

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18 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 the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

*Matter of Privilege*

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:01):** I rise on a matter of privilege. On Tuesday 4 June 2019, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier a question: 'Are you abolishing Veterans SA as a standalone agency?' He went on to ask: 'Will it,' being Veterans SA, 'retain a status as a standalone agency within Defence SA?' The leader, since asking those questions, went on to write a letter to the veterans community arguing that Veterans SA may be abolished as a standalone agency.

Veterans SA has never been a standalone agency but, rather, a program of government. This has been the case since it was first created and is reflected in both the ministerial responsibilities in the budget papers and the Auditor-General's public sector agency's audited reports. As a former member of cabinet, the Leader of the Opposition would be well aware that this is and always has been the case. Further to this, the leader is a recipient of the budget papers and the Auditor-General's Report, which clearly identify the nature of Veterans SA.

By purporting in questions to the Premier on Tuesday 4 June 2019 that Veterans SA was a standalone agency, the leader knowingly misled the parliament. Therefore, Mr Speaker, I ask that you review the questions made by the leader and the documents I have referred to (I will provide you with a copy) to rule on this as a matter of privilege.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, Attorney-General, for bringing that matter to my attention. I ask you to furnish all relevant documents and I will come back to the house.

*Bills*

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) BILL

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 June 2019.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:04):** I am pleased today to stand to support the Statutes Amendment (SACAT) Bill 2019. Why we as the Marshall Liberal government are putting this legislation through this place is all about the reason the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) was established in 2015. The ultimate objective of SACAT is to provide a single, low-cost and efficient forum for administrative and civil reviews whilst also giving the courts more time to focus on their core judicial functions. This is more evidence of the Marshall Liberal government streamlining efficiencies and procedures.

When it was established, the SACAT was conferred with jurisdiction to hear the following types of matters: housing disputes, including disputes about residential tenancy; residential parks; rooming houses; and retirement villages. Certainly, in line with the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, I was pleased to assist a former farming neighbour of mine who was involved in a situation. I was very pleased to go through the process with him and give him support during his tribunal matters. Whether it is about residential tenancies or other matters, these are all very important, and when individuals need support I am always more than happy to assist them in the process.

Other matters that came under SACAT were guardianship and administration, consent to medical treatment and advance care directives. When that legislation came through the house, I was heavily involved in the debate with the former health minister, the former member for Kaurna. Something else that came under their jurisdiction was mental health, which comprises another range of serious matters that need to be dealt with appropriately.

It has always been intended to transfer additional jurisdictions to SACAT in manageable stages. It has since taken on a number of jurisdictions related to local government, land and housing, taxation and superannuation, environment and farming, energy and resources, food safety and regulation, and community matters. This bill makes amendments to a range of acts to transfer additional jurisdictions on SACAT in line with the planned process. It also addresses some irregularities in the legislation used by SACAT and makes changes to improve the tribunal's efficiency.

A range of additional jurisdictions will come under this legislation, and the bill transfers the following jurisdictions to SACAT: equal opportunity complaints and exemption applications under the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, the South Australian Health Practitioners Tribunal, the disciplinary functions of the Architectural Practice Board of South Australia, the disciplinary functions of the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia and certain existing ministerial reviews.

The bill also transfers a range of reviews, disciplinary proceedings and appeals currently heard in the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court, appeals against certain hospital licensing decisions and a small number of administrative approvals and appeals from the Magistrates Court. Other amendments are coming in to address irregularities.

The bill clarifies the provisions in the SACAT Act concerning access by the public to recordings of proceedings, transcripts or any other documentary material admitted into evidence. This responds to concerns that, given the informality of the tribunal's workings, the current terminology creates uncertainty as to whether a document has in fact been admitted into evidence. To address this, the bill adopts a broader reference to documents, or other material produced or provided to SACAT, to ensure all relevant material can be captured.

An arbitrary restriction on access to photographs or videos held by SACAT will be removed to allow access in appropriate cases, such as residential tenancy matters. The bill also tidies up previously confusing rules for accessing sensitive material so that SACAT's permission will be required to access material of a prescribed class. This will include photographs, video recordings and other material of a sensitive nature, in addition to existing classes of sensitive material already prescribed in the regulations.

There are also amendments in this legislation, as I mentioned before, to achieve more efficiencies. The following amendments are aimed at improving the efficiency of the SACAT. There will be amendments around extending the offence of disrupting proceedings to include hearings by telephone and video link, and also to change the process of appointing SACAT assessors so that the minister—being the Attorney-General, rather than the Governor—will make appointments on recommendation of the SACAT president. This change preserves the status quo for many of the jurisdictions to be transferred to SACAT and will be more efficient.

There has been extensive consultation on this legislation. It has been conducted with all affected ministers, statutory officers, courts, boards and other bodies from whom functions will be transferred to SACAT. Representatives of the occupations and professions whose disciplinary functions will be transferred to SACAT were also consulted.

I applaud this bill being brought to this house by the Attorney-General and hope it has swift passage. I think it is very sensible legislation so that we can streamline matters that, in the past, have gone before various tribunals. A lot of that was tidied up in 2015 and now we are doing more progressive work to make sure that we are getting the SACAT more streamlined and more efficient. With those few words, I commend the bill.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:11):** I rise to indicate that Labor supports the Statutes Amendment (SACAT) Bill 2019—however, with the exception of clause 160, which allows the Attorney-General to appoint assessors without cabinet approval and without the Governor appointing

such assessors. Labor believes that the current appointment mechanism provides a very important oversight function.

This support for the bill is also subject, rightly, to ongoing consultation with affected industry bodies and stakeholders. Many South Australians find themselves dealing with SACAT or having matters heard by it on issues that deeply affect their lives, their families, the industries they work in and the businesses they operate and, therefore, it is crucial that they are properly and deeply heard. I also indicate that I am the lead speaker on this bill.

This bill brings a number of jurisdictions into SACAT or makes some amendments to existing jurisdictions. I do not intend to go through the exhaustive list, as the Attorney-General already did that in her second reading. We understand from advice provided by the Attorney-General's staff that three new jurisdictions that were not originally contemplated are being transferred to SACAT.

That advice outlined the following three jurisdictions: the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996 function, currently under the Magistrates Court, pertaining to applications for change of sex and gender identity children; the appeals jurisdiction that currently sits with the District Court Administrative and Disciplinary Division under the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013; and the appeal jurisdiction that currently sits with the District Court Administrative and Disciplinary Division with regard to the Tattooing Industry Control Act 2015.

I certainly would not want to put words in the Attorney-General's mouth, but I would suggest that it would be helpful if she could outline the precise nature of those jurisdictions and why they, in particular, were transferred into SACAT. As mentioned, this bill also amends the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 to allow the Attorney-General to directly appoint assessors under the SACAT Act.

I understand that currently assessors are appointed by the Governor following cabinet consideration. Again, the Attorney-General might like to outline why the appointment of assessors should no longer require cabinet consideration and appointment by the Governor, given the importance of their role in a number of matters considered by SACAT and given the need for those associated with those matters to have the utmost confidence in the appointment process in relation to those assessors.

As I think the member for Hammond also said, many South Australians find themselves at SACAT to have matters that are really important to their lives heard. It is therefore absolutely crucial that people have faith in those assessors and, indeed, all that are involved with their particular matters. I can indicate also that, through discussion with many members of our community, particularly those associated with the various bodies and areas that will potentially now be covered by SACAT, there are numerous questions that must also be answered about the resourcing for particular bodies as they transition to SACAT, particularly those who already face significant resourcing challenges as a result of various cuts that have been made to resourcing by this government.

With those few words, I once again indicate that Labor supports the majority of the Statutes Amendment (SACAT) Bill 2019 but that we will continue to consult on the bill with South Australians, various stakeholders and industry bodies. I indicate that we will have various questions about the appointment processes for assessors and also in relation to resourcing for the various bodies as they transition to SACAT and continue their work there.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:16):** I rise to provide some brief remarks in support of the bill. Like the member for Hammond, who has spoken before me this morning, I certainly hope to see the swift passage of this legislation through this house. The bill is another step in the process of conferral of jurisdiction on the tribunal. It has been envisaged from the outset and takes the tribunal that further step forward to the full conferral of jurisdiction. That has commenced, with the initial conferral of jurisdiction back in 2015, and has progressed each year since then.

I just want to take some moments to reflect on what is still the relatively brief history of the South Australian tribunal in our state, introduced, as it was, after some decades of advocacy via law reform bodies in our state with a view to the creation of a tribunal, effectively, with powers of general administrative review. The intent, of course, of the tribunal's conferral of jurisdiction is over the course

of the series of steps to confer that general administrative review jurisdiction across the board, and the bill takes that forward. I will address those specific aspects of that conferral in a moment.

It is perhaps timely to reflect on the main objects of the tribunal as set out in section 8 of the act. The South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013 requires that the tribunal focus on a number of main areas in the discharge of its objectives. Those main objectives are, in the exercise of its jurisdiction, to promote the best principles of public administration, including independence, the provision of natural justice and procedural fairness and high-quality, consistent decision-making, together with the transparency and accountability that one would expect of a court or tribunal exercising jurisdiction and its statutory functions in this environment.

As was observed by the first President of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, the Hon. Justice Greg Parker, in his report in the first year of operation of the tribunal, those main objectives also importantly include accessibility, fast processing and resolution of disputes, the keeping of costs to a minimum, using straightforward language, applying flexibility and ensuring consultation with stakeholders.

The very nature of the tribunal is to ensure that, in dealing with these civil and administrative matters, the process includes all those features as fully as is possible. As we fast-forward to the 2018 report and the report of the Hon. Justice Judy Hughes, we see that positive steps have been taken in the tribunal operating with regard to those main objectives over those intervening years.

As honourable members will recall, we have seen the particular challenge to the conferral of jurisdiction that was posed by the decision of the High Court in *Burns v Corbett*. The decision of the High Court in that case caused a review of the limitations on jurisdiction that can arise in circumstances where a tribunal is conferred with specific jurisdiction but is not a court, and the parliament has acted already with regard to necessary amendments in the aftermath of *Burns v Corbett*.

In this short history, over a series of stages we have seen the conferral of jurisdiction on this still relatively new tribunal. As one might expect, that has been met with questions of jurisdiction being dealt with in the courts and already some legislative response. I want to highlight also, in recognising the 2018 report of Justice Hughes, that, like Justice Parker before her, the report each year deals with the contemplated step-wise expansion of jurisdiction for the tribunal.

We note that in the 2017-18 financial year the tribunal's jurisdiction was expanded with reference to a quite wide range of legislation, including with respect to the Firearms Act, the Animal Welfare Act, the agriculture act and a number of other areas—a similar suite of legislation—further expanding the jurisdiction of the tribunal. This further step takes what I understand may be the penultimate step in the expansion of the jurisdiction ultimately to be conferred on the tribunal.

The particular legislation affected by this further round of expansion of jurisdiction is again quite wide ranging in 2019. It includes amendment to the Architectural Practice Act insofar as it confers upon the tribunal the disciplinary functions of the Architectural Practice Board of South Australia. As has been adverted to by the member from Reynell, it amends the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996 by the conferral of jurisdiction pursuant to that act. There is a consequential amendment to a number of other acts resulting from the conferral of jurisdiction, and they are the subject of parts 5 through to 31. I do not pause to refer to each of them in turn, as they are plainly set out in the bill.

I refer briefly to the conferral of the disciplinary functions of the Veterinary Surgeons Board of SA. That is the subject of part 31 of the bill and that will be another aspect of the substantive conferral of jurisdiction that is the subject of this round of expansion. Insofar as the disciplinary functions of those professional boards are concerned, it is anticipated that the conferral of jurisdiction will, in those cases, have a substantive effect on the range of work that those boards otherwise do, so I make particular reference to the Architectural Practice Board and the Veterinary Surgeons Board in that context.

As I understood the member for Reynell, she referred to general support for the bill, with the exception of clause 160, and the need for ongoing stakeholder engagement. I do not cavil at the observation that it is important that there be ongoing stakeholder consultation. As I referred to earlier, the main objectives of the tribunal—those that are set out in section 8 of the act—all very much auger

toward a tribunal that is doing all it can to ensure that it is, to use a catch-all, user friendly and orientated toward accessibility and efficiency. I certainly indicate that stakeholder engagement and ongoing consultation, as we continue these rounds of expansion of the jurisdiction of the tribunal, will continue to be important.

With that in mind, while there are 31 parts of the bill, I have made particular reference to the conferral of the disciplinary functions in relation to two of the professional courts. It might serve to illustrate the wideranging nature of the consultation that has occurred with stakeholders on this round to note that, as I understand it in relation to those aspects affecting the Veterinary Practice Act, consultation has taken place involving the Animal Welfare League of South Australia Inc., the Australian Veterinary Association SA/NT division, the Avicultural Society of South Australia, the Dog and Cat Management Board, Dogs SA, the Feline Association of SA, Greyhound Racing SA, Horse SA, Livestock SA, RSPCA SA Inc., Thoroughbred Racing SA, the Veterinary Defence Association Australia and the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia.

Those organisations—professional, voluntary, industry and otherwise—are of very wideranging interest in the veterinary space. Just to illustrate that question of stakeholder consultation, those bodies have been engaged, as I understand it, and honourable members in a variety of ways will have worked with and benefited from the contributions that those bodies make in their respective areas of particular focus in the short time that I have been in this place.

I have had occasion to deal extensively with Livestock SA and RSPCA SA Inc., to take just two of those by way of example. They are bodies that will be particularly interested in part 31 of the bill, and I am glad to note that they have been consulted as part of the process of this round of the expansion of jurisdiction.

In relation to the other professional body that I referred to earlier, perhaps reflecting the unified nature of the profession in that regard, consultation has occurred in relation to the architectural profession in regard to those aspects of the bill that will affect changes to its professional practice board and so far as it affects the Architectural Practice Act. Those bodies include the Architectural Practice Board of South Australia itself, the Australian Institute of Architects South Australia chapter and the Consult Australia (formerly the Association of Consulting Architects Australia) South Australian branch.

With particular reference in this case to the observations of the member for Reynell about the importance of consultation, perhaps referenced to just those two discrete areas, it might serve to illustrate the wide range of interested bodies and, by extension, the importance of engaging widely when undertaking change of this nature.

There are extensive bodies of consultation that have occurred, as I understand it, in relation to the consumer and business aspects of the act. The industry bodies consulted are extensive and, of course, in regard to those aspects of health practitioner regulation that are affected, a very extensive body of consultation has occurred. I am glad to see that and I look forward to that continuing. I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:36):** I wish to thank all members who have made a contribution to the debate on the Statutes Amendment (SACAT) Bill 2019. In particular, I recognise the indication of support for the bill by the opposition's leader, other than reference to the appointment by the Attorney-General without the Governor's endorsement in respect of assessors. I certainly hope to advise the committee in due course of the importance of this change and why we have presented it for consideration.

In respect of the matters that have been excluded from the bill, I think it is important that we place on the record our position. One of the new jurisdictions that was considered but is not being transferred to SACAT is the jurisdiction under the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996, currently exercised by the Magistrates Court, in relation to applications for approvals and reviews regarding change of sex and gender identity of a child. These provisions were inserted into the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act later, in 2017, as part of the amendments to repeal the sexual reassignment act and amend the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act to provide for alternate, less onerous processes for recognising changes of sex or gender.

SACAT had originally been scheduled to receive the Magistrates Court's previous broader jurisdiction over applications for change of sex and gender identity under the now repealed sexual reassignment act. The functions transferred in this bill are a small subset of the sexual reassignment act work previously undertaken by the Magistrates Court, which was originally planned to transfer to SACAT. Accordingly, I provide that explanation in the hope that it might assist those following this debate.

The second area of jurisdiction that was not included relates to the appeals function currently conferred on the District Court's Administrative and Disciplinary Division under the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013. This act postdated the original list of proposed SACAT jurisdictions and was added following a request from the then minister for health to transfer this jurisdiction to SACAT on the basis that SACAT offered a more accessible appeal forum than the ADD.

The third is the appeals function currently conferred on the ADD under the Tattooing Industry Control Act 2015, being appeals against decisions of the commissioner to disqualify a person from providing tattooing services or against a direction of an authorised officer requiring a person providing tattooing services to comply with specified requirements in order to minimise a risk to the safety of the public. This act postdated the original list of proposed SACAT jurisdictions and was added following an inquiry from Consumer and Business Services about whether these appeals should be transferred for consistency, since most other ADD appeals functions are proposed to transfer to SACAT.

A further matter raised was in relation to the decisions under the Electoral Act that are currently appealable to the ADD with an appeal function to transfer to SACAT under this bill. They are:

- a decision by the Electoral Commissioner or an officer as to the enrolment of any claimant for enrolment;
- a decision by an electoral registrar on an objection to the enrolment of an elector on a roll;
- a decision by the Electoral Commissioner regarding the registration of a political party;
- a decision by the Electoral Commissioner regarding the registration of a how-to-vote card; and
- a decision of a prescribed class taken under this act by the Electoral Commissioner or an officer.

I am further advised that it does not appear that there are any prescribed in the regulations under the act at this stage.

There was also a query in respect of the difference between the employment agents and labour hire providers. I indicate to members that, whilst a comprehensive description of this is provided on the SafeWork SA website, for the benefit of the house I indicate that a person is required to be licensed as an employment agent if that person is, for monetary or other consideration, carrying on the business of acquiring workers for persons who desire to employ or engage others in any kind of work or acquiring employment for persons who desire to be employed or engaged by others in any kind of work.

The following organisations are excluded from the definition of an 'employment agent' and are not required to hold a licence:

- a charitable organisation carrying on its activity on a non-profit basis;
- an organisation or association that administers a group training scheme, jointly funded by the commonwealth and state governments, for the purposes of obtaining apprentices or trainees for persons who desire to employ or engage such a person in any kind of work, or obtaining employment for apprentices or trainees; and
- an organisation that operates a labour hire business.

A labour hire arrangement is one where a labour hire company or agency provides individual workers to a client or to a host, where the workers are under the host company's direction. However, the labour hire company remains ultimately responsible for the workers—that is, their employee's remuneration. I trust that the information provided will assist members in understanding the matters that have been raised.

Finally, I indicate that I am not sure whether a comprehensive list of the persons consulted was provided at the briefing. I am happy to quickly run through who they are. The industry bodies consulted in relation to this bill were the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency, the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation (SA Branch), the Ambulance Employees Association SA Inc., the Australasian College of Podiatric Surgeons, the Australian Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine Association; the Australian and New Zealand Society of Nuclear Medicine, the Australian College of Mental Health Nurses (SA Branch) Inc., the Australian College of Midwives (SA Branch) Inc. and the Australian College of Nursing.

Also consulted were the Australian Dental Association (SA Branch), the Australian Dental Prosthetists Association, the Australian Friendly Societies Pharmacies Association Inc., the Australian Medical Association SA, the Australian Natural Therapists Association, the Australian Osteopathic Association, the Australian Pharmacy Council Ltd, the Australian Physiotherapy Association (SA Branch), the Australian Physiotherapy Council, the Australian Podiatry Association and the Australian Psychological Society.

Other industry bodies consulted include the Australian Society of Medical Imaging and Radiation Therapy, the Australian Traditional Medicine Society, the Chinese Medicine and Acupuncture Society of Australia, the Chiropractors Association of Australia (SA Branch), the Council on Chiropractic Education Australasia Ltd, the Dental Hygienists Association of Australia (SA Branch) Inc. and the Federation of Chinese Medicine and Acupuncture.

Also consulted were the Health Consumers Alliance of SA Inc., the Institute of Private Practising Psychologists, the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Worker Association, Occupational Therapy Australia Ltd, Optometry South Australia Inc., Paramedics Australasia Ltd (SA Chapter), the Pharmaceutical Society of Australia Limited (SA Branch), the Pharmacy Guild of Australia (SA Branch), the SA Salaried Medical Officers Association (SANT) President, the Australian Dental and Oral Health Therapists' Association Inc, the Society of Hospital Pharmacists of Australia (SA and NT Branch) and the Society of Natural Therapists and Researchers Inc.

The industry bodies consulted in respect of the proposed amendments to the Veterinary Practice Act were the Animal Welfare League of SA Inc., the Australian Veterinary Association SA/NT Division, the Avicultural Society of South Australia Inc., the Dog and Cat Management Board, Dogs SA, the Feline Association of SA, Greyhound Racing SA, Horse SA; Livestock SA, RSPCA SA Inc., Thoroughbred Racing SA, the Veterinary Defence Association Australia Ltd and the Veterinary Surgeons Board of SA.

The industry bodies consulted in respect of the amendments to the Architectural Practice Act were the Architectural Practice Board of SA, the Australian Institute of Architects (South Australian Chapter) and the Association of Consulting Architects (South Australian Branch). In respect of the consumer and business services acts, the industry bodies consulted were the Air Conditioning and Mechanical Contractors' Association; the APA Group, which is the Australian gas pipelines; the Association of Building Consultants Inc.; and the Australian Institute of Building (SA Chapter).

Other industry bodies consulted include the Australasian Timber Flooring Association, the Australian Automotive Aftermarket Association, the Automotive Repairers Council of Australia, Business SA, Communications Electrical Plumbing Union SA, the Construction Industry Training Board, the Hair and Beauty Industry and Employers Association of SA, the Housing Industry Association of SA, the Master Builders Association of SA, Master Landscapers of SA, the Master Painters, Decorators and Signwriters Association of SA, the Master Plumbers Association, the Motor Trade Association of SA, the National Electrical and Communications Association of SA, the National Fire Industry Association, the Office of the Technical Regulator and the Royal Automobile Association of SA.

I would like to refer to two of those organisations that were consulted, again to give some reassurance to the house of the consideration of the submissions given and the incorporation into the bill that is currently before the house. I wish to firstly place on the record my appreciation to those industry bodies that responded. This is a valuable contribution to lawmaking, in particular the importance of ensuring that we take into account all the practical applications that occur in relation to what we do here. I have certainly found this most valuable and important now, in government, to ensure that these are incorporated, the practical implementation, where it is brought to our attention.

By letter of 16 April 2019, the then president of the Australian Medical Association (South Australia) Inc., Professor William Tam, responded to the draft legislation, indicating there was a concern relating to the reduction of health professionals on the panel of assessors to one. He states:

The AMA(SA) has significant concerns regarding section 109 of the draft bill 'Substitution of Part 3' beginning on page 38 of the bill, and particularly the first section: '8—Participation of Assessors on Tribunal'. In paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of this section the proposed changes reduce the number of health professionals on the panel of assessors from having two of four members in total, to one of three members in total. In cases involving doctors, this will mean there is one doctor, rather than two doctors, on each panel, a significant reduction in proportional terms.

The AMA(SA) considers this to be inconsistent with the stated function of the tribunal under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law, which is, in large part, to make a determination as to whether a practitioner has engaged in professional misconduct, unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory professional practice—and to make that determination in alignment with the views and perspectives of the practitioner's peers.

The definitions of these types of conduct as set out in the definitions section of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (Schedule 2, Part 1, 5, pp.8-84) include, in each case, a requirement to measure whether the conduct or professional practice was 'substantially below the standard reasonably expected of a practitioner of [an] equivalent level of training and experience'. This is a determination that is most appropriately made by a health professional of the same profession as the practitioner before the tribunal.

While the importance of also having non-medical representation on the panel is fully appreciated, it is the AMA(SA)'s position that the reduction in representation by doctors [on] the panel will shift the balance of the panel away from one with equal representation of health and non-health practitioners, and ultimately dilute both the core functions of the tribunal and the potential for successful outcomes based on profession-specific expertise and evidence.

I thank Mr Tam for this submission. It is an important matter he has alerted us to, as the proponents of this bill, and I am pleased to advise the house that his recommendations were incorporated and resolved in the bill currently before the parliament. Again, this is a classic example where that has been of great assistance to us and, I hope, to the parliament, when considering this matter.

The second matter relates to the Australian Veterinary Association SA Division. They provided a comprehensive submission on the draft Statutes Amendment (SACAT) Bill under consideration and raised a number of matters. I do not wish to read out all their matters of concern; they are of no less significance, but I just highlight one aspect of their submission. They state:

The Draft Bill sets out the nature of the panel of the assessors who would assist in hearings. This is listed as—

and then they replicate clause 64 of the bill. I will not read that, but I am sure those following this will understand what we are talking about. They go on to state:

Where the Tribunal sits with assessors, at least one should be a veterinarian and preferably a veterinarian with direct experience of clinical general practice (or the same kind of veterinary practice as is the subject of the complaint).

Can I say that again these matters have been incorporated in the bill that has been presented for the parliament's consideration, along with some other tidy-up matters. I thank them particularly for raising those issues.

I think it is fair to say that, because we rely so heavily on persons of the same discipline in training and experience to provide advice in relation to the alleged misconduct, usually of a peer, it is important that we value their work and appreciate the significance of their contribution in these determinations. It is also fair to say that it is not an easy job to do—that is, to step up and be critical of one's peers in making these determinations or in providing the evidence upon which an assessment can be relied on these determinations—and we thank them for doing it.



Sometimes it brings some frustration and criticism from others in the profession, particularly if the person who is being assessed has a particular view about the reliability or validity of what is being outlined in the evidence or report of the assessor. It is a pretty thankless task, in some ways, but it is an important one. Where we have these bodies, including various tribunals, to review this material and make decisions on it, it is absolutely critical that we have this information.

A further matter has been raised by the opposition, relating to the amendment of section 22 of the SACAT Act. This is, I suppose, to streamline the appointment of assessors who are to be appointed to this role. The proposal in this bill is to amend that section 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 recommendations of the Attorney-General, as is the current practice.

This has been highlighted by the opposition as raising some concern, to the extent that they do not propose to support this proposed amendment. Currently, ministers appoint assessors for use in the District Court and the Administrative and Disciplinary Division 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 government appointment for each assessor will become overly burdensome.

I think it is fair to say that the machinery of this bill will not rise or fall without the passage of this matter. However, it is a matter that has the safeguard of the appointment being only on the recommendation of the SACAT president. The SACAT president, as is known to the parliament—I will refresh your memory if you do not remember—is Her Honour the Hon. Justice Judy Hughes, a member of the Supreme Court, and she undertakes this role.

It is fair to say that the current person holding the role of president or Attorney-General is not the standard upon which one makes law in this place. We do need to consider that, whoever occupies these positions, there is sufficient safeguard and supervision in relation to such appointments. To be perfectly frank, if the opposition were concerned that just the Attorney-General was going to have this role without advice from a party such as the SACAT president, I think that would be well founded.

Certainly, in my time, I have seen different persons occupy the role of Attorney-General and I would not have trusted some of them with making decisions. Nevertheless, there have been different colours through this role at different times. I want to reassure the house that, in considering this process, this is a matter that comes on the recommendation of the SACAT president and that it is not going to be a process where any Attorney-General of the time can pick and choose who they like in relation to this appointment. I hope that gives some reassurance.

If it is of assistance, I am further advised that there would be over 100 assessors for the South Australian Health Practitioners Tribunal matters. I am sure that, whilst our newly reappointed Governor is ready and willing to serve in any capacity he is called upon to do so, going through the exercise of working out all these assessors for appointment is an executive responsibility, which, I think, has been identified as being an onerous and, at the very least, cumbersome process, and therefore we would urge the opposition to reconsider their position in that regard.

In respect of SACAT, which is now under consideration for the extra work that will increase their workload, can I conclude by thanking Her Honour Justice Judy Hughes, members of her tribunal and members of her staff for two things: firstly, for the continued operation of a tribunal that has been outlined by the speakers as necessary for the efficient and accessible resolution of disputes as expeditiously as possible and, secondly, for her willingness to undertake these extra jurisdictions and absorb them into her court.

As the Attorney-General, I remark that she is one of the pleasing heads of jurisdictions and extra work does not raise any complaints from her. In fact, I can genuinely say that, when asked if she might need extra resources, she has frequently indicated that she has been able to absorb the extra workload within her staff.

I recognise the work of SACAT as a result of the report undertaken by former Supreme Court Justice David Bleby QC. He provided quite an extensive report. His number one recommendation was that the operations of SACAT, which had been split geographically—that is, guardianship matters in the ABC building, as it is often described, at Collinswood, and the Residential Tenancies

Tribunal type matters in the city—should be in one location. I am pleased to report to the parliament that that has occurred and I am pleased to have been in office at the time, supervising that transfer. I have been to an opening, invited back Justice Parker, the first President of SACAT in South Australia, and generally been able to celebrate the fact that they are now operating from one premises.

This is very important because of two things: firstly, it is one location for the purposes of the work they do and the camaraderie that provides in respect of tribunal members and staff and, secondly, the Public Advocate has also moved her office to metropolitan Adelaide and is now geographically proximate to the SACAT operations.

The Public Advocate staff, in particular those who are making submissions to SACAT for those people who are largely disadvantaged in our community and require the support of the former guardianship board (now SACAT), provide representation, appointments of those to undertake that responsibility and, of course, the ancillary orders that are necessary to support persons who may be aged or infirm, who may have a dispute in their family connection or who may have no-one. It is an important role that we undertake in that regard. So that, too, has occurred and I think it has been an important initiative; it means that there has been some advance in that regard.

Recently, I attended the new offices of the Public Advocate and she has settled in her team. It seems that they are all very happy. Some are catching the train into work, and some are looking at the challenges of parking a vehicle, because for years they have been travelling out to Collinswood. Now they have the opportunity to access public transport, which has been a boon for a number of them. I am advised by some that their shopping habits have expanded because they are more proximate to retail facilities, which may or may not be a good thing. New-shoe therapy has never gone astray. Nevertheless, there are some real pluses in relation to the general morale of those teams who have to work constructively to ensure that we provide services for those persons in need.

With that, I again thank members who have made a contribution to this debate, and we will be available, of course, to answer anything else we can in committee.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before we go into committee, I would like to welcome the Aldinga Greys to the public gallery today, who are guests of the member for Mawson. Welcome. I hope you enjoy your visit.

#### *Bills*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) BILL**

#### *Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Attorney, you have just provided a list of stakeholders who were consulted on the bill. What were the responses from each of those stakeholders? Did any of those stakeholders raise concerns about their jurisdiction being transferred to SACAT and, if so, which stakeholders and what were their concerns?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The consultation list, as far as industry bodies are concerned, I have provided to the parliament and refer to those. The two bodies that raised concern about the composition of the panel were the Australian Medical Association (SA) and the Australian Veterinary Association SA/NT division. Both of them raised the matters that I have indicated. I am advised that all the bodies, including those two to this extent, have no objection to the transfer to SACAT.

I have highlighted the couple of areas that those two raised, and we have incorporated that in the bill for good reason. The rest have no problem with it being transferred to SACAT. I hope I was

clear in identifying that the three areas of jurisdiction that were not included in the original transfer proposal for 2014 are items that are being transferred in this bill as distinct from not being transferred at all. I hope I was clear about that.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** In what form did the consultation occur? You have given quite a lengthy list of those that have joined under this bill. How did that consultation occur?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Consistent with usual practice, the relevant stakeholders were emailed a letter with a copy of the draft bill inviting them to make a contribution.

**Ms HILDYARD:** How much additional funding will SACAT receive as a result of taking on these new jurisdictions?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am advised that the funding for the Health Practitioners Tribunal, the veterinary tribunal and the architects disciplinary tribunal will transfer to SACAT. Otherwise, SACAT will not receive extra funding other than what was already provisioned last year. I do not immediately know how much that was but, as I indicated in my response, I frequently consulted with Her Honour President Judith Hughes about not only the transfer of work that she has received but extra work that is being transferred over a period of time.

Amazingly, she has frequently indicated that there is no impediment to her taking on the responsibility, bearing in mind that, for a lot of these areas of work, only a very small number of applications are likely to come before her. I have no doubt that, in the efficient way she manages her tribunal, she will soon let me know if that situation should change. In relation to medical practitioners and veterinary and architectural professionals, a body of work comes with that and the money comes with it.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Did any bodies raise issues about resourcing in relation to their transition to SACAT? If so, have those bodies raised issues about resourcing previously?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** One party, the Australian Veterinary Association, SA division, which I have referred to, raised a question of cost. I will outline in a moment what they said. I am advised, however, that it is not anticipated that there will be any change in the cost of operating the board transferring to SACAT, in relation to the cost of the SACAT doing it, including their own efficiencies of scale that they operate.

This is what they said. Part of it is a table, so I am not sure whether I can table that document, but I will quickly try to indicate what it says in the submission:

The costs of veterinary registration are higher in South Australia than in any other state or territory. Over the last five years there have been significant increases in fees charged. Since 2015 fees have increased by over 56%:

I interrupt myself to say that that is not my fault. That is presumably the time before our government. In any event, in 2015 they set out a registration fee of \$435. By 2019, it is \$680. They go on to say:

When compared to other jurisdictions, South Australian fees are significantly higher—over double the average fee. Current general registration fees in other states and territories are:

ACT	NSW	NT	QLD	TAS	VIC	WA
\$433	\$300	\$116	\$256.60	\$384	\$370	\$465

The AVA is concerned about the incorporation of the Veterinary Practice Act 2003 into the jurisdiction of SACAT, this will increase the cost of the disciplinary process and put further upward pressure on veterinary registration fees in the state.

As such, we seek further clarification on the likely cost implications of the Draft Bill.

I confirm, on the advice I have, that there is no anticipated increase in cost.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** Obviously, in the form that you are seeking to achieve with SACAT, how many staff—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Are we still on clause 1?

**The CHAIR:** We are still on clause 1, which is the title.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** Could you begin your question again, please, member for Ramsay.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** My question is: how many staff and tribunal members do you foresee there will be under this new form of the tribunal?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Let's be clear: there is no new form of tribunal. The SACAT is the South Australian administrative tribunal. For the purposes of administrative review, it comprises a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court as president, deputy presidents, senior members, registrars and, I think, commissioners; I cannot remember. We have a number of people, as with the South Australian Employment Tribunal, who are parties to assist in mediation, etc.

What is going to be applied by the SACAT for the purposes of hearing these matters with the assessors, which are outlined as to who should be there in relation to the hearing of matters, as I understand it is yet to be determined finally. There are not new people; the board will be dissolved. The SACAT administration will take responsibility for that. A large part of this legislation is to transfer that role and to, obviously, establish a list of assessors to be able to do that.

Again, to be clear, whilst we are transferring here in this bill the role of disciplinary conduct and so on, in relation to the health board, that will be dissolved. The veterinary and architectural boards will continue to operate, but their responsibility in relation to these aspects are being transferred to SACAT, but they are still operating for the purposes of their own registration arrangements. Part of their responsibility is being transferred to SACAT as distinct from all their responsibility.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** A clarification of that last point—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Ramsay, before you seek that clarification, I am just going to say that there are 200 clauses in this bill. This particular question may have been more applicable to one of the clauses on the way through. The Attorney has chosen to answer it, so you can seek clarification.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** I have one more question after this, but my clarification is whether it is possible for you to take on notice and come back to the house as to how you intend to see how many people will be part of SACAT.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** That is not a matter, to be frank, for our determination as a parliament. The convening of the bodies for the purposes of assessment are set out in each of the acts we are changing here as to who sits on them and how many assessors sit with them, and then the practical application of that will be determined by Justice Judy Hughes as to her distribution of those for the purposes of who is going to be doing the work.

For example, there are some areas which I would expect Her Honour would consider to be ably undertaken by a senior member of the tribunal. In more complex matters, she may take the view that the body of assessors should sit with a deputy president. But I cannot immediately come back to the committee to identify how that is going to operate until Her Honour is consulted on those matters.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** In my previous role as minister for social housing, we were regular users of SACAT. What are your expectations about time lines? Are there KPIs, for example, that you would expect to be met?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am assuming the member is referring to the residential tenancy role that has been now a core base of work for SACAT. Whilst that jurisdiction is not being amended in any way in relation to this legislation, I am happy to answer. I see the residential tenancy work—formerly by the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and now for several years by SACAT—as a difficult area.

It always has been, because we are dealing with tenancies often relating to people who are in a financially vulnerable situation, mostly in the tenant's circumstance. The landlord might be the South Australian Housing Trust or a private company, many of which we have found under the High Court decision, which has been referred to by the member for Heysen, as being registered in Melbourne. Therefore, we have had to transfer jurisdiction to the Magistrates Court to deal with these

matters because the tribunal did not have sufficient jurisdiction, so the corporate decision had some issues relating to it. Anyway, we have addressed those.

It may also have landlords who are private individuals. It has frequently been problematic because it is a difficult area of decision-making, often where the tribunal is being asked to make a decision about terminating a tenancy due to unpaid rent, illegal conduct, behaviour generally in relation to occupation or unreasonable interference by those who own the property or their agents. So it has often been problematic.

One of the areas our government is currently having a look at, in my department, is how we might look at this vexed question of bonds. As the member would well know from her position as a former minister, people who are in an impecunious circumstance may have to have their bond paid by a government agency because they are not able to come up with the money for security of the tenancy, so that is also a burden in relation those cases.

Also, we now have the phenomenon of people in residential tenancies, particularly those who are very vulnerable financially, having to change tenancies—sometimes it is because they are chasing employment or they have a change of employment; sometimes it is because they are looking to provide a secure accommodation away from a potential domestic violence circumstance. People have to change tenancies and they frequently do. Bonds have to be refunded if they have left the premises without outstanding rent or damage to property, and they need to be able to get the money to pay for the next residence.

The frequency of changing residential tenancies has placed us with a contemporary issue; namely, how can we better deal with this in the prompt processing of bonds or what other models or products can we develop that might assist in this situation to give reassurance to the owner of the property, which might be a government agency or a private operation or, as I say, it might be some company in Melbourne, and at the same time give access to money that the tenant might need to be able to move on to the next property.

I am pleased to say that the Real Estate Institute of South Australia has been working with our agency to provide a pilot in relation to a new product. I hope in due course to be able to report to the parliament how that might progress, but we just have to deal with the contemporary issues that are there. What effect will it have in relation to the areas of the minister's former portfolio? I cannot be certain, but I will say this: in that area of work, together with the guardianship work—which again is another area of high demand for personal interaction and support, frequently of the litigants—my experience in opposition and in government is that SACAT has, notwithstanding being a new institution, worked quite well.

There are still some practical individual problems, but the co-location of the agencies, particularly in those two large fields, has been a significant advance in the practical and efficient operation of that tribunal. I think it has significantly advanced in recent months as a result of that transfer late last year, and I am confident that will continue. I am absolutely certain that if the president of the tribunal were in any way to see a situation where there would be some delay or deficiency in operating her tribunal she would let me know. I meet regularly with her, and she gives me up-to-date assessments.

I cannot tell you exactly what the KPIs are; I would probably have to go back and check the budget papers. However, like most operating agencies of government, there are KPIs set. For example, a number of other courts have to give annual accounts to this parliament, sometimes separately to me as Attorney-General, of the time frame in which they have delivered judgements and the time frame in which they have listed cases for trial, completion of them, etc. There are different KPIs relating to whatever tribunal or court operates, and some of those are published annually in the budget.

Notwithstanding the former premier streamlining annual reports and budget papers—I am not sure whether he streamlined the budget papers, but he certainly moved things around and kept transferring different agencies to different portfolios, which made annual comparisons a little bit confusing—I recall former premier Weatherill issuing an edict in relation to annual reports to the parliament of the agencies of government.

Some of them were not too happy about it I heard at the time and have since found out, and they did not feel that there was to be any impediment to what they reported to parliament. I will give one example: the Guardian for Children and Young People, who has the statutory protection of this parliament, as a result of Mr Mullighan's inquiry and recommendations, she or he (whoever holds that role) is not to be in any way interfered with in the reports they give to parliament.

Special statutory protection has been given, so when the providers of these annual reports—sometimes they are commissioners and sometimes they are people who are advocates with a level of independence—have to report to parliament, unsurprisingly they might have felt a bit aggrieved as to the Premier's instruction in that regard, probably his edict in relation to not filling up the reports with colourful pictures or photographs, which might have helped to reduce the size of these reports.

However, in relation to key performance indicators, which the member has asked a question about, it also means that the statutory reporting is done but valuable information in these annual reports, which historically have been there, are somewhat streamlined. I think that is unfortunate; nevertheless, there is a reporting process. If statistical information on KPIs is not available on websites these days, of course it is available through freedom of information.

I do not see there will be any failing as a result of the transfer of these jurisdictions in that regard. I hope that is comprehensive enough to cover the honourable member's question.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 62 passed.

Clause 63.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Attorney, what is the policy rationale behind moving the appeals or reviews from the District Court Administrative and Disciplinary Division to SACAT?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** In short, this relates to the Electoral Act of 1985 and transfers the current role of the District Court Administrative and Disciplinary Division. This is exactly the type of work anticipated and proposed by SACAT to undertake and, accordingly, in consultation with the Electoral Commissioner, is being proposed to transfer.

**Ms HILDYARD:** On the same clause, does the Electoral Commissioner support the change?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Attorney, what is the difference between an appeal, as the act is currently written, and a review, as proposed in the amendments? For example, are they enforceable in different ways?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The appellate process is one which, I suppose, is fairly familiar; that is, the District Court is the recipient of a number of appeals, including in an administrative role. In relation to the matters we are transferring for review by the SACAT, there is a slightly different procedure in hearing them. Different reviews have been undertaken by different jurisdiction; some, for example—not in this act—relate to a review of a matter sometimes by judicial registrars in other jurisdictions, and they are very limited in what they can review on a question of fact or law, or both.

This is a slightly different model. The SACAT administrative review will take the form of a review of the decision that has been made administratively, sometimes by a government official, and they can introduce some evidence. It is not a *de novo* hearing, as we call it, but they can introduce some evidence. Rather than give you four pages of distinction, an appeal under the District Court Act is an appeal under section 43 and in the nature of a rehearing in the sense that it is an appeal *stricto sensu* confined to matters which are properly before the District Court but is subject to the exceptional power to receive fresh evidence.

I am advised that, in relation to the nature of SACAT's review of administrative decisions, it is a hybrid form of review that is broader than the equivalent review by the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court which must not depart from the decision of the original decision-maker except for cogent reasons per section 42E of the District Court Act.

However, a SACAT section 34 review is not a full *de novo* review, since section 34 provides that SACAT must examine the original decision by way of a rehearing and give appropriate weight

to the decision of the original decision-maker, although SACAT may consider allowing additional evidence to be considered that was not before the original decision-maker, and must reach the correct or preferable decision. I hope that is clear. It is not as concise as I was saying but, hopefully, it makes it comprehensive and clear.

Clause passed.

Clauses 64 to 77 passed.

Clause 78.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Attorney, have the significant resourcing challenges faced by the Equal Opportunity Commission been addressed, or will they be addressed as a result of this transition to SACAT?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The amendments proposed under the Equal Opportunity Act, as set out in part 11, are as a result of consultation with a number of bodies, including the equal opportunity commissioner; the South Australian Employment Tribunal, in particular the president, Justice Dolphin; and Justice Hughes, obviously, as President of SACAT. The equal opportunity commissioner has a number of mandated provisions of responsibility under the Equal Opportunity Act.

Unless the member wanted to identify any aspects of resourcing which she is seeking, as I understand it there is no effect on the resourcing of her agency vis-a-vis these amendments. So, regarding the reference by the member of her 'significant resourcing difficulties', I have to say that these amendments, I would suggest, have no impact whatsoever. I would further say that the equal opportunity commissioner, in discussing with me and advising on matters under review from decisions made in her agency, was very helpful in identifying how this occurs.

What she raised with me, which aided and supported the drafting of this bill, was a very important matter; namely, whilst the Equal Opportunity Act administrative review was being dealt with by the South Australian Employment Tribunal to date, it was clear that sometimes there is already a proceeding in the South Australian Employment Tribunal in relation to someone's workplace concern that is extant and, therefore, it would be practical for any referral for review to be able to be heard in the South Australian Employment Tribunal.

Rather than sending it off to SACAT and then SACAT saying, 'There is an existing proceeding over in this tribunal, therefore we will refer it,' it was thought expedient by the commissioner, for the parties obviously, for her to have power to refer the matter directly to SAET. In the ordinary course under these reforms, reviews of the commissioner's decisions would go before SACAT, but both she and SACAT have the power to refer it to SAET if, in fact, that is a more convenient forum for determination.

I thought that was a sensible way of resolving it and, accordingly, we have accommodated that situation. Giving the equal opportunity commissioner the power to do that was again in consultation with the President of SAET and the President of SACAT. As best as I understand it, everyone agreed on that and that was a sensible way to advance it. Interestingly, in the course of that consultation, apparently very few cases that are referred for review from the Equal Opportunity Commission to SAET actually involve another workplace dispute or concern.

Frankly, I was surprised by that. I just assumed that the South Australian Employment Tribunal was the recipient of this responsibility because of what would have been an overlap in a number of other cases. In any event, apparently that is not the case. It is more the exception than the rule that there is some other ongoing dispute or pending proceeding in SAET. Nevertheless, we have accommodated that and I hope that will work very well. Everyone seems to be in agreement and we are therefore presenting it to the parliament for approval.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Continuing on with clause 78, Attorney, will staffing levels and the level of other resources associated with progressing Equal Opportunity Commission matters be improved as a result of this transition? I will ask the next part of the question in a moment, otherwise I am going to give you about five questions in one.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am not certain what base you are coming from, but I do not see this operational transfer as having any impact at all. This is a review process of decisions that the commission currently undertakes responsibility for and will continue to do so. To clarify, I have used the word 'review', but their referral of complaints to the Equal Opportunity Commissioner, which she currently refers to SAET, will be transferred to SACAT as the alternate. Simply, we are transferring the review body, as distinct from any other work that she does.

**Ms HILDYARD:** I am hopeful that it might improve resourcing. I have one final question on this clause. I suspect there may be other questions on this clause from other members, but my final question on clause 78 is: does the Attorney envisage that there will be improvements in waiting times for members of the South Australian public to have complaints progressed through the Equal Opportunity Commission as a result of this transition?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I do not think this will have any impact in relation to the progressing of matters in the first instance that go to the commission. It is up to the commissioner then to refer them. All the bill is doing is transferring who the body is that will hear those matters if she does not.

**Mr SZAKACS:** I apologise if this matter has been asked by the member for Reynell. Has there been an answer today in respect to the number of matters, based on previous figures, that the registry in SACAT will be likely referring to the SAET for hearing or determination under the bill?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am not sure whether the member is referring to the number of matters currently referred to SAET that are being proposed by this clause to be transferred over to SACAT. We could probably get those numbers for you. It is not a huge body of work, but it is an important body of work. If you are talking about all the matters of jurisdiction and the number of cases, I do not have that information before me at this point.

**Mr SZAKACS:** I am happy to clarify: it is the number of matters currently being determined by the SAET that would be referred to the SACAT under this amendment.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I remember asking the President of SAET, Justice Dolphin, about numbers. I think one of the magistrates was largely doing the work at the Employment Tribunal. I think it is fair to say that the efficient operation of the commissioners at SAET who helped to resolve a number of these matters has also been useful, but we do not have the number. It was the president, Justice Dolphin, who informed me that very few of these cases actually have an existing matter in SAET in relation to some other workplace concern.

As I have previously advised the committee, this was of some surprise to me. I thought this would be something that was par for the course. Apparently, it is not. As I say, for the benefit of the member for Cheltenham, this transfer of responsibility from SAET to SACAT is in consultation with and approval by the equal opportunity commissioner, the President of SAET and the President of SACAT.

**Mr SZAKACS:** Would the Attorney be in a position to take on notice that question in respect of those matters that she had taken advice from the president on in respect of numbers?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will certainly inquire as to the number of cases that the equal opportunity commissioner has referred in the last 12 months perhaps or the last financial year. It is probably in her annual report or online, but I will have a look at it and provide that information.

Clause passed.

Clauses 79 to 159 passed.

Clause 160.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Can the Attorney expand on the policy rationale behind no longer requiring that the appointment of assessors need cabinet consideration and then appointment by the Governor?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The only thing I would add in relation to this matter that I had not outlined in my contribution is that the member may not be aware that we are actually transferring a lot of the division of the District Court role to SACAT. In relation to assessors, the assessors that



support the valuable work of the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court are assessors who are appointed already by the minister responsible for each of the acts. Whichever minister is responsible for each of the acts approves a list of assessors for the purposes of each of those acts.

At the moment, the Governor does not have a role in relation to these assessors. I think I gave the example that there are well over 100 proposed for the Health Practitioners Tribunal. You have seen the list; it is a massive list. Because there is no role of the Governor, who normally does have a role in relation to SACAT appointments—he does not currently have a role in relation to these in the District Court; it is done by the ministers—this is a way of transitioning to a similar process where a minister, in this case the Attorney-General, would deal with those, based on the recommendation of the President of SACAT.

It is not as though we are having an Executive Council approved list of persons in one jurisdiction and then we are transferring it over and weakening it, if we can put it in that category, to be just by a minister, as distinct from cabinet advice to His Excellency. We are really transferring the same. Because the SACAT Act makes provision for appointment of certain persons, it is now receiving this jurisdiction, and we are suggesting that it have a similar process.

At the moment, I think we are probably strengthening it a bit by having it as a recommendation of the SACAT president, which does not apply, I think, for other acts that are currently determined in the District Court Administrative and Disciplinary Division by District Court personnel with the support of these assessors.

I hope that makes it clearer for the member that we are not actually downgrading, watering down or reducing the level of supervision over this. We are transferring like for like and, arguably, introducing the SACAT president as a nominating or recommending party. If the member had any misgivings about the process of a ministerial appointment, she can be assured it comes on the recommendation of the SACAT president.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Reynell, before you ask your next question, the question you have just asked seemed to me to relate particularly to clause 161. What you indicated to me was that it was in relation to clause 160. We have passed up to clause 159, but I am also going to suggest that if we come to vote on clause 161, we need to vote on the right clause, if you follow my drift. I think I am right in saying what I have said. Your question related to assessors, which is clause 161. So I am going to put clause 160.

Clause passed.

Clause 161.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Attorney, what are the appeal rights for people in relation to decisions or reports or recommendations of assessors, and are those appeal rights consistent throughout?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is not the decision of assessors that is appellable. The assessors support and are party to a panel which is of SACAT. There may be a member—I suggested before it might be a senior member or a deputy president, for example—of SACAT, together with an assessor, or maybe two of them, and their decision as a panel is what is appellable, and in certain circumstances that can be appealed to a single judge of the Supreme Court.

I do not think there is any direct Full Court decision to the Supreme Court. There is an exception, that is, if that panel comprises Justice Hughes, who is the only judicial member of the tribunal at the moment. There is a section there that is vacant, which is a deputy president, which was filled by a part-time member of the District Court. Mr Rau, the former attorney-general, concluded her contract and did not replace her but appointed Justice Hughes as a full-time president, which used to be half time when Justice Parker had that responsibility. So there was some reorganising.

There is provision in the act for a deputy, but, as I say, it is not currently filled. If the president or deputy president, as judicial officers, form part of a panel then, unsurprisingly, it cannot go to a single judge of the Supreme Court—it needs to go to a Full Court of the Supreme Court—so there is that exception.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:15.*

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2019**

*Message from Governor*

The Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

*Petitions*

### **SERVICE SA MODBURY**

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

### **TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale):** Presented a petition signed by 250 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.

*The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport is called to order.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

*Ministerial Statement*

### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:04):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is sought; is leave granted? There being a dissenting voice, minister, leave is not granted.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I will table my ministerial statement, Mr Speaker.

*Parliamentary Committees*

### **STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**

**The SPEAKER (14:04):** As Speaker, I bring up the first report of the committee, entitled 'Directing a member to withdraw from estimates committees', dated June 2019.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time*

### **EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:06):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the Department for Child Protection suspended the exceptional resource funding procedure?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:06):** I thank the member for this very important question. This gives me the great opportunity to clear the record and to clear up any of the misunderstandings that have been spread by the opposition through the media.

**Ms Stinson:** Because you didn't tell the truth.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** The core function of the department—

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please be seated. Member for Badcoe, when you say, 'Because you did not tell the truth,' I am taking that to be unparliamentary, and I respectfully ask you to withdraw that comment.

**Ms STINSON:** I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. The Minister for Child Protection has the call.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The core function of my department is statutory child protection services. For those children who need to enter the out-of-home-care system, our foster and kinship carers do an incredible job of providing safe, stable and loving homes for this state's most vulnerable children and young people.

Our foster and kinship carers are our greatest asset. These selfless volunteers open their hearts and their homes to children and young people in need and in doing so change lives. Exceptional circumstances arise, however, where carers may require additional financial support to meet the particular care needs of an individual child or young person. When this occurs, and in the absence of alternative avenues of support, my department will always consider whether additional one-off funding support can be delivered via the exceptional resource funding procedures.

Let it be clear: since the Marshall government was elected, there have been no cuts to the exceptional resource funding in my department. This has not been the subject of any savings measures.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Last budget, there was a \$1 million funding injection, which doubled the money available for distribution for exceptional needs funding, and those opposite will need to hear what is in store for this year's budget. Currently, all decisions to make and allocate exceptional resource funding take into account and balance the following:

1. The needs of the individual children and carers;
2. The needs of all children and carers; and
3. The need for the public to have confidence that the government's spending is transparent and equitable.

Last year, consistent with Treasurer's Instruction No. 2, which remains unchanged from the 2016 version under the then Labor government, my department reviewed the exceptional resource funding as a part of a suite of policy and procedure reviews. The exceptional resource funding review focused on providing greater clarity about how funds were allocated and consistent with the three factors I just mentioned.

The future updated guidelines will also consider the current budget and any implications that flow from it. I am advised that the new approach will:

1. Maintain the current funding limit of \$20,000 per request;
2. Not exempt any particular type of expenditure; and
3. Focus decision-making based on the individual circumstances of the child and the young person.

As an example, it is anticipated that the following type of expenses may be covered: expenses associated with renting a larger home to better accommodate an increased number of family members; minor home modifications, including, for example, upgrades to increase the safety of children who join that household; payments of fees to non-government schools if it is in the interests of the child to attend—this may be due to learning needs or because of siblings, including foster siblings, already at the school; car leases, purchases or modifications where it is essential to the child's needs; and home aids or modifications for a child or young person with a disability where they are not eligible for NDIS or other funded support.

The vast majority of requests for exceptional funds received from carers are well under a \$20,000 limit and will continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

**EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:10):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Is the minister aware that the department's chief financial officer issued an email to staff on 27 September 2018, directing that the exceptional resource funding procedure was suspended, with no claims for home and car modifications to be approved until further notice?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:11):** The full answer that I have just given the house is current as it stands. That is the information—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —as per my previous answer, which I have clearly answered.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:11):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. When was the minister made aware of the decision of 27 September to suspend the exceptional resource funding procedure?

*The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Energy and Mining is called to order.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is warned. Would someone like to answer the question. The minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, be seated, please. The member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Elizabeth are called to order.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** And the member for West Torrens. Minister.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Sir, the question clearly contained argument and assumptions.

**The SPEAKER:** It did assume that the minister was aware of related content—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe can leave for the rest of question time.

**Ms Stinson:** You're joking!

**The SPEAKER:** You can leave for the rest of question time.

**Ms Stinson:** What?

**The SPEAKER:** You can leave for the rest of question time under 137A.

*Ms Stinson interjecting:*

*Members*

**MEMBER FOR BADCOE, NAMING**

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe is now named. You have an opportunity to apologise, if you wish.

**Ms STINSON:** Thank you. I apologise, sir.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:12):** I move:

That the apology be accepted.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** Would someone like to move that the member be suspended or—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The apology having been accepted, I think that matter is dealt with. However, the Clerk might like to provide advice on whether the ruling under 137A still applies.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the member will still withdraw for the remainder of question time.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If I hear any other reflections on the Chair, or what I interpret to be reflections on the Chair—they are also reflections on the parliament—I will deal with them accordingly. The member for West Torrens has the call.

*Question Time*

#### EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:14):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Was the minister made aware by anyone in her department that the exceptional resource funding procedure had been suspended?

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

#### EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Did the minister tell a journalist in January this year that the resources funding applications from foster and kinship carers were still being assessed on a case-by-case basis?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:14):** I don't recall the exact date of whatever you are referring to but, as far as I am aware, as I have mentioned in my very full answer in relation to the Treasurer's direction No. 2, which hasn't changed from 2016 under the Labor government, it is important for each department to reflect on all their policies and procedures to see that they are adequately and correctly spending the money. At no time was I aware that funding would be stopped or denied. I was told always that it would be on an individual case-by-case basis, as it always had been.

#### SCHOOL INTERNET SERVICE

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:15):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister provide the house with an update on the government's improved internet rollout for schools, including in my electorate of Newland.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:15):** I am very pleased to be able to do so. It's very important, of course, that we do improve internet connectivity in our schools because members would recall that when the Marshall Liberal government was elected, only 25 per cent of schools in our government system in South Australia had access to fibre-optic cable connections. That is, of course, the expectation. Ninety per cent plus of schools interstate have access to this sort of internet connection.

I think that that low level of service for our schools was why the Liberal Party, and indeed the Labor Party, made election commitments to do this work. The great news is that, far from it just being an election commitment that was promised during an election, it is now being delivered across South Australia, including in the member for Newland's electorate, by the Marshall Liberal government. Members would recall that on 11 December—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —the Premier and I, along with the member for Morphett, at Glenelg Primary School announced that the department would be partnering with Telstra to supply high-speed connectivity to all South Australian schools. This is an \$80 million investment. We went out last year to look for the best possible partnership for our schools across South Australia and we got a great deal. We are working hard with Telstra to deliver it.

Already, I can report that 90 of our schools are connected. More than 47,000 students across South Australia have access to this high-speed internet and so do more than 5,000 of our educators in those schools. But wait, there is more. Just this week, not only is the Modbury High School, which is in the electorate of Newland, already connected but the Ardtornish Primary School—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —was connected on 5 April. Last week, the St Agnes Primary School, in the member's electorate, was connected. This week, just today as we speak, the Modbury Special School, close to the member for Newland's heart, as indeed it is to the member for Florey's heart, when it used to be in her electorate—

**Ms Bedford:** Where it is still.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** And it is still; I am sure it still is. But the member for Newland, I know, will be very pleased especially to know that today, as we speak, they are being connected to the internet. It is going to be an exceptional service for them, as it will be tomorrow for Modbury South Primary School when it is also connected—another one that I am sure is close to the member for Florey's heart, too. Also this week, I am pleased, as the local—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —member, to see the Highbury Primary School connected, and I know that many of the member for Newland's constituents go there. I am pleased to report that next week, the Banksia Park R-7 school will be connected.

Members around the house can know that schools in their electorates are receiving this support. Just next week, in the coming days, the members for Reynell, Florey, Unley, Hurtle Vale and MacKillop will be pleased to see that the O'Sullivan Beach Primary School, Modbury School preschool to Year 7, Parkside Primary School, Woodcroft Primary School, Bordertown Primary School and Bordertown High School will all be connected, and Old Noarlunga Primary School in the member for Kaurna's electorate and Woodville Gardens School B-7 in the Leader of the Opposition's electorate were connected yesterday.

This is an exceptionally important program for our schools. It enables our students to have access to the best possible resources in this critical technological area. If we are going to have the internet used in our pedagogy, in our classrooms, it has to be reliable; it has to be the sort that can be turned on and turned off at a tap and not be slow if another classroom starts using devices at a time when your classroom is doing that. It has to be something that is reliable for our students.

It's going to be critical in developing STEM technologies. It's going to be critical in ensuring that our students are prepared for the enormous opportunities there are in cybersecurity in the years ahead—there are enormous job opportunities there. It is critically important in a range of VET and other career options, too. The opportunities are endless, but this is a government investing in education to ensure that all of our students in all of our schools, in every town, region and city in this state are supported to fulfil their potential.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the deputy leader to order. I also call the member for Florey to order. Members, please be advised that there is a cameraman in the gallery today that I have allowed. The deputy leader has the call.

**EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** My question is for the Minister for Child Protection. Is the minister aware of a directive, issued by email on 27 September to all staff, suspending the exceptional resource funding procedure?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:20):** What I would like to put further on the record is information that I wasn't able to finish because of all the interruptions. As of 30 April 2019—and this relates to the question—my department had over 3,300 children placed in family-based care. My department has a responsibility to ensure the fair and equitable expenditure of public moneys generally, but where exceptional resource funding is concerned my department is determined to be particularly fair to all.

My department faces the constant challenge of assessing these requests. Some applications in the past year have asked for support that, under the former Labor government's funding, would have equated to one person getting 80 per cent all of the funding available. This is a difficult job and each case is individually assessed. As I said, it was put on hold while all the policies and procedures were re-accounted, but not stopped—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** It was always still going and they were to be individually assessed on a case-by-case basis. My department will continue to consider each application for exceptional needs funding on its merits against the guiding criteria and on a case-by-case basis. I receive continuous briefings from the chief executive on this subject and will continue to support procedures as currently in place.

The government values the significant contribution that our carers provide. We are doing more than ever has been done to support our foster and kinship carers, including delivering our election commitment to extend carer payments to age 21. Since 1 January 2019, additional support is available through the Stability in Family-Based Care program to carers of children who remain in family-based care until they turn 21. I believe there have been 10 children so far who have taken that up.

As Minister for Child Protection, I am committed to maintaining strong relationships with those who open their hearts and homes to our most vulnerable children and young people. Despite the growth in foster carer numbers since the election, there are still children in need. I would encourage anyone considering this important role to call 1300—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: relevance. The question was: was the minister aware of a directive issued by email on 27 September.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I have the question; thank you, member for West Torrens. It's a valid point of order. I ask the minister to please come back to the substance of the question. I believe she was finishing her remarks.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I have finished.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the deputy leader, I call to order the following members: the member for Cheltenham, the member for Wright and the member for Morphett.

**EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Was the email that was sent out in September, suspending the program, done at the direction of the minister?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:23):** I refer the member to my former answer.

### EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Did the minister direct her department to review the exceptional resource funding procedure?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:23):** This has clearly been covered in my previous answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### CHELTENHAM PARADE INTERSECTION

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister advise when the much-needed upgrade to the Cheltenham Parade-Port Road intersection will begin?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:23):** I thank the member for Cheltenham for his question. I am delighted to let the member know that there has been significant progress on this project and—hang on, we are talking about West Lakes Boulevard/Port Road/Cheltenham Parade; that's the one? There was \$6 million that was in there—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We have the question; let's hear the answer.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Anyway, \$6 million was previously provided for in the 2017-18 budget. That money has continued there in the 2018-19 budget and is continuing to be there for that project. It has taken a little bit of time to get the scope of this project correct given that it is quite a busy intersection. Some of the potential treatments out there would have been in excess of the \$6 million budget.

Having said that, we have now come to a landing on the right solution for that very busy intersection. I will get a fulsome answer for the member in terms of the exact nature of the treatments, but making sure that there is better right-hand turn access from West Lakes Boulevard onto Port Road is probably the most important part of helping to improve that intersection. I can confirm that there was \$6 million in last year's budget and that money continues to be there. In fact, I believe that the rollout, and the delivery of that intersection, is happening in a short period of time.

### AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE TRIAL

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:25):** My question is also to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the autonomous vehicle trial in Renmark?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:25):** I thank the member for the question, and I note his keen interest in all things the Riverland. It is a beautiful part of our state. I also note the member for Chaffey's obvious keen interest in the Riverland. Something is happening in the Riverland that is actually quite groundbreaking and revolutionary. It depends on what the house thinks about this, but something is happening in the Riverland at the moment that is really quite exciting, if this is something that takes your fancy.

We have had for a while some money put aside from the Future Mobility Lab Fund to undertake an autonomous vehicle trial around Renmark, connecting a retirement village with some very important points around the town. It will help elderly people to connect with things as part of their daily lives. What we have just now signed off on is the ability for that trial to go ahead. A very



stringent risk assessment process is undertaken by a committee that undertakes these autonomous vehicle trials, and I was proud to sign off on that only a couple of weeks ago.

Essentially, an EasyMile EZ10 vehicle is now being provisioned to go around the streets of Renmark. It will be staffed by people who work at SAGE Automation, a fantastic local South Australian business that is driving forward innovation in this space. It also has research staff who, in conjunction with the SAGE people, will remotely monitor and check the performance of this vehicle from Flinders University.

They are also undertaking a community perception survey because we know that one of the most important things about these autonomous vehicle trials is the ability of the community to accept this new technology as something that can be part of our everyday lives. This trial, a little unique from the other trials, centres around a retirement village. Having said that, we have obviously done some work down on Fleurieu Peninsula in the same sort of vein. What we have found through the trials to date is that it's actually older South Australians who are willing to embrace this technology.

We have not seen a barrier where this is something that the kids all understand and will get involved with: this is something that older South Australians are willing to embrace because they can see the benefits of mobility for them into the future. Helping keep people connected to the broader community through this technology is one of the very many benefits of having autonomous vehicles on our roads.

Something really exciting is happening in Renmark, and that is that, for the first time in the country, we are going to see an autonomous vehicle use a dedicated intersection to cross a busy road. Essentially, what is going to happen is that the autonomous vehicle is going to trigger a sensor that triggers a traffic light sequence change across one of the roads on its path. The cars in the other direction are going to stop and the autonomous vehicle is going to cross the road. This might sound quite simple, but it is actually very complex.

This is the first time in the country that this is being undertaken. What we will learn from this trial will quite heavily inform the next steps for autonomous vehicle technology here in South Australia. There are some really exciting things happening. What we are demonstrating through this trial is a potential commercial-use case going forward because we know that, whilst these trials are exciting and we learn things, we need to find ways to embed this technology on a day-to-day basis, on a commercial basis, in our community. What we will learn from what is happening up in Renmark is very much going to inform that. This vehicle will travel at 20 km/h, which is a bit quicker than is normal.

Again, I think that this is a really exciting development. For those of us who find this sort of stuff pretty cool, it is a massive step forward, and I look forward to the next steps in our autonomous vehicle future.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Cheltenham, I welcome to parliament today members of Amazing Greys seniors, from the Aldinga Bay Baptist Church community group, who are hosted by the member for Mawson, and students in the gallery from Salford College hosted by the Minister for Child Protection. The Hon. Graham Ingerson, the former deputy premier, welcome to you, sir.

#### *Question Time*

#### **CHELTENHAM PARADE INTERSECTION**

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (14:29):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Minister, what public and stakeholder consultation will occur for the Cheltenham Parade-Port Road intersection upgrade and when will that begin?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:30):** I will come back to the member with an answer.

### CHELTENHAM PARADE INTERSECTION

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (14:30):** My question is also to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Minister, despite funding being allocated for this project in February 2018, why is it today that you are still unable to furnish the house with details in respect to this much-needed upgrade for the residents of the western suburbs of Adelaide?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: the construction of the question was in no way in order with standing order 97.

**The SPEAKER:** It's a valid point of order. I am feeling merciful. I am going to allow the minister an opportunity to answer the question.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:30):** By the member's own question, when he says that the money was provided for in February 2018, what he is saying is that it was made as a commitment before the election. That money was confirmed in the 2018-19 budget. What has been going on over the past 12 months essentially with that project is that we have been scoping up what the most appropriate form is.

The member's concern, not to put words in his mouth, would be very much about the local residents who find it difficult to use that road. That's a very valid concern; in fact, I hear this right across the electorate, where Cheltenham Parade, for instance, and West Lakes Boulevard are two busy roads, but not as busy as Port Road. Local residents want to get around a lot more easily, and so their concern primarily is about turning movements on and off of West Lakes Boulevard and Cheltenham Parade.

But what we have to be mindful of, especially with major arterial roads like Port Road, which in certain sections is the busiest road in South Australia, is that we have to make sure that whilst we are improving outcomes for side roads we don't make traffic worse for the main arterial thoroughfare. That is why in this case—we are talking about a road that in certain parts takes over 70,000 cars a day—we have to get the treatment right.

I understand that there has been a lot of internal discussion with various stakeholders about the most appropriate treatment. We are there now. As soon as I get the information, I will provide that to the member. What I can say is that this project is funded. This government has chosen to confirm this project going ahead, and it will be delivered in this term under the Marshall Liberal government.

### SERVICE SA PROSPECT

**Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister update the house on the proposed closure date of the Prospect Service SA centre announced in last year's budget?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:32):** I can say in relation to the Prospect Service SA centre that our position remains unchanged as to the statements we have made public previously: we will not be shutting that centre until alternative pathways are in place. There has been a lot of work going on internally on the provision of those alternative pathways, and there has been quite a lot of progress made. When I am able to say more about that to the South Australian people, we will be making that known.

### FRUIT FLY

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:33):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on the state government's fruit fly eradication response at Lindsay Point?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:33):** I thank the member for Kavel for his very important question; I know that he has taken a great interest in the effects of Queensland fruit fly, particularly in his electorate with the horticulture and the annual crops they are growing up in the wonderful Adelaide Hills. What I can say is that again the South Australian borders are under pressure from Victoria and New South Wales.

What we have seen now is that we have had another gravid female fly that has been detected in the Lindsay Point area.

For those of you who don't know where Lindsay Point is, it's just over the South Australia-Victoria border, north of the Riverland horticulture zone. That single gravid female was detected on 21 May and it has meant that Biosecurity SA have had to roll out another program to combat the ever-increasing pressure on our borders.

What I can say is that the Marshall Liberal government is responding, and we are responding in the appropriate way. We have introduced our zero tolerance approach not only up at Lindsay Point but particularly at the Yamba roadblock. The Yamba roadblock is, of course, our border protection into the Riverland. The zero tolerance approach has seen a significant reduction in the amount of fruit that has been taken. We have seen motorists who have had to incur on-the-spot fines.

To back that up, we have now implemented another \$1½ million upgrade of the Yamba roadblock facility so that we can better accommodate those motorists coming across the border and also look after our staff. Not only are we upskilling the staff but we are making conditions much safer. It's also implementing a new procedure that has long been ignored by a previous government.

In the baiting and hygiene operations that are currently underway in the 1.5-kilometre outbreak area, we have put out nearly 5,000 litres of organic bait and collected almost two tonnes of fruit from the ground. It has been collected and disposed of appropriately. Approximately two million sterile Q-flies, sourced from the member for Stuart's electorate at Port Augusta, were released last week. That now sets out two million flies per week over possibly six to nine weeks, depending on the current weather circumstance, and that will break the lifecycle of the Queensland fruit fly.

We know that while flies are active, while we still have warmth in our soils, while we still have warmth and we still have fruit that can be a host, we have to act accordingly and act appropriately so that we can combat this ever-invasive pest. The Queensland fruit fly is the globe's most invasive insect, and we know that it's having a serious impact on a \$1.2 billion horticulture industry, particularly in the Riverland.

It shows us that, as a government, we are throwing everything we can at eradication and also protecting the horticulture industry. Through zero tolerance, making sure that our sterile fruit fly program is implemented, upskilling our staff and making sure there are extra bins and that signage and education programs are all rolled out appropriately, we can continue to deal with the pressures on our border.

Obviously, changing culture has taken some time, but what we are seeing now is that the detection of fruit coming into South Australia has significantly reduced. People are now paying if they are not abiding by the law. The bins, education and signage are paying dividends to South Australian taxpayers because #RegionsMatter.

#### **SERVICE SA**

**Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. In relation to the investigations he just informed the house were being undertaken in relation to the Service SA closures, has his department conducted, or will his department conduct, any community consultation in relation to the options available?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:38):** There certainly will be a high degree of communication and engagement with the local community as we help support people to engage with these alternate pathways.

Currently, people are unaware of the full breadth of choice they actually have to undertake transactions. I think there is quite an important community engagement piece that needs to happen to make sure that people are fully aware of all the alternatives that they have currently and will have under our new system. Certainly, there will be a very strong focus on talking with South Australians so that they are able to transact with Service SA as quickly as possible and using the full suite of available solutions.

It's fair to say at the moment that the service we provide at Service SA isn't as good as it could be. I think that there's a lot that is cumbersome about the way that Service SA operates, and some of that is to do with their enabling regulations and some of that is to do with essentially making sure that this organisation is as customer focused as it can be. I am extremely excited about the opportunity for us to improve that service, both from its digital platform and our ability to reform those face-to-face transactions.

We do accept that there are a group of people in the community who want to transact face to face. We know that we need to provide those options, and we will be providing those options, but it is fair to say that there is a lot of red tape in regulation and existing practice that sits behind that customer service platform that makes it difficult for South Australians to engage.

Service SA has a long way to go in terms of being where we as a Marshall Liberal government would like it to be. There is a strong reform platform that sits behind the changes that we are going to be making, and we will definitely be talking to the broader community about what that means for them.

### SPORTS FACILITIES

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can the minister advise the house when work will commence on the construction of the female change facilities at Gaza Football Club that were promised by Therese Kenny, the Liberal candidate for Torrens at the last state election?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:40):** I thank the member for the question. I am happy to go away and check that with the presumption that there was a commitment made to that project—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —but we have a number of projects that are underway at the minute. In fact, we just announced our Grassroots Football, Cricket, and Netball recipients the other day. There were a number of very, very happy electorates. I know that the Flinders Park Football Club in the member for Torrens's electorate and Hackham Football Club as well—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Reynell is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —I think in the member for Kurna's electorate were—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —greatly appreciative of those projects, and we will keep delivering more of those projects right across the state.

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Cheltenham will not gesticulate into a corner. Member for Florey.

### WOODLEIGH HOUSE

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:41):** My question is to the Minister for Energy in his role as the minister representing the Minister for Health. Where will existing and future patients at the 20-bed acute adult mental health unit now at Woodleigh House be accommodated after the demolition of the building and before any new facility is completed?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:41):** I thank the member for Florey for her question. She is, as always, very focused on key issues for people in her electorate. I have no doubt that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has

addressed this with his department and will be able to provide me with a detailed answer to bring back for the house for that important question.

#### **CANCER DIAGNOSIS ERROR**

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:41):** My question is also to the minister representing the Minister for Health. On what date was the government informed about the cancer misdiagnosis of Mr Claus Burg?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:42):** It wouldn't surprise the house to know that I don't have the answer to that very specific question but, again, I would be very happy to go to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and get an answer and bring it back for the member.

#### **CANCER DIAGNOSIS ERROR**

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:42):** My question is again to the minister representing the Minister for Health. On what date did the Central Adelaide Local Health Network begin an investigation into the cancer misdiagnosis of Mr Claus Burg?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:42):** My answer is the same to that question as it was to the last one: happy to get a specific answer to that specific question for the member from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:42):** My question is again to the Minister for Energy in his capacity representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Have ambulances ever needed to ramp at either the Port Augusta or Whyalla hospitals?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:43):** I don't know whether the member actually has a specific period of time in mind, whether she means recently—

**Ms Bedford:** Ever.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Ever.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** As the member for Stuart, I am not aware of ambulance ramping at the Port Augusta hospital, but let me check that. I have seen more than one ambulance in the hospital driveway, so whether that classifies as ramping or just comparing notes, having a chat and figuring out the plans for the rest of the day I am not too sure.

I don't have that level of detailed personal knowledge with regard to the Whyalla hospital, but I would be very happy to, again, go to the relevant minister, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, and see whether I can get a fulsome answer for the member's question, which is: has there ever, in the history of time, been any ambulance ramping at either the Port Augusta hospital or the Whyalla hospital?

#### **AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:44):** A supplementary: can the minister representing the minister find out how many ambulances there are at Port Augusta and Whyalla?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:44):** Well, yes, I am sure that I could do that. I have actually been into the ambulance station at Port Augusta several times and once very recently with the actual Minister for Health and Wellbeing. I think that was only about two months ago.

I could give you an estimate, just from my memory of looking around the garage, about how many ambulances were there, and there may have been one other out and about town at the same time but, to be sure that the member gets a very specific answer to her genuine question, I will ask

the Minister for Health and Wellbeing how many ambulances are meant to be stationed at the Port Augusta and Whyalla hospitals, and I will—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kaurana is called to order, and the Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I will do the very best I can to get a specific answer—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —for the member for Florey.

#### CANCER DIAGNOSIS ERROR

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:45):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Have any SA Health staff or SA Health contractors been suspended following the cancer misdiagnosis of Mr Claus Burg?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:45):** Again, let me go back to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and find out exactly. That is a very important question, as the other questions have been, so I want to make sure that members opposite, when they ask these types of questions in question time, get very clear, specific answers, the very best information the government can provide for them. Again, I will be very happy to go back to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and get a definitive answer for the member for Wright on that question.

#### CANCER DIAGNOSIS ERROR

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:46):** My question is again to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Can the minister assure the South Australian community that there are no further misdiagnosis cases like this at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

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

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is warned.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46):** 'Misdiagnosis cases like this at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital' is a pretty broad sort of question. It is fair to assume that the member is talking in a link to his previous question. Any misdiagnosis is frustrating all the way through to potentially tragic, depending on what the misdiagnosis is and if or how it can be corrected, and I take that topic extremely seriously, as you expect I would.

I don't know if it will be possible for me to get a clear, definitive answer to that question from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, given that he is not anywhere near personally responsible for the diagnoses of the medical professionals, but I do know that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing—

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —in the other place takes this issue incredibly seriously. This is an issue that has been dealt with for—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —a very long time in this place. It is an incredibly important issue and I will do my very best to get as useful an answer from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing as I possibly can for the member for Wright

**CANCER DIAGNOSIS ERROR**

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:48):** My question is again to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Has Mr Claus Burg been offered any compensation for his cancer misdiagnosis?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:48):** The member for Wright is moving from more medically based questions now to more legally based questions and, yes, of course, there is a connection between the two. Out of an abundance of caution, as well as wanting to give, again, the member for Wright as good and accurate an answer as I possibly can, I will take that up on his behalf with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and come back with an answer.

**KANGAROO ISLAND ROAD SAFETY GROUP**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:48):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why has the minister cut the \$500 a year administration grant to the volunteers who run the Kangaroo Island road safety group?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:49):** I think that question presupposes some information—

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** You wrote them a letter.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Mawson, we have the question. Minister, let's get on with the answer please.

*The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order. The Minister for Transport has the call.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Mawson for the question, and I do realise how important the road safety groups that exist around South Australia are. In fact, I was only discussing with one group across on the West Coast with the member for Flinders when we were across there some of the invaluable information that group was able to provide in relation to local experience on our roads.

I am more than happy to get some more information for the member for Mawson, but I would reiterate how important these groups are and the invaluable advice they provide about local conditions across our community, especially this year when we see an increase in the number of road deaths. I think that we are up to 55 so far this year versus a baseline of 35 last year. We have seen, though, the overall statistics when it comes to broader casualty accidents outside of just fatalities. The numbers fare a little bit better but, regardless, that headline figure is not good enough, and we need to be doing everything we can to make sure that we improve road safety.

That is part of the reason why we as a government have now, between last year's budget and this year's budget, put down somewhere in excess of \$1.5 billion to fix country roads. What we have seen in place for some time to try to tackle road safety in South Australia, including the work that the local road safety groups do, is a safe systems approach undertaken that talks about safe vehicles, safe speeds, safe people.

However, there is one element, in my view and I think in this government's view, that has been missing, and that is safe roads, and there is very little way to get around safe roads except to spend money. I think the budget that is about to be handed down is going to deliver the biggest lick of cash into fixing country roads in this state's history. The opportunity for us to make a material difference to people's lives by keeping them alive on our roads is solved in large part by putting money into country roads.

That is something that the department has wanted to do for a long period of time. What they have been missing is political will, and what we have—and I was lucky enough to catch up earlier today with minister Tudge from Canberra—are state and federal governments working together,

willing to invest in regional South Australia, realising that there is a little bit more that happens beyond the tollgate in South Australia. This budget delivers more for road safety than this state has ever seen.

### FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. When will the environment minister respond to Kangaroo Island residents who wrote to him in December last year with questions about the Flinders Chase development?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:52):** Well, I spend quite a lot of time having to correct misinformation spread by the member for Mawson, so that does distract me from—

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —dealing with some of the items he wants me to—

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You earlier ruled, sir, that that language was unparliamentary, and I would ask you to ask the member to withdraw that accusation.

**The SPEAKER:** Correct.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my right, be quiet. The minister says that he spends a fair bit of time—and I am paraphrasing here—correcting misinformation from the member for Mawson. I respectfully ask the Minister for Environment and Water to withdraw that.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I withdraw that, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, and get on with answering the question. Thank you, minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** As I was saying, I have an open dialogue with many people on Kangaroo Island about many matters, and I am quite confident that I am able to get messages and information disseminated into the Kangaroo Island community via various sources.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** What sort of answer was that? It was bizarre!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is called to order for that commentary. The member for Taylor has the call.

### CURTIS ROAD INTERSECTION

**Mr GEE (Taylor) (14:53):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**Mr GEE:** Yes, I know. It's a full moon, isn't it?

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Contain yourselves.

**Mr GEE:** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister ensure that funds are provided to install a roundabout at the intersection of Curtis and Heaslip roads at Angle Vale in light of the long history of serious accidents?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:54):** I thank the member for his question. I have actually visited the site. I was out there with the Hon. John Dawkins, having a look at that issue. That project was put up for funding as part of the federal Black Spot program, but it was not successful in that



regard. I note that that intersection still has some continuing difficulty. It is also an open question, certainly from council in relation to the ownership of various roads, including Curtis Road, out there in the north. It is fair to say that this is a difficult problem to deal with, in terms of the growth around Angle Vale and those surrounding suburbs either side of the Northern Expressway.

Really, it's a legacy situation that is going to take some time to clean up. There is that intersection, but there is a whole series of other intersections that I have been written to about in relation to residential growth in that area. The problem is that this land was rezoned, and there were a series of infrastructure deeds put over that land that provided trigger points at which those intersections and roads around there would be upgraded. That was done before I got here.

The difficulty is that we have a huge number of residential developments happening in the north and, with low population growth and a huge number of developments, we see each of these developments moving along slowly and incrementally. What that means is that those trigger points for where those infrastructure deeds kick in don't hit at the appropriate time. In fact, it takes quite a bit of time for those trigger points to be hit. The only way around that is for the state government to step up and provide that infrastructure, essentially in advance of when those infrastructure deed triggers would go off.

That's difficult because, again, we should be holding those deals as they were signed; they should progress forward. What it does show is an obvious flaw in the system. It is a flaw that exists out there in the north. It is a flaw that exists massively out at Mount Barker. On the 10-year anniversary of the rezoning of that area, we see a very flawed approach to dealing with the provision of infrastructure in greenfield developments.

We need to have a better way to deal with these things. We need to have a better way to provide orderly transition and growth of the urban fringe. It is something I am very keen to deal with, and it certainly is on the radar. To the member's point, if I had been able to make the decisions at the time at which they were made, we would not have made them in the same way that they have been made. But we will, as we have done in so many other areas of government, clean up the mess. It just takes a little bit of time to do it.

#### **WOMMA ROAD INTERSECTION**

**Mr GEE (Taylor) (14:57):** Again, my question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister ensure that funds are provided to install a roundabout at the intersection of Womma and Stebonheath roads in Penfield in light of the long history of serious accidents?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:57):** Again, this is an intersection that has an infrastructure deed that sits over the top of it, with AVJennings, who are the people delivering the residential development around that area. Without pre-empting final discussions and negotiations, can I say that that is a particular intersection that we believe needs some short-term scrutiny because of the massive investment that Drakes Supermarkets is making in that area to move their distribution centre out there.

As a government, we are willing to support growth and new jobs in our economy, and the massive investment by Drakes into what is a world-class distribution centre is something that should be supported. It will also create a step change in traffic movements, especially for heavy vehicles into that area. We are actively working on that. I would love to be able to provide more detail, but I will hold back at this stage lest I reveal any commercial-in-confidence negotiations going on at the moment. But it is fair to say, member, from my language, that we are keen to get a solution delivered as soon as possible. I am extremely hopeful that that will be delivered very soon.

#### **REGIONAL SCHOOL BUS SERVICES**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister please update the house on the progress of the review of the regional school bus policy, which I am led to believe was completed in February this year?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:59):** I thank the member for Frome for his question. It's a reasonable question. When we came to government, I was very pleased to work with the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer to get the school bus review underway. It is a very significant job, and it's very important for a range of country communities, including the member for Frome's community, that this work be done, that it be properly taken into account.

I am looking forward to receiving advice on the review in the not too distant future. I understand that the review took longer to complete than was initially anticipated due to the high level of interest and significant number of submissions. I am advised by a couple of stakeholders that they appreciated the opportunity to engage with the reviewer directly as well. When the review comes in to government, we will look to consider it as quickly as possible, and the ministers particularly involved and, I am sure, the whole of cabinet will be interested.

When we have a response to it, I will make sure that the member for Frome is among the first people we touch base with, although we will probably publicly release it at a similar time frame.

#### TAX INCENTIVES

**Mr BROWN (Playford) (15:00):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that no taxpayer incentives are being offered for companies to move from the northern suburbs to Lot Fourteen?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00):** I don't have any information to suggest that they are, but if the member has any information perhaps he could provide it.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson, I believe, was interjecting then and he is called to order. The member for Cheltenham.

#### PREGNANCY ADVISORY CENTRE

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:01):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Minister, when did the Pregnancy Advisory Centre, situated in my electorate at Woodville Park, cease providing surgical terminations per its charter of operations?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:01):** When did that happen? I don't know. It would be a surprise if I had that level of detail on behalf of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. I understand the gist of the question is that the member is suggesting that the facility is not operating as per its charter currently. I am happy to go to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and try (1) to ascertain if that's the fact, and (2), if it is, on what date did that start to happen.

#### PREGNANCY ADVISORY CENTRE

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:02):** My question again is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. What steps are being taken to ensure these critical clinical services are reinstated and made available to the women seeking them?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:02):** That question really couldn't be answered even by the Minister for Health and Wellbeing without the answer coming to the very first question that he asked on the same topic. Let me go to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and let me find out if what the member suggests is actually the case. I have no reason to believe that it wouldn't be, but it is a very important first step.

If this facility is operating outside its charter, I will find out for the member for Cheltenham when that happened and I will also try to find out from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing what steps are being undertaken to get the facility to operate back within its charter, as he is keen to find out.

**MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE**

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister advise the house if he or his office has made any reimbursement for the purchase of alcohol?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:03):** What I can tell the member for Wright is that I have come into this house and corrected the record. There was a purchase of wine on behalf of my office for a function. That purchase was reimbursed to Food SA and since then there have been no further purchases.

**MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE**

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:03):** Supplementary: my supplementary is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister detail to the house the dates, amounts and by whom any reimbursements in his office were made?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:04):** I hope that the member for Wright was listening: there has been one reimbursement and I will go back and find out exactly the date and the exact amount.

**MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE**

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:04):** My question is again to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister assure the house that he and his office have always complied with Treasurer's Instruction No. 13?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:04):** I thank the member for Wright for his question and, yes, I have complied with both Treasurer's Instructions and the Premier's instructions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**CATHERINE HOUSE**

**Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (15:04):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of Catherine House, a homeless women's charity?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:04):** Yes, sir.

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

**Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (15:05):** My question is to the Premier. What impact does the Premier believe the government's 25 per cent cut in mental health funding will have for NGOs providing mental health services to organisations like Catherine House?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:05):** We have gone through this in the last sitting period. There is no cut that the Liberal Party or the Liberal government in South Australia has put through to mental health funding in South Australia. There has been a transfer of patients from the state jurisdiction to the federal jurisdiction. The funding has transferred with them to that federal jurisdiction.

I strongly encourage those members opposite to really look at the facts of this matter. This was an arrangement put in place when the NDIS deal was signed between a federal Labor government and a state Labor government, and we are implementing that plan at the moment. Some of the issues raised by those opposite and by others—

*Mr Patterson interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —via the media are really putting a lot of stress onto a very vulnerable section of our community, so I ask those opposite to do the reasonable thing—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the responsible thing, and to make sure that their members on that side are fully informed of exactly and precisely what is happening—and there is no such cut as suggested by the member in her question.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**BUDGET PAPERS**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:06):** I lay on the table the following 2019-20 budget papers:

Budget 2019-20—

- Paper 1 Budget Overview
- Paper 2 Budget Speech
- Paper 3 Budget Statement
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 1
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 2
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 3
- Paper 4 Agency Statements—Volume 4
- Paper 5 Budget Measures Statement

I move:

That the Budget Statement, Agency Statements and Budget Measures Statement be published.

Motion carried.

*Bills*

**APPROPRIATION BILL 2019**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the year ending 30 June 2020 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

**The SPEAKER:** Pursuant to the suspension of standing orders, the debate is adjourned on motion and the Premier already has leave to continue his remarks, therefore I admit the honourable Treasurer.

*The Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas) was admitted to the chamber.*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** Mr Speaker, I am pleased to have accepted your very generous invitation to visit with you to present the second budget of the Marshall Liberal government.

The 2019-20 budget is focused on the government's priorities of building a strong economy, growing jobs, lowering costs and providing better services for South Australians. The national and international economic backdrop to this budget presents a number of challenges, with threats of global trade wars and the Reserve Bank governor warning of a softening national economy. This budget now has had to meet the challenge of a significant writedown in major revenue sources, such as goods and services tax and conveyance duty.

Since the 2018-19 Mid-Year Budget Review, there has been a significant reduction in expected GST revenue of \$2.1 billion over four years to 2021-22. The reduction is estimated to be \$171 million in 2018-19, \$517 million in 2019-20, growing to \$760 million in 2021-22. This reflects both weaker than expected national GST revenue, due to weaker national consumption expenditure and dwelling investment, and a deterioration in South Australia's share of GST grants, due to a decision by the independent Commonwealth Grants Commission.

The softer than expected housing market has also meant a further writedown of expected conveyance duty of \$184 million over four years to 2021-22 since the 2018-19 Mid-Year Budget Review. This is in addition to the \$107 million writedown included in the 2018-19 Mid-Year Budget Review. Whilst the government has been faced with this considerable reduction in expected revenue, it has decided to continue to invest in productive economic infrastructure while putting in place responsible budget measures to ensure the budget remains sustainable.

The government has chosen not to risk the prospects of adversely impacting economic growth and job growth by simply relying on further expenditure reductions to match completely the expected revenue reductions. The government also has rejected the suggestions from some observers that it should reverse its decision to implement election promises such as cutting ESL bills by \$90 million per year, abolishing payroll tax for all small businesses and cutting land tax. Instead, the government has chosen a responsible balance of further expenditure reductions, targeted revenue increases and an increase in debt levels to help finance a significant economic infrastructure program.

As I advised members last year, the government inherited a financial mess, which meant that seven of the last 10 Labor budgets were deficit budgets culminating in a \$313 million deficit in 2017-18. The Marshall Liberal government is pleased to advise that its first budget in 2018-19 is estimated to end with a small surplus of \$101 million. This budget also delivers small surpluses for each year of the forward estimates, with a surplus of \$94 million in 2019-20 rising to \$251 million in 2022-23, and ensures a sustainable budget position into the future.

Consistent with the actions taken in other states, net debt increases significantly over the forward estimates due to the less buoyant revenue outlook and the commitment to borrow to invest in productive infrastructure. This is considered sustainable, given it is being invested in economic infrastructure and the relatively low cost of debt currently available. For example, total non-financial public sector net debt from 2018-19 to 2022-23 increases by 94 per cent in Victoria, 139 per cent in Tasmania and 57 per cent in South Australia.

Some of this increase in net debt in all states is due to the commencement of a new Australian Accounting Standard (AASB 16) relating to the accounting treatment of leases. This increases total non-financial public sector net debt by around \$1 billion by the end of the forward estimates period. This is simply a presentational change which does not indicate a change in substance of the government's financial performance or its contractual arrangements for leases.

Even with these challenging financial circumstances, this budget includes a responsible package of \$2.2 billion of new initiatives over four years as well as a massive \$11.9 billion total government investing program. Some of the key features of this budget include:

- a housing sector stimulus package;
- commencing construction of the new Women's and Children's Hospital;
- a major road safety package;
- projects to be funded as part of the 10-year Adelaide City Deal agreement;
- works to protect and save coastal areas such as West Beach;
- industry sector support from the Economic and Business Growth Fund;
- a racing industry support package;
- significantly increased investment in education, including a more than \$80 million investment to deliver high-speed internet to every government school student by the middle of 2020;
- additional resources for health, child protection and TAFE SA; and
- commencement of early works for the north-south corridor project.

Whilst future economic and job growth in South Australia will be enhanced significantly by investment in the defence, shipbuilding and cybersecurity industries, the importance of industries like the

housing industry sector cannot be underestimated. In recognition of the softer outlook for housing construction, the government has developed a \$104.5 million housing sector stimulus package, including \$42.5 million in direct government expenditure and the provision of interest-free deposit gap loans from HomeStart. Details of the package include:

- creating an interest-free deposit gap loan of up to \$10,000 funded via an affordable housing fund of \$2 million to be administered by HomeStart. The program will commence from 1 September 2019;
- a \$21.4 million housing construction program in 2019-20 and 2020-21 to be undertaken by the South Australian Housing Authority. This will include building around 90 homes, of which the majority will be sold as affordable housing; and
- a \$21.1 million preventative maintenance and upgrade program in 2019-20 to be undertaken by the South Australian Housing Authority. The preventative maintenance program will include works to pre-1968 homes as well as upgrading a number of walk-up flats.

It is estimated that the support package will result in around 170 new housing contracts being entered into and around 120 housing outcomes for those struggling to buy an established property.

For many years now there has been consideration about the possible move of the Women's and Children's Hospital away from its North Adelaide location. Prior to the election, the government promised to relocate the hospital to the site of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. This budget actually includes a substantial provision of \$550 million in the forward estimates to complete the planning and start the construction of the new Women's and Children's Hospital. The final business case, planning and final cost will be identified during 2019-20. It is likely that the estimated completion date will now be in financial year 2025-26, rather than the original commitment of 2024.

There has been considerable community concern this year about the recent spike in road deaths. The government's continuing commitment to road safety programs and projects is demonstrated by a significant investment in this budget in a road safety package. This \$834 million package over four years includes:

- funding to improve road safety in both metropolitan and regional areas for new projects, including level crossings and intersection upgrades, duplication and targeted works on key regional roads. It will also include shoulder sealing, overtaking lanes and resurfacing of the Sturt Highway, Barrier Highway, Eyre Highway and Princes Highway;
- protecting and guaranteeing into the future that the current MAC funding used for road safety advertising, communication and sponsorship will continue to be spent on road safety; and
- significantly increasing fines for drivers who risk the lives of others by speeding excessively and other dangerous behaviour such as using a mobile phone whilst driving.

The former government's decision to privatise the Motor Accident Commission has led to the decision for new governance arrangements for road safety from 1 July this year. The government acknowledges the significant achievements over many years of the MAC with road safety programs and its continuing leadership this year whilst the transition arrangements were finalised. After 1 July this year, a new independent chairperson will chair a new road safety committee comprising SAPOL, DPTI and other key stakeholder representatives to ensure there is a continuing, coordinated focus by government on road safety programs.

This budget also involved a partnership with the commonwealth government and the City of Adelaide to deliver the Adelaide City Deal, which includes an investment of \$551 million over 10 years. Central to the City Deal is the development of Lot Fourteen as an innovation precinct that will be home to leading businesses, entrepreneurs, major cultural attractions and educational programs and facilities. The City Deal will also provide funding for important tourism projects in the Greater Adelaide region.

As part of this funding, \$150 million has been provided for the Aboriginal art and cultures gallery with the commonwealth contribution of \$85 million. The final cost of the gallery will also be

determined during 2019-20 with the finalisation of the business case. The final decision on this gallery will be an important one for government as it will be a critical opportunity to create a world-class tourist attraction, with a unique offering, housed in an iconic building. It will be a decision which will require courage from government and the community.

Whilst it was the former Labor government that introduced the 15 per cent betting operations tax, the government accepts the responsibility for supporting the racing industry. The former Labor government did not provide any additional ongoing funding from the betting operations tax for the racing industry in the budget forward estimates.

The government provided an extra \$4.85 million in last year's budget and this budget now allocates an extra \$24 million over five years to assist the racing industry. The \$8 million allocation this year includes \$4 million for infrastructure upgrades and \$4 million for general industry assistance. Future ongoing funding will be based on 1.5 per cent of net wagering revenue for the betting operations tax, which is the same formula received by the Victorian racing industry. This funding will involve conditions, including agreement on important governance reforms.

The government was lobbied by corporate bookmakers and others to reduce the tax to 8 per cent or 10 per cent, with the claim that the government would actually collect the same or more revenue at the lower tax rate. Unsurprisingly, Treasury rejected this extraordinary claim and the government commissioned the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies to undertake an independent analysis of a significant cut to the rate of the tax. The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies confirmed that such a cut would actually lead to a significant reduction in revenue and that the claims from the corporate bookmakers were, and I quote, 'simply not plausible'. This budget, therefore, does not include any cut in the rate of the betting operations tax.

In last year's budget, the government established the \$100 million Economic and Business Growth Fund to promote economic growth in South Australia by encouraging growth in industry sectors with less emphasis on picking winners by giving grants to individual businesses. Some of the initiatives funded through the Economic and Business Growth Fund include:

- \$33 million over five years towards additional marketing of our state to key domestic and international tourism markets;
- \$10 million over three years for a program to co-fund greenfield exploration activities to facilitate new major mineral discoveries, driving further mine developments and stimulating growth and innovation in the mineral resources sector;
- \$7.5 million over three years for a Red Meat and Wool Growth Program, which focuses on improving systems and technology to increase the quality and volume of production, boosting exports and increasing employment;
- \$6.35 million towards the \$24 million package to deliver the enabling infrastructure to help Thomas Foods rebuild and expand at a new Murray Bridge site;
- \$6 million as additional screen production investment towards the South Australian Film Corporation's Production Investment Fund to finance local and international screen production; and
- \$4 million over four years to establish a landing pad to attract international and interstate companies to assist with their establishment in South Australia to achieve high-growth job creation across priority industries.

This budget includes significant new commitments in the investing program, in particular in relation to transport projects. The government's major funding priority, in terms of transport projects, is the completion of the north-south corridor project. The commonwealth government has announced a further \$1.5 billion funding commitment, in addition to the previous \$1.2 billion funding commitment, bringing promised total commonwealth funding to \$2.7 billion.

The state government will now commit \$2.7 billion, which will mean a total of \$5.4 billion funding committed, towards the final cost of what will be the single biggest infrastructure project in our state's history. The business case for the remaining works is still being completed and, once

completed, this budget allocates \$252 million over four years towards planning and early works for the project. Other transport projects include:

- the upgrade of seven metropolitan intersections:
  - the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection;
  - the Fullarton Road and Cross Road intersection;
  - the Glen Osmond Road and Fullarton Road intersection;
  - the Goodwood, Springbank and Daws roads intersection;
  - the Grand Junction Road, Hampstead Road and Briens Road intersection;
  - the Main North Road and Nottage Terrace intersection; and
  - the Main North Road, Kings Road and McIntyre Road intersection.
- grade separation works at the Torrens Road, Ovingham level rail crossing and the Brighton Road, Hove level rail crossing;
- the widening of Flagstaff Road with a fourth lane, making it a permanent two-way dual carriageway;
- the duplication of Victor Harbor Road between Main South Road and McLaren Vale;
- targeted works on key regional roads, including shoulder sealing and additional overtaking lanes on the Horrocks Highway; and
- works to upgrade the Sturt Highway from Renmark to Gawler, the Barrier Highway from Cockburn to Burra, and the Eyre Highway from Port Augusta to the Western Australia border. The Princes Highway will also be upgraded, including road widening, safety upgrades, new overtaking lanes and duplication along key sections, and town bypasses.

After last year's commonwealth budget, the government negotiated successfully with the commonwealth government for \$506 million, originally budgeted beyond the forward estimates, to be brought forward into the forward estimates. The government has already commenced discussions with the re-elected commonwealth government about bringing forward funding currently beyond the forward estimates into the forward estimates.

For too many years governments have ignored the problem of our disappearing metropolitan beaches, and there is no clearer example of this than the virtual disappearance of any beachfront at West Beach. This budget allocates \$48.4 million over four years to save our metropolitan beaches, especially West Beach and Henley Beach. This funding will provide for immediate sand carting and critical sand replenishment and also the construction of a pipeline from Semaphore South to West Beach. There will also be a \$4 million grant program to assist local councils with a range of regional coastal protection works.

Whilst the government acknowledges the importance of public investment in a strong infrastructure program for maintaining jobs growth, the government believes that in the long term jobs growth will only be sustained by ensuring the costs of doing business in South Australia are nationally and internationally competitive. That is why from 1 January this year the government has abolished payroll tax for all small businesses in South Australia and from next year will reduce significantly land tax bills. The government has also reduced ESL bills for business, and workers compensation premiums next year will reduce even further to 1.65 per cent from a peak of 2.75 per cent, which existed before bipartisan support for workers compensation reform by this parliament.

The government is implementing its energy reform plans designed to reduce electricity costs in South Australia and, at the end of this month, I will receive the final report of the former chair of ESCOSA Mr Lew Owens into whether the former Labor government drove up water prices in South Australia by inflating the regulated asset base of SA Water. I am sure all members will be awaiting that particular report with great interest.



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The government believes that the results of this report, together with a lower interest rate environment, will mean lower water prices to customers and lower returns to the budget from 2020-21. As a result, this budget has included a contingency for reduced returns from 2020-21 onwards.

The government is also determined to lower costs for struggling South Australian households. This budget continues to provide \$90 million this year in ESL remissions to again reduce significantly the massive increase in ESL bills imposed by the former Labor government. For a family with a median valued house value of \$480,000, the saving next year will be \$163.05 compared with the payment that would have been imposed under the policy of the former Labor government. For a family with a house value of \$750,000, the saving is even greater, at \$254.70.

One result for struggling South Australian families after 16 years under the former Labor government was that they were being slugged with excessively high power costs. The government has renegotiated a better deal with a major energy provider so that another 120,000 low income households are eligible for savings on their current energy bills of up to \$585. This will be an enormous assistance for many struggling South Australian families this year. The government has also increased the energy concession to \$226.67 from 1 July 2019 for about 180,000 eligible households.

In addition to these savings, the costs of running a car for an average household will be reduced significantly. After 1 July this year, CTP premiums for running an average car in the metropolitan area will be slashed by up to \$114.48 per car. For the more than 340,000 households in South Australia with two or more cars, the potential savings will in most cases be more than \$200 per household.

This budget also continues a decision made in last year's budget to provide a \$100 sports voucher towards the cost of membership or registration fees for primary school-age children participating in sport and recreation programs. Again, for many struggling families with two children, that policy is worth \$200 to these families. Whilst this budget has included some increases in fees and charges, the massive savings I have just highlighted make it clear that the overwhelming majority of families will benefit from the lower cost policies of this government.

Last year, I said on behalf of the government that we accept that our state's future and economic and job growth prospects are highly dependent on the quality of education and training provided by our schools, training institutions and universities. This budget is making the largest investment in schools by any government in the history of the state. Total annual funding to education in 2022-23 will be \$611 million more than the total spending in 2018-19.

The government's more than \$80-million landmark project to deliver high-speed internet to every government school student is on track to be delivered by the middle of 2020. The government continues to invest heavily in education capital works, including \$185 million over seven years to facilitate the transition of year 7 into high school and to accommodate additional growth in the school system.

The government also continues to increase funding for South Australia Police, with funding in 2022-23 to be \$81 million more than the funding estimated to be spent in 2018-19. In particular, an extra \$9.5 million over four years will provide an enhanced rapid response capability to resolve high-risk incidents, including terrorist threats.

This budget includes a range of initiatives designed to help build stronger communities including:

- an extra \$26.9 million over three years to meet additional costs for children and young people in out-of-home care;
- \$75 million over five years in partnership with the commonwealth government to address critical housing needs for people in remote communities; and

- \$3 million for a trial of an intensive family support programme to assist vulnerable families in northern Adelaide.

In this year's budget, the Marshall Liberal government is making another massive investment in our health system, with an extra \$537 million in new spending. This now means that since last year's election the government will have allocated an extra \$1.8 billion over the forward estimates to our health system.

Last year's budget outlined a revised financial framework for the health portfolio, setting a more sustainable objective of delivering services at national average efficiency levels by 2021-22 and outlining a series of sensible reforms in order to pursue system improvements. The government remains committed to all the reforms outlined in last year's budget, and the government has taken significant steps in 2018-19 to begin the improvement of our health system.

Governance reforms for the health system have been implemented, and boards of management for each hospital network will formally commence from 1 July 2019, providing greater autonomy and responsibility for delivering quality, efficient services at the local level. The Central Adelaide Local Health Network, supported by administrators KordaMentha, is making progress in the implementation of its organisational and financial recovery plan, including implementing a recently announced organisational redesign, improving rostering practices to significantly reduce the use of expensive agency nurses and improving budgeting, procurement and human resource practices across the organisation.

For example, the use of agency nursing staff has plunged by 90 per cent in March 2019, to just 0.7 per cent of the workforce, compared with 7.7 per cent of the workforce in January 2018. Also, a massive backlog of 10,000 uncoded episodes of care have now been cleared, which has resulted in millions of dollars of additional revenue. CAHLN's indicative cost of activity in the six months to 31 December 2018 is now 21 per cent above the National Efficient Price. This was a significant improvement on the 30 per cent above the National Efficient Price figure recorded for the 12 months to 30 June 2018.

PricewaterhouseCooper's independent report into SA Pathology outlined that there are significant opportunities to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation. SA Pathology will be given the opportunity to implement the recommendations of the PwC review and make fundamental improvements to its business.

South Australian Medical Imaging has largely met the efficiency targets set by the government for 2018-19. South Australian Medical Imaging will continue to work to increase efficiency in line with government targets and contribute to the delivery of hospital services closer to the National Efficient Price.

Notwithstanding the above, SA Health advised that it would not meet its financial targets in 2018-19, estimating that it would overspend by \$95 million. However, the government remains committed to achieving national average efficiency for our hospital system by 2021-22. A significant savings task remains, and SA Health and the local health networks will need to continue driving efficiencies and service improvements across the sector.

The government recognises that South Australia's regions are critical for the future of our state. Last year's budget reflected significant new investment in our regions, and this budget continues to implement a range of new initiatives to grow economic opportunity and improve community infrastructure. The budget outlines spending of \$1.1 billion over eight years on regional road projects and transport infrastructure upgrades.

The budget also commits new spending of \$32.7 million over five years for upgrades of a number of regional high schools, which will be in addition to the \$100 million being spent on a new high school in Whyalla. The government will also continue with its commitment to spend \$14 million per year over 10 years to address improvements in country health facilities.

Australia's national dog fence is the largest continuous fence in the world, protecting livestock from wild dog and dingo attacks. The government will replace the ageing 1,600-kilometre component of South Australia's dog fence with the commonwealth and state government providing \$10 million each and industry providing \$5 million.

As I outlined earlier, the budget has had to be framed against the backdrop of significant reductions in expected revenues from GST and conveyance duty. This budget outlines a responsible program of further operating savings of \$361.6 million over four years. As outlined last year, the government adopted a completely new approach to achieving budget saving targets. Agencies were advised it was no longer acceptable to only adopt the 'salami slicing' approach by maintaining all existing programmes and taking a 'small slice' or efficiency dividend off every programme.

Agencies were directed to return to first principles and adopt a simplified version of zero-based budgeting by looking for wasteful or low-priority programmes or projects that could be abolished. Difficult decisions to reprioritise funding have been made again in this year's budget and, as examples, the government has already announced removal of funding for the Adelaide Fashion Festival, Motor Sports Festival and Brand SA.

Last month, the government announced a range of increases in fees, fines and charges, which is estimated to generate an extra \$79 million in 2019-20 and \$353.6 million over four years. The government will also be increasing the solid waste levy in the metropolitan area to \$110 per tonne on 1 July 2019 and then to \$140 per tonne from 1 January 2020. This increase will eventually raise about \$24.8 million per annum once fully implemented. This increase assists to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill to reduce methane gas emissions and incentivises resource recovery and recycling.

Increases to the levy in the past have resulted in reduction in waste sent to landfill. Staged increases in the levy have resulted in a reduction of waste to landfill by 31 per cent since 2002-03. A 50 per cent reduction on the levy will be provided to charity organisations on unwanted waste they receive as part of the donation system. Over the forward estimates, this extra revenue is being used to save West Beach and other metropolitan beaches, to help fund regional coastal works and also fund the waste and resource recovery modernisation and council transition package.

This budget will also raise an additional \$134.4 million over five years by increasing the dividend payout ratio for all government businesses to 100 per cent of profit after tax. Currently, the dividend payout ratio varies from 60 per cent to 100 per cent. This will apply to SA Water, HomeStart Finance, SAFA, MAC and South Australian government employee residential properties. The government is also introducing targeted measures to crack down on individuals and companies who have reduced their land tax bills by setting up complex legal structures to avoid the land tax aggregation provisions of the act.

This initiative introduces improved land tax aggregation provisions and a surcharge on certain trusts and is estimated to raise an extra \$40 million per year or \$120 million over three years. In South Australia, land tax ownerships are aggregated together to ensure owners of land pay equivalent land tax rates on the total value of land, regardless of the composition of land held. For example, an owner with one land parcel worth \$1 million pays the same tax as an owner of three separate parcels worth a combined value of \$1 million.

However, the current aggregation arrangements create an incentive for land owners to set up complex structures designed to avoid being aggregated and to minimise land tax. For example:

- a taxpayer who ultimately controls 10 taxable land parcels across 10 trusts, with each trust having a slightly different composition of beneficiaries, could be subject to land tax on the individual value of each parcel, rather than on the aggregated value of all parcels, notwithstanding that they are all controlled by the same taxpayer; or
- a taxpayer may set up multiple companies to each own a taxable land parcel. These companies will then be subject to land tax on the value of the land owned by each company independently (a single parcel), rather than the aggregated value of the land owned by all the companies, notwithstanding that they are controlled by the same taxpayer.

While the government is reducing land tax rates to increase the competitiveness of the tax system, it also wants to ensure there is equity between taxpayers. An improved approach to the aggregation of land for land tax purposes will be introduced in South Australia to look through separate legal

structures to determine the true owner of land, levelling the playing field for all taxpayers. The approach will be similar to that used in Victoria and New South Wales and includes:

- a shift to aggregating based on an owner's interest in every piece of land, rather than only aggregating properties held in the same ownership structure;
- introducing provisions to allow two or more related companies to be grouped for land tax purposes; and
- introducing a surcharge on land owned in trusts in cases where the interests in land of trust beneficiaries are not disclosed or cannot be identified. This is designed to minimise the incentive to own properties in trust to avoid aggregation by increasing the tax payable. Exceptions to the surcharge will be provided for certain trusts, for example, special disability trusts, guardianship trusts and complying superannuation funds. The government will set a surcharge with the intention of minimising avoidance practices, following consultation on the proposed changes.

These changes apply from 1 July 2020. The final details of the arrangements will be subject to consultation prior to implementation.

Associated with these land tax changes, the government will progressively reduce the top land tax rate from 1 July 2020. The top land tax rate for the value of ownerships above \$5 million will be reduced by a 0.1 percentage point each year, from 3.7 per cent in 2019-20 to 2.9 per cent from 1 July 2027. The initial cost in 2020-21 will be \$2.7 million, rising to \$8.6 million in 2022-23. The government is also estimating that an extra \$10.8 million over four years will be collected by an increased payroll tax compliance program by RevenueSA, focusing on businesses who fail to register, the use of contractors, the grouping of businesses and other high-risk areas.

In addition to these targeted savings and revenue measures, the government has indicated that it has budgeted for reasonable salary and conditions settlements for public sector employees. However, there is clearly not the financial capacity to afford excessive salary and conditions claims as part of any enterprise bargaining negotiations.

Expenditure on its salaries and wages is the largest expense for the government, representing 42 per cent of general government sector costs in 2019-20. In 2018-19, the government managed to reverse the explosion in employee expenses and FTE numbers that occurred in the last years of the former Labor government. The employee expenses increase in 2018-19 was restricted to 2.7 per cent after a 5.1 per cent increase in 2017-18. Employee expenses are estimated to decline in real terms by 5.1 per cent from 2018-19 to 2022-23.

Over the last four years of the former Labor government, FTE numbers in the general government sector exploded by about 3,790 FTEs or, on average, about 1,000 FTEs per year. In 2018-19, the government managed to reduce significantly the rate of increase in FTE numbers to about 191 full-time equivalents. The government is estimating that by 2023 there will be an actual increase of 1,385 full-time equivalent teachers and other education staff, driven by enrolment growth in government schools and the massive increase of \$611 million in annual education spending by 2022-23.

Offsetting these big increases in FTEs in education, the government is estimating equivalent reductions in other parts of the public sector. The budget papers again note that these estimates are notional and actual changes may vary. As has occurred for many years, agencies have the flexibility to deliver the savings in the manner that best suits the needs of the agency.

As I outlined earlier, our state's economic prospects are influenced by what the Governor of the Reserve Bank has described as a softening national economy. The Reserve Bank has foreshadowed further cuts in interest rates and there is also the need to see the economic stimulus from the commonwealth government's significant income tax cut package. The Reserve Bank has also supported the maintenance of significant infrastructure investment by the commonwealth and state governments to help generate economic and jobs growth. This budget estimates economic growth as measured by GSP increasing next year to 2.5 per cent from 2.0 per cent this year. Employment growth in 2018-19 is estimated to be 1.25 per cent and 1 per cent next year.

The preparation and presentation of this year's budget has been made more challenging by the need to comply with new Australian Accounting Standards. These new standards will apply from 2019-20 and will apply to all Australian governments and the private sector as well. These changes have a material impact on the budget and forward estimates and mean that the figures presented in this budget will not be directly comparable with state budgets from previous years.

For example, new Australian Accounting Standard AASB 16 Leases will mean that most government leases, such as those for office accommodation and motor vehicles, will now mean an up-front increase in liabilities and net debt from the start of the lease. The end result of this accounting treatment change is an increase in the total non-financial public sector net debt by \$1.3 billion in 2019-20. New revenue standard AASB 15 and AASB 1058 also have a significant impact on the budget papers. For example, commonwealth government funding for some infrastructure projects will now be recognised over the life of the project rather than when the payments are received.

This budget also includes changes to achieve full compliance with the recently updated Uniform Presentation Framework (UPF), which guides governments in the presentation of their budget papers. For example, some assets and related liabilities and some revenues and related expenses will no longer be netted off. Examples include how interest expenses, gambling revenue and taxation revenue are reported. These presentational changes do not reflect a change in the financial position of the government.

This budget also includes revised funding arrangements for the new SA Housing Authority and Renewal SA. The SA Housing Authority commenced operating this year as an independent housing authority under the SA Housing Trust Act. In recognition of this change, and to restructure and recapitalise the authority's financial arrangements, this budget provides for revised funding arrangements involving a one-off grant payment in 2018-19 and additional equity contributions over the forward estimates. This funding package will support the authority's capital works as well as provide funding required to restructure its operation and support its viability. This new funding arrangement for the SA Housing Authority is consistent with those implemented in last year's budget for Forestry SA.

The use of equity contributions to public non-financial corporations was also used on a number of occasions by the former Labor government. They were used to fund capital expenditure and to meet short-term cash requirements, including for Renewal SA and the SA Housing Trust.

Last year's budget set a strong foundation for a sound financial future, and without the difficult decisions taken last year we would not have been in a position to meet the new financial challenges which presented this year. The budget is designed to build a better future for South Australia, with major investments in hospitals, schools, roads and other infrastructure projects. This budget continues to deliver on our election promises to create jobs, to lower costs for struggling families and to provide better services for all South Australians.

In concluding, I again want to thank all my ministerial colleagues for their wholehearted and cheerful support in tackling the challenges of this particular budget process. I acknowledge each and every one of you on this occasion. I also want to place on the record my thanks to all the hardworking Treasury staff. I know the former treasurer would acknowledge the work of Treasury staff, and I want to do so again. They are the unsung heroes in terms of trying to present budgets and I want to thank them. They have worked long hours in putting together the budget and advising the government.

Finally, I want to thank all the staff in my ministerial office without whose hard work and commitment to this job we would never have met many of the deadlines that are required in presenting any budget. Mr Speaker, I commend this budget to the house.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:50):** I move:

That the second reading be now resumed.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

## 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

## 2—Commencement

This clause provides for the Bill to operate retrospectively to 1 July 2018. Until the Bill is passed, expenditure is financed from appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act*.

## 3—Interpretation

This clause provides relevant definitions.

## 4—Issue and application of money

This clause provides for the issue and application of the sums shown in Schedule 1 to the Bill. Subsection (2) makes it clear that the appropriation authority provided by the *Supply Act* is superseded by this Bill.

## 5—Application of money if functions or duties of agency are transferred

This clause is designed to ensure that where Parliament has appropriated funds to an agency to enable it to carry out particular functions or duties and those functions or duties become the responsibility of another agency, the funds may be used by the responsible agency in accordance with Parliament's original intentions without further appropriation.

## 6—Expenditure from Hospitals Fund

This clause provides authority for the Treasurer to issue and apply money from the Hospitals Fund for the provision of facilities in public hospitals.

## 7—Additional appropriation under other Acts

This clause makes it clear that appropriation authority provided by this Bill is additional to authority provided in other Acts of Parliament, except, of course, in the *Supply Act*.

## 8—Overdraft limit

This sets a limit of \$50 million on the amount which the Government may borrow by way of overdraft.

Schedule 1—Amounts proposed to be expended from the Consolidated Account during the financial year ending 30 June 2019

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL***Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:50):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to introduce a bill forthwith.

**The SPEAKER:** There is an absolute majority.

Motion carried.

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:51):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Mining Act 1971 and the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:51):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The 2019-20 budget is focused on the government's priorities of increasing economic growth and jobs and providing better public services for South Australians. As part of the 2019-20 budget, the government has announced increased expiation fees for high-risk offences, including excessive speed, as well as increased fees under the Mining Act 1971. The Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures) Bill 2019 contains amendments to the necessary legislation to implement these fee changes.

The bill seeks to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961 to facilitate the increase in expiation fees for speeding offences between 30 km/h and 44 km/h and 45 km/h and over. Research indicates that each 5 km/h increase in speed over 60 km/h doubles the risk of casualty crashes on metropolitan roads, and that each 10 km/h increase in speed doubles the risk of a casualty crash on rural highways.

Speed is a significant factor in fatal crashes in South Australia and reductions in average travel speeds across the road network is the most effective and swift way to reduce road trauma and provide significant and immediate road safety benefits. The detection of speeding offences is one of SAPOL's priorities in its road safety strategy. The increase in speeding fines will serve as a further deterrent to people speeding, and is intended to lead to a safer road network.

The Road Traffic Act 1961 will also be amended to allow the penalty for bodies corporate, who fail to nominate a driver, to be amended through regulations and subsequently be increased. When a person is detected transgressing the road rules, the loss of demerit points places a driver's licence at risk. This deterrent is one of the measures available that provides consequences for dangerous driving. Anecdotal evidence suggests that people who are detected speeding and/or running a red light in a corporate vehicle are simply paying the corporate fee to avoid losing demerit points, thereby avoiding all the personal consequences of dangerous driving.

Increasing the corporate fee will provide a deterrent to companies who pay the corporate fee instead of nominating the driver of a vehicle. This is a measure to provide an incentive to companies to nominate the driver of a vehicle, which will enable drivers to be held to account for their dangerous driving, which places other people's lives in jeopardy, and will bring South Australia more in line with other Australian jurisdictions.

The Mining Act 1971 will be amended to include a fee to recover the cost of assessing and reviewing programs for environment protection and rehabilitation or mine operations plans, with the new fees to apply to submissions made from 1 January 2020. Development programs relating to historic mining tenements approved under the Mines and Works Inspection Regulations 2013 will transition to the Mining Act to avoid unintended assessment fees.

Development programs were required on some tenements before the introduction of programs for environment protection and rehabilitation. The bill will also end the current scheme of providing discounts on mining lease rental payments under the Mining Act to tenement holders where they are also the freehold owner of the land under that tenement.

The 2019 budget takes a considered approach to new revenue measures, with these changes intended to increase the deterrents for high-risk traffic offences as well as improve cost recovery within the extractive minerals sector, including for work undertaken in the assessment of environmental protection and rehabilitation approvals and mine operation plans. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

###### 2—Commencement

Part 2 will commence on 1 January 2020. Part 3 will commence on the day on which the Act is assented to.

###### 3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Mining Act 1971*

#### 4—Amendment of section 6—Interpretation

This clause inserts a new definition. A body corporate is a *related body corporate* in relation to a particular entity if it is related to the entity under section 50 of the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth.

#### 5—Amendment of section 40—Rental

This clause amends section 40 by changing the meaning of 'relevant interest'. A relevant interest in land over which a mining lease has been granted is an estate of fee simple or native title conferring a right to exclusive possession of the land. Under the section as amended, an estate of fee simple of which a holder of the lease or a related body corporate is a registered proprietor is not a relevant interest.

#### 6—Amendment of section 41E—Rental

This clause amends section 41E by changing the meaning of 'relevant interest'. This amendment corresponds with the amendment made to section 40 by clause 5.

#### 7—Amendment of section 52—Grant of miscellaneous purposes licence

This clause amends section 52 by changing the meaning of 'relevant interest'. This amendment corresponds with the amendment made to sections 40 and 41E by clauses 5 and 6.

#### 8—Amendment of section 70B—Preparation or application of program under this Part

Section 70B as amended by this clause will require the payment of a prescribed fee when a program is submitted for the purposes of the section.

#### 9—Amendment of section 70C—Review of programs

Section 70C as amended by this clause will require the payment of a prescribed fee when a program is submitted for the purposes of the section. If a program under the section is submitted to the Minister after being reviewed at the Minister's direction, and the fee is not paid, the fee is recoverable from the holder of the mining tenement as a debt due to the Crown.

#### 10—Insertion of section 70DA

This clause inserts a new section

##### 70DA—Development programs to be taken to be approved programs

Under the proposed new section, a development program approved under regulation 9 of the *Mines and Works Inspection Regulations 2013* and in force immediately before the commencement of the new section is to be taken to be an approved program under Part 10A and is subject to the operation and requirements of that Part.

#### 11—Amendment of section 73G—Mine operations plans

Section 73G as amended by this clause will require the payment of a prescribed fee when a program is submitted to the Director for the purposes of the section.

#### 12—Transitional provision

This transitional provision provides that the amendments made to sections 40, 41E and 52 apply in relation to rent paid under those sections following the commencement of the amendments.

#### Part 3—Amendment of Road Traffic Act 1961

#### 13—Amendment of section 45A—Excessive speed

This clause amends section 45A(1) by inserting a new penalty provision for the offence of exceeding the speed limit by 45 kilometres an hour or more. The existing penalty is a fine of \$1,100 to \$1,500 for a first offence and \$1,200 to \$1,700 for a subsequent offence. The new penalty is a fine of \$2,400 to \$2,800 for a first offence and \$2,500 to \$3,000 for a subsequent offence.

#### 14—Amendment of section 79B—Provisions applying where certain offences are detected by photographic detection devices

Under section 79B(2) if a vehicle appears from photographic detection device evidence to have been involved in certain speeding, red light or other offences, the owner of the vehicle is guilty of an offence against section 79B unless certain matters are proven.

This clause replaces the existing maximum penalty that a court can impose for the offence. At present the penalty is \$5,000 for a body corporate and \$4,000 for a natural person if the vehicle appears to have been involved in both a red light and a speeding offence and \$4,000 for a body corporate and \$3,000 for a natural person in any other case (unless it is an offence against section 45C(1) for heavy vehicle speeding offences on the South Eastern Freeway in which case the body corporate penalty is \$25,000 to \$50,000 and the natural person penalty is \$5,000). Under the



amendment the new penalty applicable in all cases except where the offence is an offence against section 45C(1) is \$10,000 for a body corporate and \$5 000 for a natural person.

This clause also amends the expiation fees applicable to offences against section 79B. Separate expiation fees are currently applicable under the section depending on whether the offence in which the vehicle appears to have been involved is an offence against section 45C(1) (the South Eastern Freeway heavy vehicle speeding offence), a combined red light and speeding offence, or some other type of offence. In each case at present the expiation fee for a natural person is an amount specified in the regulations for the relevant offence or combination of offences, and for a body corporate is the expiation fee for a natural person together with an additional amount specified in the Act. Under the amendment the additional amount for a body corporate is now referred to as a body corporate additional fee. In the case of an offence against section 45C(1) this body corporate additional fee is specified in the Act and is retained at its existing level of \$25,000 (so that the expiation fee where a body corporate is the owner of the vehicle is the expiation fee for a natural person that is fixed in the regulations, together with the \$25,000 body corporate additional fee fixed by the Act). In the case of combined red light and speeding offences, or in any other case, the body corporate additional fee that is to be added to the expiation fee for a natural person is no longer specified in the Act but is to be an amount not exceeding \$5,000 prescribed by the regulations.

15—Amendment of section 176—Regulations and rules

This clause amends section 176(1a) to increase the maximum amount of any expiation fee that may be prescribed by regulation under the Act (for offences against the Act or the regulations or rules) from \$1,250 to \$2,500.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. R.P. Wortley to the committee in place of the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos (resigned).

#### *Adjournment Debate*

### **LIONS CLUB OF GILLES PLAINS**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:56):** I rise to speak about an organisation within my electorate of Torrens that does invaluable work for the benefit of our community. The Lions Club of Gilles Plains, chartered on 24 June 1979, will celebrate its 40<sup>th</sup> charter anniversary tonight at a special dinner. Its banner, designed in 1978 by Gilles Plains high school students, is still used to this day and is a proud piece of the club's history.

Historically, Lions Clubs International was for men only, so the Gilles Plains Lions Club, soon after being established, made the decision to start up the Gilles Plains lioness club to give women the opportunity to be involved. I am pleased to say that now both women and men can be members of Lions International. Today, I make special mention of just a few of the members of the Lions Club of Gilles Plains, people who dedicate their time and knowledge and demonstrate compassion. They are people who understand what it truly means to give back to the community.

Lion Peter McKinnon, the only remaining charter member, has been there from the beginning. Peter has served in several positions, including as club president, secretary and treasurer. His contribution has been outstanding. Lion Ray Norton, who is in his 39<sup>th</sup> year of membership and has served as president four times, was the first life member of the Lions Club of Gilles Plains and is the current membership chairman. Ray and his wife, Yvonne, have become dear friends through our shared passion for our local community. Ray continues to serve at the highest level with his sharp mind and generous heart.

Current president, Lion Ted Osborn, who is concluding his third term as president, has held numerous positions. He is always there willing to assist to organise meetings and the many community and fundraising events that the club initiates. Ted works tirelessly, always thinking ahead. Secretary, Lion John McIntosh, has also served as district governor. Lion Debra Poole will be taking over as president this year.

I also acknowledge the outstanding role of the current members of the club who have been awarded the Melvin Jones Fellowship, the highest award in Lions: Peter McKinnon, Ray Norton, Jane Sommers, Stewart Garvin and Ted Osborn. Included in the many wonderful contributions made over the years, the Lions Club of Gilles Plains has:

- donated equipment to the state emergency services, including two-way radios and abseiling equipment, which formed an integral part of emergency rescues;
- sponsored RSB seeing eye dogs;
- donated a promotions caravan to SA Police;
- painted the walls of the Blind Welfare residential complex in Gilles Plains;
- provided equipment, including two motorised wheelchairs, to people in our community who would have otherwise gone without;
- trained hearing dogs to recognise doorbells, telephones and other electronic devices around the home for people who are deaf or hard of hearing;
- supported the North East Community Assistance Project with donations towards their Christmas hampers;
- operated the daily breakfast programs at Wandana and Hillcrest Primary School;
- collected reading glasses for recycling;
- sold raffle tickets standing right next to the much-admired prize of the giant stocking, which they packed with a selection of gifts for the family of the lucky winner, with money raised then distributed to various charities; and
- hosted local sausage sizzles, raising money that has enabled them to support international, national and local organisations and individuals, including the Cancer Council, the Red Cross and Diabetes SA.

This wonderful club has also hosted Clean Up Australia Day events in our local area from the inception of this initiative, and I am always very pleased to lend a hand. Together, we organise and promote the event to encourage other members of the community to clean up and conserve our environment. Members continue to sell the very popular Lions Christmas Cake, and for 12 years in a row now the club has been the leading mint seller in South Australia.

One of the many amazing stories from the Lions Club of Gilles Plains is the full sponsorship of the journey for a child from Sumatra to Adelaide to undergo complete facial reconstructive surgery, carried out by Professor David David AC. For making this possible, the Lions Club of Gillies Plains was awarded the membership of the Australian Cranio-Maxillo Facial Foundation. The achievement of being able to assist in making life-changing events possible has encouraged it further to do even more. Today, its members continue to support children through World Vision Australia, including a child in Sri Lanka and one in Tanzania.

In the past, the club has done significant work to promote drug awareness within local schools, assisting to educate youth on making the right choices on their life journey. More recently, it sponsored the establishment of a new club, the Lions Club of Mawson Lakes, working closely with them in a mentoring role. Several Gillies Plains Lion members who have made significant contributions to the community have had local reserves named after them, including Lion Peter Wesbroom Reserve at Gilles Plains, Ray Norton Reserve at Hillcrest and Lion Kevin Bob Dyer Reserve in Hillcrest, all in the Port Adelaide Enfield council area. Lions Club International is a worldwide organisation, with clubs in over 200 countries and a membership in excess of 1.4 million.

In closing, to all Lions Club Gilles Plains members past and present, I say thank you and happy 40<sup>th</sup> charter anniversary to one of the best. Your service to our community is valued, recognised and greatly appreciated, and it is an honour to stand in this place today to acknowledge all you have contributed over the past 40 years.

#### **MEMBERS' BEHAVIOUR**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:03):** Recently, I called upon members of the South Australian parliament to reflect on our own behaviour in this place and endeavour to find ways to act more respectfully. I suggested that it is time to set a more respectful leadership example for our community

and our younger generation. One reason I feel this is important is that the disrespectful behaviour in here is often viewed by school students, parents and community members.

Secondly, aggressive behaviour in this workplace could deter people from sharing their thoughts openly, and it could obstruct community-focused debate, which would not be in the best interests of our community. I appreciate the Speaker's speech that followed my Tuesday 4 June speech. Our Speaker said that both sides of this house should take heed of my comments and reflect, and you asked for cooperation of all members to maintain order—

**Mr BROWN:** Point of order: it is disorderly to quote from *Hansard* during the same session of parliament.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order, member for King. You are not able to quote directly from *Hansard* in this case, so just rephrase things a bit.

**Ms LUETHEN:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I agree with our Speaker that we are all privileged to be elected to this place and that with that privilege come the responsibilities of acting with respect and consideration and being role models for our community. It is time. Just as a parliament before us several hundred years ago decided to ban members wearing swords, it is time now for us to ban aggressive and disrespectful behaviour.

On the radio *Spin Cycle*, I heard Mike Smithson say that throat-cutting gestures have been around forever, but that does not mean that, just because it has been acceptable in the past, these types of violent gestures are acceptable today. They are just not.

Last week, I had the privilege of leading four school tours from Our Lady of Hope Catholic School in Parliament House. I would like to commend these classes of grades 5, 6 and 7 students, as their behaviour was exemplary. We spoke about parliamentary process and the standing orders in parliament and how they guide our respectful behaviour so that we can best represent our constituents' views. I asked if any of the students had seen politicians behaving badly, and I was not surprised when so many hands went up. The problem with this is that these children are only 10, 11 and 12 years old, yet they know that the behaviour in this place and federally is not as they would like to see.

I was pleased when a teacher from Our Lady of Hope School reiterated to students the importance of respecting each other's views, and this was certainly demonstrated when the students confidently took turns debating their nominated bills. The students chose to debate a bill to ban plastic straws in SA. Some students chose a bill to ban mobile phones from classrooms. Not surprisingly, every student crossed the floor to vote against the ban on mobile phones from classrooms. Amusingly, a repeated argument they put forward on why mobiles were needed was the need to call for help if a teacher passed out on the job.

We know that too many South Australian children are growing up witnessing violence. If a child is unfortunately growing up in a household where there is disrespectful and violent behaviour between parents, we must work together to make sure that, when these children come into this place and watch us in parliament, we are definitely not reinforcing that disrespect or aggressive behaviour is the norm.

We need these children to see that there is another way. We can show these children a respectful way of disagreeing. We can show these children a respectful way of negotiating to get the best outcomes. We play an important role in helping to break the cycle of abuse when we teach children by our example to be more respectful and caring. It is time for us not only to call out disrespect but to stop being bystanders if we see it.

On this front, it has been pleasing to read that Prime Minister Scott Morrison and the federal opposition leader have said that union leader John Setka should resign from his position at the construction union. *The Advertiser* reported in 2017 that Victorian police charged Setka with the alleged harassment of a woman, recklessly causing her injury. You would think this would be enough to call for this person to step down.

David Penberthy wrote, 'John Setka has been calling people dogs and maggots (and worse),' words that I did not want to say in this place, 'for years'. We must all stop being bystanders to

behaviour that supports aggression, harassment and violence. I call on all members to condemn this behaviour, too, even though it has been quiet on the other side.

My King community have told me repeatedly that they expect better behaviour from politicians. I look forward to our working together to set a new respectful standard of behaviour in line with our community's expectations. On this side, I can see that, in the last sitting week and this week, we are off to a great start to stop it at the start.

At 16:09 the house adjourned until Wednesday 19 June 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***BUS SERVICES**

**688 The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (2 April 2019). With regards to public transport bus contracts—

- (a) On what date do the current public transport bus contracts expire?
- (b) Will an extension to the current bus contracts be granted and if yes, until what date?
- (c) For how long will the 'electronic data room' run for? (Please provide dates of opening and closing)?
- (d) For how long will the whole tender process run for and when will it close? (Please provide dates)?
- (e) On what date are the new contracts required to come into effect?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning):** I have been advised of the following—

(a) Metropolitan public transport bus contracts expire on 30 June 2019. In relation to regional public transport bus contracts the expiry dates are as follows:

- Eight contracts expire on 31 March 2020
- Eleven contracts expire on 30 June 2019
- Four contracts expire on 28 February 2024
- One contract expires on 1 November 2024
- One contract expires on 31 October 2019
- One contract expires on 31 January 2021
- One contract expires on 30 April 2021
- One contract expires on 31 December 2026

(b) A short-term extension to the current contracts which are due to expire on 30 June 2019 will be required in order to ensure that we have enough time to conduct a tender process that will drive the level of change and improvement that is required to allow the industry to respond in an innovative way and achieve a world class bus service network and service in Adelaide.

(c) The data room for the metropolitan bus contracts will be in use for the duration of the competitive tender process.

(d) The time frames for the tender process are being developed based on feedback from the industry as part of a recent market sounding process and will provide sufficient time for the market to develop innovative strategies to improve bus transport in Adelaide.

(e) The new metropolitan bus contracts will come into effect upon expiry of the current contracts, as extended. The new regional contracts are required to come into effect the day following the expiry of the current regional contracts.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION**

**817 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). Since 18 March 2018, how much has the South Australian Tourism Commission spent on paid advertising promoting South Australia to: intrastate visitors, interstate visitors and international visitors?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Since 18 March 2018, the South Australian Tourism Commission has spent \$12,585,780 (ex GST) on paid advertising.

Please note that paid advertising is one component of the overall SATC marketing effort.

**PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES**

**840 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). What is the current contract end date for the incumbents of each of the following positions:

- (a) Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet?
- (b) Chief Executive, Department of Treasury and Finance?
- (c) Chief Executive, Department of Human Services?
- (d) Chief Executive, Department for Education?

- (e) Chief Executive, Department for Health and Wellbeing?
- (f) Chief Executive, Attorney-General's Department?
- (g) Chief Executive, Department for Innovation and Skills?
- (h) Chief Executive, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure?
- (i) Chief Executive, Department for Environment and Water?
- (j) Chief Executive, Department of Primary Industries and Regions, South Australia?
- (k) Commissioner for Public Sector Employment?
- (l) Commissioner of Police?
- (m) Chief Executive, Environment Protection Authority?
- (n) Chief Executive, Department for Correctional Services?
- (o) Chief Executive, Defence SA?
- (p) Chief Executive, Department for Child Protection?
- (q) Mental Health Commissioner?
- (r) Chief Executive, Green Industries SA?
- (s) Chief Executive, Department for Energy and Mining?
- (t) Chief Executive, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing?
- (u) Chief Executive, Office of the SA Productivity Commission and Chair, SA Productivity Commission?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

- (a) Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet—31 August 2023
- (b) Chief Executive, Department of Treasury and Finance—30 November 2020
- (c) Chief Executive, Department of Human Services—21 June 2021
- (d) Chief Executive, Department for Education—21 June 2021
- (e) Chief Executive, Department for Health and Wellbeing—6 May 2021
- (f) Chief Executive, Attorney-General's Department—8 April 2021
- (g) Chief Executive, Department for Innovation and Skills—5 February 2022
- (h) Chief Executive, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure—21 October 2022
- (i) Chief Executive, Department for Environment and Water—30 September 2021
- (j) Chief Executive, Department of Primary Industries and Regions, South Australia—20 April 2020
- (k) Commissioner for Public Sector Employment—30 June 2021
- (l) Commissioner of Police—20 July 2020
- (m) Chief Executive, Environment Protection Authority—17 February 2022
- (n) Chief Executive, Department for Correctional Services—1 October 2022
- (o) Chief Executive, Defence SA—1 October 2022
- (p) Chief Executive, Department for Child Protection—30 October 2021
- (q) Mental Health Commissioner—3 January 2020
- (r) Chief Executive, Green Industries SA—12 February 2020
- (s) Chief Executive, Department for Energy and Mining—5 March 2022
- (t) Chief Executive, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing—27 November 2019
- (u) Chief Executive, Office of the SA Productivity Commission and Chair, SA Productivity Commission—21 October 2020

#### TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (14 May 2019).

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning):** I have been advised of the following—

On 29 April 2019 the government invited industry to tender for the maintenance of the Department of Transport, Planning and Infrastructure's road network, with new providers expected to be announced mid-2020.

The scope of the proposed maintenance contracts includes road network electrical assets such as traffic lights, variable speed limit signs, travel time signs and CCTV.

The department will continue to directly operate these electrical assets through the Traffic Management Centre and specify the standard to which they shall be maintained.

The new service provider/s will be required to deliver maintenance in accordance with the department's specification. The department will manage the contracts to specification and required performance levels, provide oversight and audit services to ensure providers are delivering to the required standard.

South Australia's approach is not new. Industry has been successfully delivering maintenance of road network electrical assets across New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland for approximately a decade.

To note that electrical assets not owned and operated by the department, such as speed cameras that are owned and maintained by SA Police, are not included in the scope.

#### **TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (14 May 2019).

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning):** I have been advised of the following—

The monitoring of traffic cameras is performed by the Traffic Management Centre (TMC). There are no plans to privatise the TMC.

#### **FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARER ASSESSMENTS**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (16 May 2019).

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) directly manages kinship carer assessments. When the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 came into full effect on 22 October 2018, it introduced new requirements for carers. The department is committed to increasing family-based care, including kinship care, and ensuring the assessment of these carers is processed in a timely way.

Foster carer assessments are managed by non-government service providers. These assessments are being undertaken within defined timeframes.

DCP does not have a backlog of child protection investigations. When a notification of alleged child abuse and/or neglect is assessed as meeting the threshold for child protection intervention, the relevant DCP regional office reviews the notification to assess what response is most appropriate to address the risk to the child or young person. This may be an investigation, however section 32(3) of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 also enables alternative responses and referral of cases to other State Government authorities for intervention.