at or coward punched or stabbed, and so on, there would soon be some reforms. It is a bit like saying that if men had babies then we would soon have some extra support in relation to maternity matters in our law.

Apart from that statement, which I thought was slightly offensive, the reason I say that is that, certainly in the 20 years I worked in courtrooms, there were circumstances where judges were shot and murdered. In fact, a bomb was handed to the wife of a judge in Sydney in the time I operated and she died. People do, particularly in judicial office, have to suffer, and they have suffered at the highest level. Obviously, people take some risk when they make determinations, especially when they send people to prison. Security for them is important, and minimising injury or death should be a priority.

As to politicians, well, we get abused every day. Obviously, we are not coward punched every day, I accept that, and we are not walking around expecting to physically manage our constituents, but neither are we armed. Most of us are not. I am not. I do not know about the other members, but I am not armed. I do not walk around my electorate office with a revolver. I do not think I have ever been threatened by anyone in my electorate, but then again I have very orderly and disciplined, well-behaved, constituents—or they are scared of me. I do not know. Perhaps it is a bit of both.

In any event, I make this point in all seriousness. We totally accept in the government that our police officers put their life and limb on the line when they go out to do their work for the benefit of all of us, as do other emergency workers. We were the ones on this side of the house who, when in opposition, fought to have provision for police officers in relation to injuries arising out of their work. I can remember, and the new member for Cheltenham would be proud of me in this regard, addressing police officers when we were fighting on their behalf to expand that provision.

Do not get me wrong. I want you and every member in the house to be absolutely clear about this, that the government are absolutely committed to support him, otherwise he would not have brought this comprehensive proposal to the parliament for consideration. It is a little bit ugly to suggest that that sort of statement was made by Mr Carroll. That having been said, the consideration of the matters that they presented to us were well considered.

With some of these proposals, we would not have even thought we would get to a threshold of need or identified benefit. We are prepared to give some of those the benefit of the doubt, such as the additions to the secondary sentencing principles because, if they help, and there is a possibility that they might help and it is a refreshing message back to our prosecutors and judiciary, we would be prepared to support them. Others do meet the threshold; some have not and will not.

Mr SZAKACS: Attorney, I apologise if this is verbalising a previous answer, but you identified that the bill identified categories of employees that were brought to the attention of

government through the consultation process and that the regulations were somewhat ancillary or included categories that were ancillary to the consultation process. Were there any categories of employees that were identified to the government through the consultation process that have not been included in the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I refer to my previous answer, but the stand-out was the request from the nurses' union, that all nurses doing any duty anywhere, at any time, ought to be included. We considered that. We felt that it needed to be confined to the emergency circumstances.

Mr SZAKACS: Will the Attorney take that question on notice, as to what other categories of employees were identified through the consultation process that did not ultimately find their way into the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We have canvassed that at some length, so I refer to the answer before last.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 5.

Mr ODENWALDER: Clause 5 amends section 19—Unlawful threats. Can the Attorney go over each of those new provisions and just explain, first of all, by how much the penalties have increased and what purpose she thinks that serves?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The rewrite of section 19(2), or the substitute, (a) and (b) remain the same, and (c) has gone from seven to eight years.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

The CHAIR: Attorney, you have two amendments in your name. Do you wish to deal with them separately or together?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to deal with them together, but I will explain. First, I move:

Amendment No 2 [AG-1]—

Page 3, line 26 [clause 6(2), inserted paragraph (d)]—Delete '4' and substitute '5'

This is one of four similar amendments. It increases the maximum penalty for the assault offence under section 20 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act where a person is assaulted and is one of the special categories of workers referred to in the aggravated offence provision of section 5AA of the act, and regulations made under section 5AA. The current maximum penalty is three years' imprisonment. The bill will increase it to four years, but this amendment would make it five years. I now move:

Amendment No 3 [AG-1]—

Page 3, line 31 [clause 6(4), inserted paragraph (d)]—Delete '5' and substitute '7'

This amendment increases the maximum penalty for the section 20 assault offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act where a person suffers harm from being assaulted, and is one of the special categories of worker referred to in the aggravated provision of section 5AA of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and regulations made under section 5AA. The current maximum penalty is four years' imprisonment. The bill would increase it to five years, but this amendment would now make it seven years.

Amendments carried.

Mr ODENWALDER: I want to clarify with the Attorney clause 6(2) with respect to section 20(3)(d), which provides:

for an offence aggravated by the circumstances referred to in section 5AA(1)(c) or (ka)—imprisonment for 4 years.

By the time this bill has finished, that is the default assault police charge once section 6(1) is removed from the Summary Offences Act; is that right?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think for simple assault, that is right. I suppose for ease of understanding, once the assault provisions under section 6 of the Summary Offences Act are repealed, which we both agree are to go, this will be the only one that is able to be dealt with in that lower level category of assault against a police officer. However, it should be borne in mind that there are remaining offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which I will list as follows: assault causing harm, which we have referred to; unlawful threats to harm another; and acts likely to cause another, which we have just referred to, going from seven to eight years.

In addition, we have shooting at police, 10 years; unlawful threats to kill or endanger the life of another, 12 years; acts likely to cause serious harm to another, 12 years; causing harm to another, 13 years if it is intentional, seven years if it is reckless, going to eight years under our bill; acts endangering the life of another, 18 years; causing serious harm to another, 25 years if it is intentional, 19 years if it is reckless; and shooting at police and causing harm to an officer (I assume by actually shooting them), 25 years; manslaughter, life and/or a fine at the court's discretion; and murder, life imprisonment.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 7.

Mr ODENWALDER: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Odenwalder-1]—

Page 4, line 3 to page 5, line 10 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA]—Delete inserted section 20AA and substitute:

20AA—Causing harm to, or assaulting, certain emergency workers etc

- (1) A person who causes harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties, intending to cause harm, is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 15 years.
- (2) A person who causes harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties, and is reckless in doing so, is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 10 years.
- (3) A person who assaults a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 5 years.
- (4) A person who hinders or resists a police officer acting in the course of official duties is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty:
 - (a) if harm is caused to the police officer—imprisonment for 10 years;
 - (b) in any other case—imprisonment for 2 years.
- (5) In proceedings for an offence against this section, it is a defence for the defendant to prove that the defendant did not know, and could not reasonably have been expected to know, that the victim was a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties.
- (6) Without limiting the ways in which a person can cause harm to a prescribed emergency worker, harm can be caused by causing human biological material to come into contact with a prescribed emergency worker.
- (7) For the purposes of this section, a person causes human biological material to come into contact with a victim if the person performs any act (including, without limiting the generality of this subsection, by spitting or throwing human biological material at the victim, or deliberately applying human biological material to their person knowing that the victim is likely to come into physical contact with the person in the course of their duties) intended or likely to cause human biological material to come into contact with the victim.

- (8) This section does not apply to conduct occurring before the commencement of this section.
- (9) In this section—
- assault* means an assault within the meaning of section 20(1) and includes, to avoid doubt, an act consisting of intentionally causing human biological material to come into contact with a victim, or threatening to do so;
- harm* has the same meaning as in Division 7A;
- human biological material* means blood, saliva, semen, faeces or urine;
- prescribed emergency worker* means—
- (a) a police officer; or
- (b) any other person, or person of a class, declared by the regulations to be included in the ambit of this definition.

This amendment has been pretty widely canvassed in the media. This is the substantive amendment that I will be proposing for this bill. I think it addresses the inherent weakness. There are two major amendments, including the one coming up later regarding the Sentencing Act. This deletes the intended section 20AA, which we have just been amending, and replaces it with a whole new 20AA—Causing harm to, or assaulting, certain emergency workers.

Contrary to what the Attorney said, I have consulted more broadly than with the Police Association. I have consulted with various bodies, including the CFS, MFS and their volunteer associations and the ambos. I think I even sent a copy to the Law Society. I have not heard back yet, to my knowledge, but I look forward to that.

The offences that will essentially replace or supersede some of the aggravated offences which currently exist, and which the Attorney is currently in the process of amending, include, firstly, a person who causes harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties, intending to cause harm, is guilty of an offence. This carries with it a maximum penalty of 15 years. From what I understand the Attorney said, the equivalent aggravated offence at the end of this process would carry with it a maximum of 13 years, so it is a two-year increase on that. That is my understanding, but the Attorney can correct me if I am wrong.

Before I go on with the other provisions, it should be pointed out that this whole section is intended to work in concert with the two changes proposed to the Sentencing Act, one of which the Attorney also supports, in that together as a package it sends the very clear message to the community and the judiciary that this parliament intends to place very severe sentences on people who assault police and emergency workers, particularly those who harm police and emergency workers.

The second provision provides that a person who causes harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties, and is reckless in doing so, is guilty of an offence, carrying with it a maximum penalty of 10 years. If I understand what the Attorney said in her previous answer, the equivalent amended part of 5AA would carry with it maximum imprisonment of seven years, I think.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Eight.

Mr ODENWALDER: Eight. I stand corrected. Again, we can quibble about penalties. The Attorney's one-year increase is one thing; our three-year increase is another. Essentially, it does not work either way on its own. It requires the amendments to the Sentencing Act to send the complete message. The third provision is:

- (3) a person who assaults a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties is guilty of an offence.

That is essentially assault police. This amendment proposes to replace section 61 of the Summary Offences Act. That is the simple assault police offence plus the aggravated assault emergency worker offence.

New subsection (4), the first major deviation from what the Attorney is proposing, works in concert with removing the entirety of section 6 of the Summary Offences Act, which we will get to. It

is about moving hindering and resisting police in the course of their official duties to the CLCA to this particular section. In a simple case, it carries with it a maximum penalty of two years. But, if harm is caused to the police officer, it carries with it a maximum penalty of ten years. This brings it into line with the proposed section 20AA(2), recklessly causing harm.

That is because the crux of this legislation is about harm. It is about harming and injuring police and emergency workers. It is not about anything else. It is not about increasing penalties for disorderly behaviour or threatening or assaulting: it is about actual harm and it is about sending a very clear message that actual harm to people who are on the front line is a very serious offence. There is a defence written in here that the defendant did not know and could not know reasonably that the person was an emergency worker or a police officer. I think that is pretty standard.

New subsections (6) and (7) relate to human biological material. We have had regard to the main body of the Attorney's amended bill, which concerns human biological material. Again, I understand this was a request from the police commissioner or certainly from SAPOL. They may have requested a specific offence, but they certainly wanted some clarification around the use of human biological material in assaulting police officers and emergency workers.

I understand the Attorney's comments about nurses particularly being subject to these kinds of attacks. These attacks, of course, are disgusting. Any police officer you speak to will tell you it is a matter of course, whether it is just in the line of their ordinary duty or particularly during arrests. It is a very common cause of assault during arrests and it can, of course, cause terrible harm, as we have seen in some pretty high-profile cases, with people contracting some pretty serious and debilitating diseases through these actions.

In no way do I minimise these types of assaults, but I maintain they are assaults. I maintain that harm caused by these assaults is harm, already defined by the CLCA, but out of an abundance of caution I think it is worth including in any amendment reference to human biological material. There are then the definitions relevant to this section, including the further clarification that the use of human biological material to assault does constitute assault.

It then defines a prescribed emergency worker as a police officer or any other person or a person of a class declared by the regulations to be included in the ambit of this definition. We have gone over quite a bit of this already during the course of this debate, so I will not trouble you any further. I move that this amendment be adopted, then we will be halfway to getting where we should be.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have a question of the mover of the amendment. In respect of new section 20AA(4), which is to make provision for hindering and resisting a police officer, which I place in concert with the repeal of the entire section 6 of the Summary Offence Act, it is a matter that the member would be aware is not consistent with the views of the Commissioner of Police. Did the member consult with the Commissioner of Police on this issue or any aspect of this proposed amendment? If not, why not?

Mr ODENWALDER: It is my recollection—I will check my assistant's email stream—that I sent a copy of a draft bill to the Commissioner of Police in February, and I received no submission from SAPOL.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: When you became aware of the Commissioner of Police's view on that, which is that he supports the removal of 'assault police' from section 6 but not hinder and resist (I am paraphrasing), did you make any inquiry of the police commissioner at that stage? If not, why not?

Mr ODENWALDER: I am not aware that the police commissioner has objected to it. Perhaps the Attorney could furnish me with the commissioner's exact words, and then I will be prepared to answer the question.

The CHAIR: No further questions?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I wish to speak further. I acknowledge the honourable member's aspects in relation to the amendment. It is not supported by the government. While this amendment adopts part of the government's new biological materials offence, its main purpose is to introduce

new provisions for offences against prescribed emergency workers, which the amendment defines as police officers and other persons prescribed in the regulations. This amendment does not create new offences and, in that regard, it is unnecessary.

There are already offences on the statute book for assaulting and causing harm to a police officer and a broad range of other emergency services workers. I refer to my previous answer. For example, section 20 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act contains an offence of assault. As discussed, the government's amendments Nos 2 and 3 would increase the maximum penalty where a police or other emergency service worker is assaulted to five years' imprisonment and, where such a worker is harmed, to seven years' imprisonment.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 18
 Noes 24
 Majority 6

AYES

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A. (teller)	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M.	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.	Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIR: We are still on clause 7. Attorney, you have amendments Nos 4 to 14 in your name. You can move one, some or all.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 4 [AG-1]—

Page 4, line 10 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(1), penalty provision, (a)]—Delete '5' and substitute:

7

Amendment No 5 [AG-1]—

Page 4, line 11 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(1), penalty provision, (b)]—Delete '4' and substitute:

5

Amendment No 6 [AG-1]—

Page 4, after line 31 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(5)]—Insert:

accident or emergency department of a hospital means the part of the hospital dedicated to the hospital's major accident and emergency functions, including those areas of the department used for administrative, waiting, reception, storage, diagnostic, treatment, consultation, triage and resuscitation functions and the access bays for ambulance and police;

Amendment No 7 [AG-1]—

Page 4, lines 34 and 35 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(5), definition of *human biological material*]~~—Delete 'or urine' and substitute:~~

, urine or vomit

Amendment No 8 [AG-1]—

Page 4, after line 38 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(5), definition of *prescribed emergency worker*]~~—Insert:~~

(ba) a community corrections officer or community youth justice officer; or

Amendment No 9 [AG-1]—

Page 4, after line 40 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(5), definition of *prescribed emergency worker*]~~—Insert:~~

(ca) a person (whether a medical practitioner, nurse, security officer or otherwise) performing duties in the accident or emergency department of a hospital; or

(cb) a person (whether a medical practitioner, nurse, pilot or otherwise) performing duties in the course of retrieval medicine; or

(cc) a medical practitioner or other health practitioner (both within the meaning of the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)*) attending an out of hours or unscheduled callout, or assessing, stabilising or treating a person at the scene of an accident or other emergency, in a rural area; or

Amendment No 10 [AG-1]—

Page 5, after line 10 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(5)]~~—Insert:~~

retrieval medicine means the assessment, stabilisation and transportation to hospital of patients with severe injury or critical illness (other than by a member of SA Ambulance Service Inc);

Amendment No 11 [AG-1]—

Page 5, after line 10 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA(5)]~~—Insert:~~

rural area means an area outside of Metropolitan Adelaide (within the meaning of the *Development Act 1993*);

Amendment No 12 [AG-1]—

Page 5, after line 10 [clause 7, after inserted section 20AA]~~—Insert:~~

20AB—Further offence involving use of human biological material

(1) A person who commits a prohibited act involving human biological material against another person is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty:

(a) if harm is caused to the victim—imprisonment for 3 years;

(b) in any other case—imprisonment for 2 years.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a person commits a *prohibited act involving human biological material* against another person (the *victim*) if—

(a) the person intentionally causes human biological material to come into contact with the victim; or

(b) the person threatens (by words or conduct) to cause human biological material to come into contact with the victim.

(3) For the purposes of this section, a person causes human biological material to come into contact with a victim if the person performs any act (including, without limiting the generality of this subsection, by spitting or throwing human biological material at the victim) intended or likely to cause human biological material to come into contact with the victim.

(4) In this section—

harm means physical or mental harm (whether temporary or permanent);

human biological material means blood, saliva, semen, faeces, urine or vomit.

Amendment No 13 [AG-1]—

Page 5, line 11 [clause 7, inserted section 20AB]~~—Delete '20AB' and substitute:~~

20AC

Amendment No 14 [AG-1]—

Page 5, line 14 [clause 7, inserted section 20AB(a)]—After '20AA' insert:

or 20AB

Firstly, this batch of amendments has the effect of increasing the maximum penalty for the purpose of the new biological materials offence where the prescribed emergency worker is a victim of the offence and suffers harm as a result. Essentially, the amendment increases the imprisonment maximum from five years to seven years. Similarly, amendment No. 5 increases the maximum from four years to five years.

Amendment No. 6 is part of a set of amendments (amendment Nos 9, 10 and 11), which extend the biological materials offence to front-line health workers, et al. Amendment No. 7 also relates to the new biological materials offence, when a person uses substances as weapons against a prescribed emergency worker, and adds 'vomit' to the list of biological materials for the reasons I have previously stated. Amendment No. 8 extends the list of workers to be prescribed in outlining the matters I have previously indicated.

Amendment No. 9 relates to amendment No. 6, which I have referred to previously. Amendment No. 10 provides the definition of retrieval medicine for the purposes of the biological materials offence. This definition excludes members of the SA Ambulance Service because they are already caught by the definition of prescribed emergency worker for the purpose of the offence. Amendment No. 11 is consequential. Amendment No. 12 creates the new offence, as modelled on the biological offences, and amendments Nos 13 and 14 are both pretty much consequential.

Mr ODENWALDER: I have a question about amendment No. 7, which introduces the concept of vomit. I take on board what the Attorney has already said about the subject of vomit. I understand why it has been included, but can the Attorney-General just explain why the provisions are to do with only human biological material? Was there any thought given to any other biological material being included in this provision? It would be my understanding that if someone threw dog faeces, for instance, at a police officer or an emergency worker that would constitute some sort of assault. Has any consideration been given to putting that within these provisions and, if not, why not?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, we have not considered that; no-one has asked for it. I think it is fair to say, though, that human biological material is one which can carry disease which, if transmitted through a bodily fluid, can be both terrifying for the recipient and, of course, offensive. I think I used the example of somebody spitting on a police officer while lying on the ground of a cell, which was highlighted in the Law Society submission.

It becomes a problem not when it sticks to the bottom of the police officer's trouser leg; it becomes a real worry if it accesses a break in the skin or, of course, the mouth or eyes or so on of the person. I think there is reason to differentiate between that and other excreta from animals, but certainly nobody has asked for it.

Mr ODENWALDER: I take on board what you say, and I think human biological material is probably more readily at hand in most cases. In terms of the harm that is done by human biological material—and in my head I am thinking of the spitting in the mouth and herpes, that sort of thing—the harm is not immediate in the same way that a stabbing harm would be, so it is different in that sense. It is a different sort of harm resulting from assault, but the same sort of harm, in that it takes a while to become apparent and that there are tests and things like that, could come from other animals' biological material. Do you understand the difference? There is a period where the injured person does not know that they are injured.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not an expert on dog faeces, but I suppose it is possible that you can get rabies from dog faeces. I do not know. If you get bitten by a bat or a dog, you can get rabies. Nobody has actually raised this with us as instilling the same level of fear or concern or, in fact, terror as human excreta, etc., as human biological material because of the known particular contaminant.

Nurses and medical people particularly know of the fear they might have in relation to blood that might come from someone they are treating, and so obviously they take precautions, such as

wearing gloves, etc. because this is a known concern for people working with other human beings and the risk they have of getting very serious conditions, some of them life threatening, but certainly others that could stay in their own system for life, and so we do need to appreciate that. With respect to the opposition, I think they also understand that.

In relation to other animals, if the member wants to bring to me some evidence that there is a serious health risk, for example, from other biological material out of some other dog, rat, bird, whatever, I am happy to look at it.

Mr ODENWALDER: This relates back to a previous question I had regarding who is and who is not included in the remit of the prescribed emergency worker. Has the Attorney done any consultation or received any submissions regarding the issue of personal carers for people with disabilities who visit people's homes when the person with the disability may well be on bail or on parole or some sort of bond, or someone living with that person may well be? Would someone like that possibly be included within that remit?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not within the definition of this bill. Has it been raised? Only by the AMA representatives who came to see me in the context of someone who had a mental health condition. We also discussed the question of someone with a disability. If it is a cognitive impairment, they may not be able to be found to be liable for any offence because they have to be able to have the capacity to form the intent in order to be prosecuted successfully. So we discussed it within the parameters of that.

It was certainly felt that someone suffering from a mental health condition may or may not escape prosecution and/or punitive action, but that would very much depend on the evidence before the court as to the person's capacity. Assuming that they are fit to plead, they are found to be legally responsible, it may have an impact on the sentence that is given. Only in that general way did we discuss it. Again, we were not asked to consider that for persons who were working with persons with a disability.

I think it is fair to say, though, that in some health conditions, for example, someone with dementia—and I do not want to pick them out particularly, but they are known to have had some aggressive responses—that is one of the areas of risk if you are dealing with someone with a certain medical condition. Again, that is not an area of expertise that I have or could answer. I simply say it has not been raised to the extent of seeking inclusion in this bill.

Mr ODENWALDER: It occurs to me that I could freely ask three questions on each of these amendments presumably.

The CHAIR: Not necessarily.

Mr ODENWALDER: They were moved en bloc.

The CHAIR: You have my indulgence at the moment. This is your fourth question.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do not want to risk your indulgence, sir. This is about amendment No. 11, which extends the provision around human biological material to non-emergency workers, to people who do not fit into the categories we have been talking about this whole time. It leads me to ask again about the policy underpinnings of the Attorney's bill. The name of the bill suggests that it is about emergency workers. It is about protecting emergency workers; that is certainly the impetus for the bill from the Police Association and others. I wonder why this provision, which does not relate to emergency workers at all—in fact, it almost excludes them because they already have their own section about it—was put into the bill at the last minute?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That was the request of the AMA. I think I mentioned in the general body of the debate that they brought to our attention that the emergency work may be done by the practitioners out on the roads. For the purposes of dealing with that peculiarly rural aspect, we then had to look at how we define 'rural' as distinct from 'metropolitan', so we have simply adopted the definition here so that it is consistent with the meaning under the Development Act because that is apparently the common area that is used for the purposes of defining 'urban' to 'rural'. We have not created some new definition. We have adopted the Development Act's definitions so that it is consistent.

Mr ODENWALDER: With respect, that was not my question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is what the amendment is about.

Mr ODENWALDER: Is it? I beg your pardon then. Let me refer to my notes. Yes, I stand corrected. In fact, I had a question about that. You answered another question. Could I seek your indulgence, sir?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am sorry. I am happy to answer it.

The CHAIR: You have my indulgence, member for Elizabeth. There are 11 amendments here, so I am happy for you to ask a few more questions, if you wish.

Mr ODENWALDER: There are 11 amendments? I have amendment 12 here, in clause 7. My question is: why was this section, which relates to non-emergency workers, included in a bill which purports to be about emergency workers? I am not particularly opposed to the measure that is described. This is about extending the provisions around human biological material to non-emergency workers, if I understand it correctly. If I do not, please correct me.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is specifically to relate to ordinary people like you and me, and that is why what we need to do here is still make it an offence to transmit human biological material to an ordinary person. We are not saying that they should escape any punitive responsibility. We are saying that this is something where anybody who is the subject of this should be able to say, 'I am a victim of this.' So we have the ordinary people, which is you and me, and then we have the emergency workers, which is a different order.

Mr ODENWALDER: I appreciate that—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, can I clarify which of the amendments we are asking questions about?

Mr ODENWALDER: Amendment 12.

The CHAIR: Yes. You have asked one on amendment 11 and two on amendment 12, is that correct?

Mr ODENWALDER: Have I? I am really just trying to get to the nub of one question. I understand what you are saying, and again I do not oppose the intent of the provision. The bill is not called the criminal law consolidation (human biological material) amendment bill; it is called the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill. I wonder why, when all the other provisions in this bill relate to emergency workers, this one applies to ordinary people like you and me?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Because we are now defining, at the request of the police commissioner, that emergency workers are vulnerable in this area. The government takes the view that nobody should be the subject of this, so we have made a provision for any other person—which is just ordinary people like you and me—and then implemented the provision at a higher level of penalty for people who are working at the coalface. The fact that it is not in the short title of the bill is simply because the priority of this bill is harnessed in the terms of that short title. However, that does not mean that you and I miss out, because ordinary people also need to be protected from being vulnerable to the threat of receiving human biological material without consent.

Amendments carried.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, you have three amendments in your name. If I can be of some assistance, we are dealing with clause 7. You have amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4 in your name, in relation to this clause.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We consent to amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4 moved in the member's name.

The CHAIR: Let him move them first, Attorney.

Mr ODENWALDER: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Odenwalder-1]—

Page 5, line 17 [clause 7, inserted section 20AB(b)]—Delete 'section 20' and substitute:

this Act

Amendment No 3 [Odenwalder-1]—

Page 5, line 19 [clause 7, inserted section 20AB(c)]—Delete 'section 20' and substitute:

this Act

Amendment No 4 [Odenwalder-1]—

Page 5, line 22 [clause 7, inserted section 20AB]—Delete 'section 20' and substitute:

this Act

The CHAIR: Do you want to speak to these at all? I think you have had an indication from the Attorney already.

Mr ODENWALDER: Only to thank the Attorney. The impetus of this is around my previous amendment, which is why it loses some of its strength anyway. In the existing bill, which will pass this house presumably, it really only affects section 20 of the act. However, I appreciate that we have broadened it out so that perhaps wiser amendments broaden out section 20.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The government receives and supports the amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8.

The CHAIR: I advise the committee of an error to clause 8 and, pursuant to standing order 283, I will correct the bill. I will replace the words 'unlawful threats' with 'causing harm'.

Clause as corrected passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Schedule 1.

The CHAIR: The member for Elizabeth has amendments to the schedule.

Mr ODENWALDER: For the purposes of this debate, I will not proceed with amendment No. 5. I will not proceed with amendment No. 6 because, in this house anyway, it has become redundant.

The CHAIR: What about No. 7?

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, I do intend to proceed with amendment No. 7.

The CHAIR: So you will move amendment No. 7 standing in your name to the schedule and speak to that?

Mr ODENWALDER: No. I will speak to it, though. I was hoping, of course, for the passage of amendment No. 1. Please interrupt me if I am getting this procedurally wrong.

The CHAIR: Amendment No. 1 was not agreed to.

Mr ODENWALDER: It was not agreed to, that is right. And this amendment is contingent on the passage of amendment No. 1, and I intend not to proceed with it.

The CHAIR: When you speak in this place, you really need to speak to something. If there is no amendment moved—

Mr ODENWALDER: I can speak to the overall clause then; is that right?

The CHAIR: Yes. You can still speak to the whole schedule, but what I am getting from you is that you are not progressing any of your amendments with this.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, as long as I can still speak to it.

The CHAIR: You can. If you wish to speak to schedule 1, member for Elizabeth, let's do that now.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sure, and perhaps this will serve as a summing up anyway. I was hoping that the committee would accede to amendment No. 1, which is the substantive amendment which guides this whole thing. As I said earlier in my remarks, this is no indication that we will or will not ultimately support the bill in its present form. It will pass through this house, presumably today, but we reserve the right to make further amendments as we go on.

In accordance with amendment No. 1 and the new offences created by my amendment No. 1, I was hoping to designate them as designated offences for the purposes of sentencing. That was raised very early on with the Police Association and strongly supported by people such as the Ambulance Employees Association. It would mean that a sentence of imprisonment imposed by a court could not 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 a period of detention imposed on the defendant for a designated offence.

As I have been at pains to point out from the beginning, and the Attorney has thrown it at me as an accusation, it is not a mandatory minimum sentencing regime, or whatever others in the community are trying to label it. I do not think the Attorney understands that there are many other offences in this category. I was simply hoping to move that assaulting police and emergency workers is deemed serious enough by this parliament to be included in that set of offences, and I am sorry that it has not been included today. We will press on, though, so that ultimately we arrive at a bill that properly protects emergency workers and police.

Similarly, my amendment No. 8 would have repealed the entirety of section 6. We have traversed this ground fairly well already, so I will not go over it. As well as the assault police provisions, which are a no-brainer, it would have repealed the hinder and resist provisions. Police officers tell me that the hinder and resist provisions are inadequate in the Summary Offences Act.

When an officer is inadvertently harmed during part of an arrest or any operation, the current laws are often downgraded to a resist or hinder in the Summary Offences Act. There is no remedy, so what we have both done with assault police today is make sure we cannot charge a lesser offence. If we adopt the bill the Attorney has put before us today, we will retain these lesser offences when police officers are harmed in one of their basic functions, which is to arrest offenders.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Again, I express my appreciation to the opposition to work as cooperatively as we can. There is a difference, and I accept that, but we are very pleased that this is the situation. I want to thank our long-suffering advisers, who have put in a sterling effort in helping to advise me, and I hope that they have been of benefit to the committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth, this is a little bit out of order on both sides, but I will cut you some slack. I will indulge you.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (17:58): This is the third reading; I can go for as long as I want.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, away you go, at two minutes to six.

Mr ODENWALDER: I simply want to thank the Attorney for bringing this bill. Its passage through the house today in no way indicates our overall support for the measures in the bill. We still retain some very grave reservations about the bill and we absolutely reserve our right to explore those to the fullest in the upper house. I look forward to following that debate with interest.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019

The Legislative Council granted leave to the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas) to attend in the House of Assembly on Tuesday 18 June 2019 for the purpose of giving a speech in relation to the Appropriation Bill, if he thinks fit.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Tuesday 18 June 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS**

803 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the Treasurer:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The below capital works projects as at the 2017-18 budget and as at the 2018-19 Budget, include expenditure budgeted over the associated forward estimates relevant to this question and questions with notice 804-816:

South Australian Government Capital Program as at 2017-18 Budget (\$000s)

Premier

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Defence SA	Major Project				
	Techport and Common User Facility—land transfer	133	—	—	—
Premier and Cabinet	Major Project				
	Brukungu Mine	6,623	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Government Information and Communication Technology Services	5,920	5,699	5,841	5,988
	Minerals Asset Upgrade and Replacement	177	179	179	194
	Minor capital works and equipment	4,958	3,765	3,735	4,087
	Voice Ancillary Equipment and Licences	591	606	621	637
RAES scheme power generation and distribution equipment minor works	352	354	353	382	
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	Major Project				
	Her Majesty's Theatre Redevelopment including AFCT purchase cost	43,842	33,009	6,666	—
State Development	Major Project				
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct	41,444	—	—	—
	Arts Storage	1,850	—	—	—

Attorney-General

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Attorney-General	Major Project				
	Chesser House Lease Renewal—fit out costs	2,669	—	—	—
	Fines Enforcement and Recovery	1,519	—	—	—
	GPO Tower—10 Franklin Street—office fit out	3,300	20,808	2,000	—
	Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and Office for Public Integrity—systems upgrade	1,637	400	400	410
	Prosecution Management System	549	—	—	—
	SA Employment Tribunal Case Management System	531	—	—	—
	SA Government Radio Network	40,824	30,454	—	—
	SACAT office accommodation—fit out	541	1,435	—	—
	Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	932	990	822	1,657	
Courts	Major Project				
	Electronic Court Management System	6,702	6,541	7,217	—
	Higher Courts Redevelopment	12,523	17,933	—	—
	Supreme Court Works	1,300	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,755	2,823	2,892	2,964	
Electoral Commission	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	878	50	51	52

Child Protection

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Child Protection	Major Project				
	Residential Care Facilities	6,339	—	—	—

Education

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Education and Child Development	Major Project				
	Adelaide Botanic High School	49,000	38,700	—	—
	Children's Centres—Stage 2	8,280	—	—	—
	Christie Downs Primary School	3,548	—	—	—
	Christies Beach High School Disability Unit	4,309	—	—	—
	Education Support Hub	6,321	4,981	—	—
	Evanston Gardens Primary School	1,000	—	—	—
	Small projects	15,654	28,750	30,200	41,708
	Meningie Area School	4,500	—	—	—
	National Quality Agenda—Compliance	4,559	—	—	—
	Playford International College	7,093	—	—	—
	Preschool Outdoor Learning Areas	1,627	—	—	—
	Renewable Energy Program	10,000	—	—	—
	SACE Modernisation	1,640	1,640	1,550	1,460
	Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics Facilities in Schools (STEM)	119,109	115,000	—	—
	Swallowcliffe Primary School	3,247	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Capital Works Assistance Scheme	3,135	3,097	3,004	3,431
	Major Feasibility Studies	470	482	494	506
	Purchase of Land and Property	1,181	1,211	1,241	1,272
	SACE Board	115	118	121	124
	School Bus Replacement	1,180	1,210	1,240	1,271
	State Development	TAFE SA Campus Efficiency Program	500	—	—
Annual Program					
Purchase of Plant and Equipment—TAFE SA		1,089	1,587	1,583	1,714

Environment and Water

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Environment Protection Authority	Major Project				
	Material flow and levy information system	465	625	410	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	574	577	576	623
Environment, Water and Natural Resources	Major Project				
	Brown Hill Creek Pedestrian Bridge	200	—	—	—
	Metropolitan Parks—Mountain Bicycling in the Mount Lofty Ranges	100	—	—	—
	Metropolitan Parks—Northern Suburban Parks and Reserves	2,066	—	—	—
	Metropolitan Parks—Southern Suburban Parks and Reserves	734	—	—	—
	Riverine Recovery	29,060	—	—	—
	South Australian Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure Program (SARFIIP)	47,226	32,547	14,132	—
	South East Flows Restoration Project	26,320	5,597	—	—
	Tennyson Dunes Coast Park Discovery Trail	1,855	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Fire Management on Public Land—Enhanced Capabilities	1,116	1,144	1,173	1,202
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment—DEWNR	4,428	4,386	4,265	4,885
	Water Monitoring Equipment	2,135	2,188	2,243	2,299
SA Water	Major Project				
	Hope Valley EL170 Tank Structure Renewal	16,677	—	—	—
	Kangaroo Creek Dam Safety	33,231	30,021	4,200	—
	Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme (NAIS)	56,700	63,000	33,300	2,600
	Annual Program				
Asset Renewal	11,387	9,892	8,858	10,746	

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	Information Technology	32,272	31,908	31,574	34,207
	Mechanical and Electrical Renewal	34,290	27,591	24,779	43,003
	Network Extension	38,667	41,304	40,455	41,399
	Pipe Network Renewal	76,971	44,019	38,325	35,973
	Safety	34,569	29,948	26,401	28,640
	Structures	48,468	52,053	44,677	68,864

Health and Wellbeing

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Health and Ageing	Major Project				
	Enterprise Pathology Laboratory Information System	374	—	—	—
	Enterprise Patient Administration System	1,410	—	—	—
	Flinders Medical Centre—Fit-out of Two Cold Shell Theatre Spaces	3,500	—	—	—
	Flinders Medical Centre—Neonatal Unit	13,750	3,022	—	—
	Flinders Medical Centre Redevelopment	40,775	2,045	—	—
	Lyell McEwin Hospital—Second Cardiovascular Intervention Suite (CVIS) and expanded patient holding bay	210	—	—	—
	Lyell McEwin Hospital Emergency Department Expansion	3,500	9,000	27,500	12,500
	Modbury Hospital Emergency Extended Care Unit	1,000	6,600	1,575	—
	Modbury Hospital Redevelopment	6,900	—	—	—
	New Royal Adelaide Hospital—Site Works	5,000	—	—	—
	Noarlunga Health Service Redevelopment	319	—	—	—
	Non Clinical Relocation to Roma Mitchell—Office fitout	2,400	—	—	—
	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment Stage 3	2,510	32,570	75,170	87,700
	New Specialist Older Persons Mental Health Facility	4,000	9,700	—	—
	Rescue, Retrieval and Aviation Services Base	4,962	—	—	—
	SA Ambulance Service—Ambulance Stations	11,421	3,750	—	—
	SA Ambulance Stretcher Replacement Program	1,000	—	—	—
	SA Health Supply Distribution Centre	7,577	—	—	—
	Small projects	7,461	1,000	10,000	12,000
	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Service Reconfiguration	8,000	12,252	—	—
	Veterans' Mental Health Precinct	7,465	—	—	—
	Women's and Children's Hospital Upgrade	9,594	12,436	15,000	—
	Annual Program				
	Bio-Medical Equipment	18,726	19,194	19,674	20,166
	Hospitals and Health Units—Minor Works	17,720	17,125	16,058	19,548
	Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Capital Grant	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
SA Ambulance Service—Vehicle Replacement	5,942	6,091	6,243	6,399	
Small programs	5,201	6,352	6,591	6,673	

Human Services

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Communities and Social Inclusion	Major Project				
	Adelaide Youth Training Centre—Major Security Works	1,000	—	—	—
	Continuous Monitoring of Screening	2,066	—	—	—
	Cost of Living Information System	1,323	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Adelaide Youth Training Centre—Sustainment	497	509	522	535
Domiciliary Equipment Services	1,189	1,219	1,249	1,280	
	Major Project				
	Better Neighbourhoods Program	42,191	44,771	45,791	17,342

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
South Australian Housing Trust	Economic Stimulus—construction of social housing	46,388	34,848	—	—
	Playford North Urban Renewal	18,739	19,211	10,751	—
	Remote Indigenous Housing	27,445	11,412	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Public Housing Capital Maintenance	15,575	15,562	15,550	15,550

Innovation and Skills

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
State Development	Department of State Development Office Space Utilisation Improvement	1,440	480	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Annual Investing Programs	13,925	14,222	14,490	14,725

Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Correctional Services	Major Project				
	Additional Prison Beds—Mt Gambier Prison	39,944	—	—	—
	Additional Prisoner Accommodation—Adelaide Women's Prison	3,700	10,000	3,800	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	3,195	2,491	2,812	3,044
Emergency Services—CFS	Annual Program				
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—CFS	15,320	15,008	15,593	15,983
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—CFS	840	1,836	1,882	1,929
Emergency Services—MFS	Annual Program				
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—MFS	5,018	7,425	6,711	7,801
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—MFS	211	216	221	227
Emergency Services—SAFECOM	Major Project				
	Emergency Information Warning System (Alert SA)	140	—	—	—
Emergency Services—SES	Annual Program				
	Capital Works and Rescue Equipment—SES	3,642	3,721	3,801	3,896
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—SES	407	417	427	438
	SES Light Vehicle Fleet	276	283	290	297
Police	Major Project				
	Continuous Monitoring of Screening	939	—	—	—
	Crime Tracking App	291	—	—	—
	Data Entry Terminals	1,452	136	—	—
	Hi-tech Crime Fighting Equipment	303	—	—	—
	Police Records Management System—Stages 2 to 4	7,197	6,037	2,736	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment	9,813	8,778	8,632	10,478

Primary Industries and Regional Development

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Primary Industries and Regions	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	5,045	4,993	4,979	5,375

Trade, Tourism and Investment

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Tourism	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	646	650	649	702

Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Major Project				
	10 New Safety Cameras (Operation from 1 January 2018)	2,000	—	—	—
	Additional Tram Purchases	11,000	—	—	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Car Park	30,000	—	—	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Plaza & Integration	15,615	40,000	20,000	18,000
	Adelaide Oval—Redevelopment	5,020	—	—	—
	Blackwood Roundabout Upgrade	3,500	—	—	—
	Bus Fleet Replacement Program	19,451	18,307	18,765	19,234
	City Tram Extension	35,000	—	—	—
	Critical Bridge Improvements	2,200	—	—	—
	Diesel railcar mechanical upgrade and modernisation	25,000	—	—	—
	Extension of the Tonsley rail line to the Flinders Medical Centre	74,336	—	—	—
	Gawler East Collector Link	11,740	—	—	—
	Gawler Line Modernisation	60,000	52,500	40,000	—
	Goodwood and Torrens Rail Junctions Upgrade	181,942	—	—	—
	Henley and Semaphore jetty works	1,622	1,410	—	—
	Improving critical road infrastructure	25,000	20,000	—	—
	Increased Detection of Unregistered/Uninsured Vehicles	578	593	1,091	623
	Leigh Creek Capital Program	883	715	—	—
	Low carbon transport investment program	5,000	3,000	—	—
	Managed Motorways on the South Eastern Freeway	7,848	—	—	—
	National Register of Foreign Ownership of Land titles	600	—	—	—
	Northern Connector	305,000	155,000	150,239	—
	Northern Expressway	1,322	—	—	—
	North–South Corridor Darlington Upgrade	235,000	76,631	—	—
	Oaklands Crossing	15,500	158,340	—	—
	O-Bahn extension into the city	25,197	—	—	—
	Park 'n' Rides	4,000	11,000	—	—
	Planning Reform Implementation	9,092	4,932	2,411	1,914
	Port Adelaide Office Accommodation Fit-out	11,140	—	—	—
	Port Bonython Jetty Refurbishment	4,650	3,400	—	—
	Public Transport Park'n'Ride Interchanges	5,000	—	—	—
	Rail Signals and Communication Cable Replacement	1,595	—	—	—
	Small projects	1,260	—	—	—
	South Eastern Freeway—Mount Barker Intersection Upgrade	4,651	—	—	—
	South Road Superway	7,288	24,600	—	—
	South Road Upgrade from Torrens Road to River Torrens	166,390	55,001	—	—
	Southern Expressway—Duplication	710	—	—	—
	Strategic Route Reviews—Victor Harbor Road, Main South Road, Port Augusta to Port Wakefield Road	3,500	—	—	—
	Train Control Centre	25,000	6,250	—	—
	Upper Yorke Peninsula Regional Road Network Upgrade	10,942	—	—	—
	Victor Harbor Road/Main Road McLaren Vale—Overpass	2,300	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
DPTI Annual Program		133,655	123,685	116,931	121,974
South Australian Government Employee Residential Properties					
Residential Properties		7,473	7,660	7,852	8,048

Treasurer

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Treasury and Finance	Major Project				
	Budget and Monitoring System Upgrade	87	—	—	—
	National Register of Foreign Ownership of Land titles	670	—	—	—
	Revenue SA—Wagering Tax Administration System	100	—	—	—
	RevenueSA—ICT system update	1,960	—	—	—
	Super SA ICT system solution	1,669	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	919	926	918	1,011
Revenue SA Information Online System (RIO)	534	688	521	337	

Parliament

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Auditor-General	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	221	227	233	239

Premier/Education/Innovation and Skills/Trade, Tourism and Investment

Agency	Project	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
State Development	Spatial Efficiency Projects	1,320	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	IT systems and infrastructure	1,984	1,946	1,940	2,102
	Small Programs	191	—	—	—

South Australian Government Capital Program as at 2018-19 Budget (\$000s)

Premier

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Premier and Cabinet	Major Project				
	Government Information and Communication Technology Services	5,599	5,741	5,988	6,138
	Maintenance of Government House	689	—	—	—
	Womens Memorial Playing Fields	4,000	4,000	—	—
	Adelaide Superdrome Upgrades	5,700	4,100	—	—
	Sam Willoughby International BMX Track	1,300	—	—	—
	Home of Football at State Sports Park	5,000	10,000	4,000	—
	SA Athletics Stadium	2,050	—	—	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct	15,070	1,700	3,600	—
	Arts Storage	—	1,612	—	—
	Voice Ancillary Equipment and Licences	606	621	637	653
	State Governor's Establishment	125	128	131	134
Minor Capital Works	5,582	3,805	4,077	4,180	
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	Major Project				
	Other capital investment	2,447	—	—	—
	Her Majesty's Theatre Redevelopment	50,710	6,666	—	—

Attorney-General

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Attorney-General	Major Project				
	SA Computer Aided Dispatch System	3,731	1,000	—	—
	SA Government Radio Network	35,420	12,750	—	—
	SACAT office accommodation—fit out	1,896	—	—	—
	Fines Enforcement and Recovery	900	—	—	—
	Laboratory Information Management System	51	—	—	—
	SA Employment Tribunal Case Management System	681	—	—	—
	GPO Tower—10 Franklin Street—office fit out	—	26,608	—	—
	Liquor Licensing	1,686	60	—	—
	Annual Program				

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	827	655	1,486	1,523
	State and Public Safety Communications Infrastructure	238	244	250	256
Courts	Major Project				
	Electronic Court Management System	6,578	4,217	512	—
	Higher Courts Redevelopment	10,816	18,583	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,823	2,892	2,964	3,038
Electoral Commission	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	680	51	52	148

Child Protection

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Child Protection	Major Project				
	Continuous Monitoring of Screening	353	—	—	—
	Residential Care Facilities	2,384	—	—	—
	IT Equipment and Furniture	4,411	—	—	—

Education

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	
Education	Major Project					
	Preschool Relocation Program	99	—	—	—	
	New Projects	—	—	4,408	21,175	
	Evanston Gardens Primary School	592	—	—	—	
	Adelaide Botanic High School	40,384	—	—	—	
	Children's Centres—Stage 2	7,439	—	—	—	
	Christie Downs Primary School	80	—	—	—	
	National Quality Agenda—Compliance	3,036	—	—	—	
	Swallowcliffe Primary School	356	—	—	—	
	Playford International College	1,138	—	—	—	
	Christies Beach High School Disability Unit	1,220	—	—	—	
	SACE Modernisation	1,640	1,550	1,460	—	
	Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics Facilities in Schools (STEM)	104,063	—	—	—	
	Education Support Hub	10,463	—	—	—	
	Meningie Area School	4,411	—	—	—	
	Southern Adelaide School—land acquisition	6,200	—	—	—	
	Northern Adelaide School—land acquisition	7,000	—	—	—	
	Building Better Schools	34,437	107,171	309,300	236,990	
	Whyalla Secondary school	3,000	15,000	60,000	22,000	
	Small projects	17,351	8,400	—	—	
	Annual Program					
		School Bus Replacement	1,910	1,240	1,271	1,303
		Major Feasibility Studies	482	494	506	519
		Capital Works Assistance Scheme—Investing	3,097	3,004	3,431	3,517
		Purchase of Land and Property	2,252	1,241	1,272	1,304
		SACE Board	118	121	124	127
		Public Private Partnerships				
		Northern & Southern Adelaide Schools PPP	—	—	—	260,955
	TAFE SA	Major Project				
		Enhanced Online Learning Systems	352	—	—	—
Annual Program						
Purchase of Plant and Equipment—TAFE SA		1,587	1,583	1,714	1,757	
	IT Systems and Infrastructure—TAFE SA	973	970	1,051	1,077	

Energy and Mining

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Energy and Mining	Major Project				
	State Drill Core Reference Library	1,425	—	—	—
	Battery Storage demonstration plant	202	—	—	—
	Accommodation Waymouth Street	1,102	—	—	—
	Gas Generator	283,900	16,100	—	—

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	Annual Program				
	RAES scheme power generation and distribution equipment	3,124	1,873	1,942	1,992
	Minerals Asset Upgrade and Replacement	88	191	206	211

Environment and Water

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Environment and Water	Major Project				
	Riverine Recovery	16,120	5,180	—	—
	South Australian Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure Program (SARFIIP)	57,465	26,641	—	—
	Monarto Land	293	—	—	—
	South East Flows Restoration Project	7,379	—	—	—
	Glenthorne National Park	700	1,200	3,200	1,600
	Waterfall Gully Summit Trail	3,602	—	—	—
	Ayers House restoration	500	—	—	—
	Opening Up SA's Reservoirs	1,000	4,000	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment—DEWNR	6,795	4,594	5,214	5,337
	Small Programs—DEWNR AI	4	4	4	4
	Water Monitoring Equipment	1,975	2,030	2,086	2,143
	Fire Management on Public Land—Enhanced Capabilities	1,028	1,057	1,086	1,116
Environment Protection Authority	Major Project				
	Material flow and levy information system	884	450	100	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	577	576	623	639
SA Water	Major Project				
	Kangaroo Creek Dam Safety	32,025	30,027	—	—
	Murray Bridge Wastewater Treatment Plant Relocation	34,622	12,950	500	200
	Orroroo Water Quality Improvement	10,349	—	—	—
	Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme	63,500	47,734	20,200	15,200
	Zero Net Electricity cost 2020	104,448	284,719	—	—
	Other Major Projects	88,657	34,726	32,487	57,456
	Annual Program				
	Water Quality Management	10,272	9,196	13,891	18,689
	Environmental Improvement	11,644	14,003	12,736	13,053
	Information Technology	34,870	34,822	40,911	35,062
	Safety	30,530	27,628	28,213	35,808
	Mechanical and Electrical Renewal	38,417	18,034	43,003	44,078
	Pipe Network Renewal	38,275	34,202	35,973	36,876
	Structures	50,913	31,049	58,488	59,950
	Network Extension	35,900	37,147	39,013	39,794
Other programs	26,598	23,760	30,169	31,749	

Health and Wellbeing

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Health and Wellbeing	Major Project				
	New Royal Adelaide Hospital—Site Works	16,155	—	—	—
	Women's and Children's Hospital Upgrade	12,436	15,177	3,594	6,000
	Enterprise Patient Administration System	3,000	—	—	—
	Flinders Medical Centre—Neonatal Unit	9,479	100	—	—
	Regional Dialysis Services—Gawler	179	—	—	—
	SA Health Supply Distribution Centre	7,007	—	—	—
	Flinders Medical Centre Redevelopment	1,246	—	—	—
	Modbury Hospital Redevelopment	5,900	730	—	—
	Veterans' Mental Health Precinct	200	—	—	—
	SA Ambulance Service—Ambulance Stations	4,373	—	—	—
	Lyell McEwin Hospital Emergency Department Expansion	12,700	29,300	12,500	—
	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment Stage 3	20,172	75,358	91,700	85,080

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	New Specialist Older Persons Mental Health Facility	9,700	3,900	—	—
	SA Pathology consolidation into Frome Rd	10,600	7,168	—	—
	Country Health SA Sustainment and Compliance	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
	Modbury Hospital—Upgrades and Additional Services	17,663	32,128	41,290	—
	Mount Gambier Renal Dialysis	1,500	600	—	—
	Yorke town Surgical Services	300	—	—	—
	Lighthouse Lodge Kingston—Safety Upgrades	1,000	—	—	—
	Murray Bridge Emergency Department	1,500	4,000	1,500	—
	Strathalbyn Aged Care	500	7,300	700	—
	Real time monitoring of prescription medicine	—	4,000	—	—
	Modbury Hospital High Dependency Unit	5,000	—	—	—
	Country Cancer Services	5,000	—	—	—
	Small Projects	1,917	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	SA Ambulance Service—Vehicle Replacement	7,122	6,243	6,399	6,559
	Hospitals and Health Units—Minor Works	18,125	16,058	19,548	20,037
	Bio-Medical Equipment	19,194	19,674	20,166	20,670
	Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Capital Grants	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
	Small programs	6,567	7,110	6,673	6,840

Human Services

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Human Services	Major Project				
	Continuous Monitoring of Screening	570	—	—	—
	Small projects	200	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Adelaide Youth Training Centre—Sustainment Equipment Services	509	522	535	548
South Australian Housing Trust	Major Project				
	Remote Indigenous Housing	14,467	11,922	—	—
	Better Neighbourhoods Program	51,766	39,629	14,377	15,000
	Economic Stimulus—construction of social housing	58,240	13,678	—	—
	Business Systems Transformation	14,570	13,700	6,850	—
	Other projects	35,045	28,410	10,621	10,215
	Annual Program				
	Other programs	32,868	32,401	33,350	33,400

Innovation and Skills

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Industry and Skills	Major Project				
	Waymouth St Office Accommodation	2,221	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Annual Investing Programs	14,222	14,490	14,725	15,093
	IT Systems and Infrastructure	973	970	1,051	1,077

Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Correctional Services	Major Project				
	Additional prison beds—Mt Gambier Prison	20,000	—	—	—
	Additional prison beds—Pt Augusta Prison	5,000	—	—	—
	Additional Prisoner Accommodation—Adelaide Women's Prison	13,350	3,800	—	—
	Annual Program				
Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,491	2,812	3,044	3,120	
Emergency Services—CFS	Annual Program				
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—CFS	17,508	18,093	15,983	16,383
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—CFS	1,836	1,882	1,929	1,977

Emergency Services—MFS	Major Project				
	Replacement of GP Pumpers	108	—	—	—
	Structural Firefighting Training Prop	2,454	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—MFS	6,925	6,165	9,551	7,996
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—MFS	216	221	227	233
Emergency Services—SAFECOM	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	1,642	144	147	14,329
Emergency Services—SES	Annual Program				
	Capital Works and Rescue Equipment—SES	3,721	3,801	3,896	3,993
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—SES	417	427	438	449
	SES Light Vehicle Fleet	283	290	297	305
Police	Major Project				
	Hi-tech Crime Fighting Equipment	200	—	—	—
	Police Records Management System—Stages 2 to 4	8,034	3,053	—	—
	Crime Tracking App	291	—	—	—
	Data Entry Terminals	136	—	—	—
	Continuous Monitoring of Screening	200	—	—	—
	Mobile Speed Camera Replacement	1,672	—	—	—
	Edwardstown Centralised Property	460	—	—	—
	Firearms Control System	478	3,814	968	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment	10,149	9,454	10,310	10,571

Primary Industries and Regional Development

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Primary Industries and Regional Development	Major Project				
	Loxton Research Centre Redevelopment	325	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	5,033	4,979	5,375	5,509

Trade, Tourism and Investment

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
South Australian Tourism Commission	Annual Program				
	Capital Works and Equipment	650	649	702	720
Trade, Tourism and Investment	Major Project				
	Shanghai business hub: office fit-outs	100	—	—	—
	New trade offices	110	200	100	—

Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Major Project				
	Bus Fleet Replacement Program	27,926	18,765	19,234	19,715
	Northern Expressway	326	400	422	—
	Increased Detection of Unregistered/Uninsured Vehicles	1,658	1,091	623	639
	Adelaide to Melbourne Road Corridor	1,074	—	—	—
	South Road Superway	24,596	2,000	5,073	—
	Southern Expressway—Duplication	403	—	—	—
	Adelaide Oval—Redevelopment	3,074	—	—	—
	Goodwood and Torrens Rail Junctions Upgrade	1,036	—	—	—
	Public Transport Park'n'Ride Interchanges	2,741	—	—	—
	South Road Upgrade from Torrens Road to River Torrens	88,843	—	—	—
	Managed Motorways on the South Eastern Freeway	7,763	—	—	—
	Adelaide Hills Priority Program	1,344	—	—	—

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	O-Bahn extension into the city	3,408	—	—	—
	Gawler Line Modernisation	222,500	190,577	75,000	45,000
	North–South Corridor Darlington Upgrade	157,790	7,015	—	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Plaza & Integration	40,000	20,000	19,360	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Car Park	—	30,000	—	—
	Improving critical road infrastructure	28,453	—	—	—
	Gawler East Collector Link	10,803	—	—	—
	Northern Connector	230,000	137,346	—	—
	Port Stanvac Wharf and Foreshore	780	5,730	—	—
	Critical Bridge Improvements	1,715	—	—	—
	Extension of the Tonsley rail line to the Flinders Medical Centre	62,231	2,120	—	—
	Port Adelaide Office Accommodation Fit-out	3,465	—	—	—
	Planning Reform Implementation	11,926	2,571	1,620	—
	Low carbon transport investment program	3,000	—	—	—
	Diesel railcar mechanical upgrade and modernisation	22,919	—	—	—
	Leigh Creek Capital Program	715	—	—	—
	Upper Yorke Peninsula Regional Road Network Upgrade	1,800	—	—	—
	Henley and Semaphore jetty works	2,143	—	—	—
	10 New Safety Cameras	1,000	—	—	—
	Oaklands Crossing	149,340	4,175	—	—
	Train Control Centre	26,918	—	—	—
	Park'N'Ride	14,500	—	—	—
	Blackwood Roundabout Upgrade	2,683	—	—	—
	Main South Road Duplication from Seaford to Aldinga.	2,000	23,000	75,000	164,000
	Lobethal Freight Access Project	11,693	—	—	—
	Regional Roads Program	1,475	—	—	—
	Port Adelaide Rail Spur	15,900	—	—	—
	Golden Grove Road Upgrade	10,000	9,800	—	—
	Port Road / West Lakes Boulevard / Cheltenham Parade intersection upgrade	5,800	—	—	—
	Main North Road with Tulloch Road intersection upgrade	3,800	—	—	—
	Duplication of Joy Baluch AM Bridge	10,000	135,000	54,650	—
	North Haven Boat Ramp	5,550	—	—	—
	Overpass at Port Wakefield Road	—	1,000	25,000	62,500
	Paradise O-Bahn Interchange Car Park	—	7,500	—	—
	Flagstaff Road widening	—	—	750	5,630
	Fix Candy Road and South Road Intersection	—	5,200	—	—
	Right-Turn on North Terrace	9,000	28,000	—	—
	Golden Grove Park n Ride	—	11,000	—	—
	Penola Bypass	2,800	11,800	—	—
	Crozier intersection	940	—	—	—
	North-South Corridor Pym to Regency	40,000	38,200	141,100	118,800
	Cape Jervis Breakwater Extension	—	1,920	—	—
	Southern Expressway Throw Screens	14,980	—	—	—
	City South Tramline Replacement Project	7,930	—	—	—
	Small projects	8,029	980	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Outback Communities Authority	182	187	868	197
	DPTI Annual Program	135,393	136,705	127,565	133,937
South Australian Government Employee Residential Properties	Annual Program				
	Residential Properties	6,840	7,011	7,186	7,366

Treasurer

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
SA Lotteries	Annual Program				
	Minor Works—Plant and Equipment	10	10	10	10
Treasury and Finance	Major Project				
	Shared Services—masterpiece system	1,578	—	1,658	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	1,852	1,450	1,639	1,679
	Revenue SA Information Online System (RIO)	3,617	521	337	345

Parliament

Agency	Project	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Auditor-General	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	227	233	239	245

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

804 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the Premier:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

805 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the Deputy Premier:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the Deputy Premier, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

806 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

807 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

808 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

809 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

810 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

811 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

812 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

813 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

814 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

815 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

816 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14 May 2019). For all agencies reporting to the minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2017-18 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

On behalf of the minister, I refer the member to my answer to question with notice 803.