

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 4 July 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. I advise members that I have allowed a photographer in this morning.

Motions

REMOTE AREA ATTENDANCE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:01): I move:

That regulations made under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010, entitled Remote Area Attendance, made on 16 May 2019 and laid on the table of this house on 4 June 2019, be disallowed.

This is a very serious matter and this house should be taking action very swiftly to disallow these regulations. As members would know, Gayle Woodford, a nurse in the APY lands, was tragically murdered in 2016—a nurse, who devoted her life to caring for others and who worked tirelessly to support that community, was taken from us.

Since then, an action campaign began here and around the country to improve safety provisions and legal protections for nurses who work in remote areas, with the central principle being that nurses and other health workers should never be alone. They should never have to feel like they have to respond to instances like that by themselves. There should always be somebody else with them to make sure they are safe in very remote areas of our state.

That was then followed up by legislation under the previous government and championed by the current member for Hurtle Vale and the former member for Elder, Annabel Digance, to bring in legislation that would enact Gayle's Law here in South Australia. I am very glad that was passed in the parliament back in 2017, and we have led the way in South Australia in bringing that legislation into being.

However, unfortunately that was not the end of the story. Unfortunately, what we saw following that were significant delays in implementing the law, in properly proclaiming the law so it could come into operation. Then the government, in a very devastating blow to so many people, brought in regulations underneath that law that weaken the entire premise of the law that parliament brought in.

The regulations the government snuck in, entitled the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Remote Area Attendance) Variation Regulations 2019, allow the principle that nurses should never be alone to be wiped away, because it allows a weakening of that law so much that if a risk assessment is done by a nurse then they are able to go by themselves to respond to call-outs. As people would know, nurses make risk assessments all the time. There is no doubt, particularly when you speak to Gayle's husband, Keith, that Gayle undertook risk assessments of that type all the time—and did on that night. That is why we legislated to say that nurses should never be alone.

This has sparked very significant outrage from the nursing community in South Australia, who thought this was a done deal, who thought that this was legislated and protected, but who have been devastated to learn that the government has sought to weaken this legislation. It has also been particularly devastating for the Woodford family, who thought that Gayle's legacy was now enshrined in law, that there was some good to come out of all the heartache that has happened to their family. Unfortunately, they have now had to speak publicly again to advocate for the original position they thought had been passed.

This was brought to the attention of members of our party and also of the government and the crossbench by the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation of South Australia. They originally raised these concerns with the government when they were consulted about the draft regulations. Unfortunately, the government decided not to take any action in regard to those draft regulations, and they proceeded through the legislative regulation process internally within the government without having concern for those issues raised with them.

They have now had to raise that with the opposition and the crossbenchers here and in the other place to try to get this resolved. In a letter from Adjunct Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars, the CEO/Secretary of the ANMF(SA), they have raised concerns. They said:

You would know from earlier debate on this legislation that ANMF (SA Branch) has been a staunch advocate for change to the law that would prevent circumstances in which nurses or midwives working in remote areas could be placed in harm's way due to the absence of appropriate collegiate presence when responding to the healthcare needs of the community.

The law adopted by the parliament was premised on the existence of a second responder in such circumstances. The principle that nurses or midwives should not be asked or placed in circumstance that would require them to attend alone was embedded in the act. The second responder category was drafted in such a way that it was sufficiently broad to ensure it was capable of providing sufficient people that could undertake the role, necessary for the protection of the nurse or midwife.

We were therefore distressed to read the regulations, as gazetted, which create the possibility that nurses or midwives could be required to attend alone in certain circumstances. Such a possibility in our submission is fundamentally at odds with the intention of the parliament and campaigners for the legislation, including ourselves.

In essence, the regulations would permit the nurse or midwife to attend to a person in need of health care without a second responder provided that it was an attendance to a public space and where they have conducted some form of risk assessment. This creates, in our view, the very circumstances that have created risk of harm in the past.

We seek your assistance in moving or supporting disallowance of the regulations insofar as they create a circumstance in which a second responder does not accompany the health professional when responding to a call out in their community.

That is a very clear letter from the advocates for nurses and midwives in this state saying that the regulations this government has brought in are not good enough; not only are they not good enough but they undermine the very premise upon which so many people campaigned and upon which this parliament legislated to protect nurses and midwives in the first place.

The focus is not the entirety of the regulations; the focus is really on a particular aspect of the regulations, which is regulation 11D(2)(e) and one particular requirement, one particular loophole I guess, where they are saying that nurses can go to instances alone. There are a number of others that they have put in the regulations that I think most people are comfortable with and think are reasonable, such as if you are attending a police station or the like. But this one, 11D(2)(e), provides:

- (e) where—
- (i) the callout is to a place in a location for which there is a risk management plan approved by the Minister; and—

which could be a very broad risk management plan indeed—

- (ii) the nature of the health services that, in the opinion of the health practitioner, are likely to be required at the callout are covered by or otherwise consistent with the approved risk management plan; and
- (iii) the health practitioner has, in accordance with the policies and procedures under section 77H of the Act and the risk management plan, undertaken a risk assessment and determined that it is safe to attend the callout without a second responder.

So the premise is put on the nurse or the health practitioner to make that judgement about whether it is safe for them to attend the call-out. That is the very premise we were trying to address in this legislation. Not only has it concerned the ANMF and so many of their members but it is, as I said, very concerning to the Woodford family, who have been through so much over the past few years and had thought that they had achieved so much in the legislation passing this house.

Keith Woodford, who I have had the pleasure of speaking to a number of times over the past couple of weeks, spoke recently on ABC North and West radio about this. He was asked, 'Well, how did you feel?' He said:

We felt gutted and...devastated. If it wasn't for the Nurses Union who picked it up at the last minute a couple of weeks ago, we wouldn't have known that this regulation had been put in. It was all done and dusted a few years ago...I just can't work out why. The only thing I can think of is the cost and we've all racked our brains to work out why because that very regulation is what we were fighting against...I think it must be finance because they might have to...pay money during the day time as well. I honestly don't know...I've got no idea. All I know is that they've got other vested interests.

He was asked:

Do you think South Australian people would be happy to pay a bit more...if it meant that nurses were covered all the time by Gayle's Law, that they were never alone?

He said;

Yes, I think they would...even the people up in Fregon that I knew...they're all for Gayle's Law, the majority of the people. Life is different up in the APY Lands to the norm, they put up with a lot, violence and lack of work but then you look on the other side where jobs are available, they sometimes don't want to do it...this is not the majority of them. The majority of the people in the APY lands are lovely people...strong cultural life but drugs and alcohol come into it and boredom, not doing anything has got a lot to do with it. It's just...another kick in the guts. We just seem to be getting so many of them all the time...you think everything's...going well and then this happens...we didn't even know that regulation was going...to be in there, the statement that nurses were allowed to do a risk assessment during the day and if they felt if it was safe, they could go out by themselves, which was entirely against Gayle's Law. That's what Gayle's Law is, never alone, there's got to be a second responder there at all times.

He was then asked:

Is there any doubt in your head that this is something that Gayle would have done on a daily basis, going through and doing a quick risk assessment before making a choice?

He said:

Yeah...even when people used to come to our house at night time, she would do a risk assessment through the...area before she would let anyone through...the door...people who would come here and they were drunk or on drugs, there's no way she would let them in, or if they looked agitated or violent.

This is, I think, pretty devastating. It is pretty devastating for all those people who worked so hard to get this legislation in place. It is devastating for the Woodford family, who clearly know the circumstances better than anybody. It is clearly devastating for those nurses and health practitioners who are currently working in remote areas of South Australia at the moment.

That is why the disallowance of this regulation is so important. That is why the government have the opportunity now to delete this particular offensive section of their regulations—the section that goes against the entire premise of Gayle's Law—and reissue the regulations without that section so that Gayle's Law can continue in the way that it was intended to, in the way that this parliament passed it and in the way that nurses, midwives and other health practitioners need it to be in place to protect them.

They are doing an amazing job. They are doing jobs that many of us would not want to do. It is so important for the people of our state that they are doing these jobs, but they need to be protected while they are doing them. We have a responsibility in this parliament to make sure that they are protected and we have the ability to do that today. I hope this parliament takes that action to protect those nurses and to make sure that this sort of tragedy never, ever happens again in this state.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:15): I thank the member for Kurna for putting this on the *Notice Paper*. I appreciate the way in which he presented his argument moments ago. I indicate that the government is taking this matter very seriously. I note that the member for Heysen this morning also listed on the *Notice Paper* the identical motion as a representative of the Legislative Review Committee.

When the Legislative Review Committee is considering a matter or a regulation, the process is that there is a time-limited period during which the parliament can disallow a regulation. When the Legislative Review Committee wishes to give it further consideration or, should they determine that,

after consideration of a regulation, it merits disallowance, the practice is to put on the *Notice Paper* what is known as a holding motion. Once the holding motion is on the *Notice Paper*, then the time-limiting nature of a regulation before the house does not take effect.

I acknowledge that the limit on a holding motion from the perspective of a political party that wishes to oppose a regulation outright is that, if the Legislative Review Committee formally decides that it wishes not to proceed with the disallowance, the practice is that the representative of the Legislative Review Committee will withdraw that holding motion, which at that point would prevent the house from being able to disallow.

The Labor Party has a firm policy position, which I believe from the member's contribution is that they wish to disallow the regulation, to have it listed a second time, and the member for Kaurua has set out his reasons. I note in doing so that he has indicated that there is a part of the regulation which he objects to and which, I believe, has instigated the Legislative Review Committee's further consideration of the matter.

I understand that they are taking written submissions on that at the moment and are looking into evidence. I indicate that, while the government will be seeking to adjourn this motion at this point, we are taking the matter seriously. The Legislative Review Committee will continue to take those submissions, and we will reflect on those submissions in the weeks ahead. Am I able to move the adjournment or must another member do that now that I have made a contribution on the motion?

The SPEAKER: You can seek leave to continue your remarks.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I do not seek to do that. I will conclude my remarks in case another member wishes to contribute. I conclude my remarks by saying that, in that spirit, I do not wish to comment on the merits of the motion, other than to say that the government is looking at it seriously. I anticipate that after a further contribution from the member for Hurtle Vale a government member will seek to adjourn the debate and we will continue to take it seriously in the coming weeks.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:18): I rise clearly in support of the member for Kaurua's motion that we should disallow these regulations for Gayle's Law, principally based upon the one section of the regulations that would allow a nurse working in a remote environment to undertake a risk assessment and then work as a sole provider of services without any accompanying support.

From the moment that we heard the news about the terrible circumstances around Gayle Woodford's death, I felt very deeply connected to the situation and speak in this place probably from a point of difference from most in two ways. Firstly, I clearly have a very deep clinical level of experience from being a registered nurse working in a variety of settings making risk assessments and so have an informed and evidence-based approach to the decision-making here.

From that point of view, if I was just to make a very simple statement, when you are a clinician of any kind, be that a registered nurse, a carer, a medical practitioner or an allied health professional, the vast majority of people who enter these types of professions are caring professionals. People do it because they do not want to see people suffer. They want people to live the best possible life, and they provide whatever care, support and level of clinical expertise they can in order to achieve that. Knowing the types of people who would particularly be working out in the lands, they are very special clinical practitioners. These people have a very deep sense of social justice and will do anything they can to ensure that the best possible health care and service delivery are provided to those people.

In doing that, yes, often they will need to make risk assessments multiple times during the day at different junctures when they are provided with opportunities to deliver care. Should they be the people who are left to make that decision at any time on whether or not they travel independently to a destination to deliver that care? I say no. I say the people who should be making that risk assessment and that decision are the managers—the managers of the service, the people who are providing the funding, supports and resources to deliver those services. They are the people who should be making the decisions and, in the main, that then comes back to the government that is setting the rules around that.

I believe that the risk assessment can be done now. We know that there is an enormous risk to life and safety for anybody travelling independently out into the field to deliver care, principally women undertaking nursing roles in remote communities. We know that there is a risk. What cost do

we place on life and that risk? There is no cost, which brings me to the second level of difference I have from an experience point of view, and that is the sense of immense grief and loss you experience when you lose a family member in a violent, fruitless and hopeless situation.

That is the sense of grief and loss that the Woodford family has. It is the sense of grief and loss that her friends and her work colleagues have—the hopeless waste of life that has happened to somebody who was absolutely dedicated and committed to ensuring that people on the lands had the best possible access to health care and support.

If anyone does need a reminder of what that grief and loss might look like, I invite you to look at the vision of Julie Kelbin, the mother of Jack Hanley, who lost his life in Hindley Street. However that event came about, whatever happened, the image of Julie and her absolutely guttural cries should be enough to remind you of what is absolute waste. That is what has happened to Gayle Woodford's family. This is what we can stop with the stroke of a pen.

We can say that no nurse, clinician or provider of care, love and support in a rural setting should be asked to make, by themselves, an assessment when begged by somebody to come and help at any time of the day. We can make that decision. It is a simple stroke of a pen. Please support us in our call. I sense that there is definitely a deep understanding on both sides of the chamber here of the hopelessness of the situation that people face, and I urge you to support this motion.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:25): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

While the division bells were ringing:

The SPEAKER: Members, please be advised that I have allowed a photographer in the gallery.

Ayes 24

Noes 21

Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

*Parliamentary Committees***PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PENOLA NORTHERN BYPASS**

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:31): I move:

That the 21st report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Penola Northern Bypass, be noted.

The Penola Northern Bypass is the second stage of the Penola bypass, which is a joint initiative of South Australian and Australian governments together with the Wattle Range Council. The committee has been informed that the proposed works aim to significantly reduce heavy vehicle traffic volumes through the town of Penola. Currently, the Riddoch Highway, which is part of the national land freight network, traverses the main street of Penola. The high number of heavy vehicle movements through the area currently presents a safety risk for motorists, pedestrians, cyclists and local residents.

The Penola Northern Bypass will involve the construction of a new 2.2-kilometre undivided arterial road between the road to Clay Wells Road and Riddoch Highway, north of Penola. The northern bypass will link up with the Penola Southern Bypass, which was constructed in April 2015. This will complete the 4.7-kilometre Penola bypass and provide an alternative route for heavy vehicles to avoid driving through the Penola township and town centre. It is expected to increase safety for all road users, reduce traffic congestion in the area and contribute to reductions in noise and emissions from heavy vehicles. The estimated total cost of the project is \$14.6 million, with project completion expected by the end of June 2020.

The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and has been assured by officials from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure that all relevant project acquittals and approvals have been received, including from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and also the Crown Solicitor.

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

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:34): Today, I rise to speak in support of the motion to note the 21st report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Penola Northern Bypass. I welcome the tabling of this important standing committee report and thank the staff who supported the committee. I would also like to recognise the work of the staff of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, who undoubtedly are spending much time currently preparing for the mobilisation of the significant investment.

Importantly, I would like to recognise the critical role of our partners in this project—the federal government, in particular the work of the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, and also the Wattle Range Council—who have invested in ensuring the corridor for the project has been secured to enable the work to proceed.

Along with my constituents who live in and operate businesses around Penola, I welcomed the 2018 budget commitment by the Marshall Liberal government to the finalisation of the plan for the Penola heavy vehicle bypass. This commitment has also been welcomed by the freight industry and the travelling public who use the busy Riddoch Highway in this area of the Limestone Coast. The work will complete the vision for the whole bypass, the first section having been completed and opened in April 2015.

Penola is a beautiful town, significant for its cultural and tourism values, situated approximately 25 kilometres from the South Australian and Victorian border, positioned midway between the regional city of Mount Gambier and the regional centre of Naracoorte on the Riddoch Highway. Penola is, of course, renowned as a special place where Mary MacKillop and Julian Tenison-Woods co-founded the Sisters of St Joseph in 1866. The town is also well known for its location, adjacent to the Coonawarra, providing services to the busy viticultural, silvicultural and

agricultural districts, and catering to the tourism traffic that both the Mary MacKillop school and the world-renowned wine district brings to the region.

I look forward to the benefits that the completion of the bypass will bring to the township of Penola, enabling locals and visitors alike to access Church Street, the town's state heritage sites, unencumbered by the noise and heavy vehicle traffic it currently experiences. Some of these historic sites include the historic Petticoat Lane, the oldest residential area of Penola, comprising a range of historic timber and stone cottages, and Mary MacKillop attractions, which include a wealth of experiences, including the interpretive centre, which houses the MacKillop and Woods exhibitions, a research room and a shop. There is also the historic MacKillop schoolhouse and St Joseph's church, which includes a shrine to Mary MacKillop, the old convent and the early Cameron home, the home of the founder of the township also at the site.

I expect the removal of the heavy vehicles from the town centre will yield many benefits for the town, including making the visitor experience much more pleasant and in turn support the sustainability of the growth of the town's cafes, restaurants, art galleries, retail and cellar door outlets that line Church Street. The region has many fine foods and wines. The bypass will take heavy vehicles out of the main street and allow these to be consumed in a more peaceful, tranquil environment. It will be a much safer experience without the passing traffic.

Signage and promotion will continue to be important for the town to enable it to pick up those visitors who may otherwise pass through, as the town has much to offer. As a state government, we are trying to encourage more tourists from Victoria to drive on into South Australia, and Penola is one of these towns that can be the first port of call from western Victoria.

As a collective, the state government, along with our local government and federal government counterparts, needs to also consider how heavy vehicle movement is managed travelling to and from our near neighbour, Victoria, to the east of the township. Heavy vehicle movements from the east of the township will require attention and be managed to ensure these vehicles are also diverted from the main street to reap the benefits of the bypass and allow the main street to flourish.

The first stage of the Penola bypass was at the southern end of the bypass, where the state government committed \$10.5 million and the Wattle Range Council contributed approximately \$2.5 million to secure the land and road corridor for the full bypass. The budget commitment made in 2018 secured the investment of the federal Australian government and our state government to the value of \$14.6 million in an 80:20 split to enable planning and implementation to occur to complete the northern section of the bypass. The works will enable heavy vehicles to bypass the township and this will involve:

- construction of 2.2 kilometres of undivided, sealed, rural arterial road with sealed shoulders;
- construction of a T-junction at the Riddoch Highway (Church Street) where the new northern bypass will connect to the highway to the north of the township;
- connecting the existing southern and the new northern components of the bypass by realigning the Riddoch Highway, and upgrading the junction at the Penola bypass and the Robe to Clay Wells Road to a staggered T-junction; and
- changes and installation of lighting, drainage works and some minor native vegetation removal, which are also proposed as part of the project.

The report of the Public Works Committee summarises well the benefits of the project which will see the northern section of the bypass completed and which will deliver advantages for the township and surrounds of Penola. The project will improve safety for all road users and help reduce the likelihood of crashes. The report of the committee identifies that in the period 2014-18 there were 15 reported crashes on the section of the highway between the northern bypass T-junction and the current southern bypass T-junction. Unfortunately and tragically, these incidents have resulted in four fatalities, two serious injuries, six minor injuries, and nine incidents of property damage.

The bypass will significantly reduce heavy vehicle traffic volumes through the township. The Riddoch Highway forms part of the national land freight network, providing an important linkage between Dukes Highway in the north of my electorate, the southern part of the electorate, the wider Green Triangle and the Port of Portland. It will reduce the conflict between heavy vehicles, pedestrians and local traffic within the township of Penola. The movement of heavy vehicles can be at conflict with the often slower movement of local and tourist traffic, posing a safety risk.

The completion of this project will deliver a safer Church Street for motorists and pedestrians. It will also minimise the impact of the noise of heavy vehicles, allowing a better experience for operating businesses and people conducting business in the main part of town. It will also cater for anticipated additional commercial vehicles travelling on the road to Clay Wells Road and the Riddoch Highway generated from timber plantations near Penola. With blue gum plantation harvesting well underway across the centre of the region, there are many log trucks travelling in and around Penola.

The southern section of the bypass is already assisting to prevent much of this traffic entering the main street. It will also reduce travel time and create improved access for heavy vehicles. The benefits here are obvious. It will also improve freight efficiencies, which support the Limestone Coast region's highly productive economy.

In the construction phase, there is a commitment to minimise impacts on the travelling public, business operations and the wider community where practically possible. There is also a commitment to maintain local access to the area for the community, to minimise impacts upon the environment and heritage and to take into account community and stakeholder needs and expectations.

I note that the report highlights a time frame for the project, with the planning, design and investigations for the project to be completed soon, in 2019-20. The pre-construction phase, including the award of the contract, stakeholder engagement and the set-up arrangements for works, is to be undertaken over the next six months. I look forward to seeing the progress on this construction phase of the project in the first six months of 2020.

The project stacks up well. I look forward to the process for letting the contracts. I am hopeful that some of our local small and medium contractors will be given the opportunity to prove themselves to be competitive in this process. I am pleased that the Public Works Committee has finalised its report into the investment into the Penola bypass and I commend the final report of the committee, entitled Penola Northern Bypass, to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:42): I rise to support this report by the Public Works Committee, which is the 21st report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Penola Northern Bypass. I would just like to acknowledge the work of both the former member for MacKillop and the current member for MacKillop in making sure that we complete this vital link. So, instead of just having the southern bypass, we will complete it with the northern bypass. It is certainly needed in a town that is on a busy freight route and in a very strong agricultural area.

Obviously, forestry is in the area, as are fishing and farming at all levels. It is very strong farming country in that area, whether it is cropping or grazing, and there are obviously the vineyards of the Coonawarra. I am pleased to say that I have travelled down that way under my own steam for about 40 years and always enjoyed a drive either to Penola or through Penola, heading through to Mount Gambier. I have obviously had a bit of interaction with the town.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: With the kangaroos on the Wattle Range Road.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, I have done that as well further down at Mount Burr. Certainly, in the time that I was shearing down there, around Lucindale, I spent a lot of time travelling in that area. It is vitally needed work, and I think this report shows the commitment this government has to regional South Australia, which has been let go for so long. We had a former Labor government for 16 years that just let the regions go, and I am just so pleased to see this commitment of funds and our recent announcement of \$1.1 billion of road funding into South Australia, which is much needed. It is about making sure that we get as much done as possible knowing that there will always be more work to do.

I am really pleased that another regional resource contributes towards these road networks: as part of our policy on mining, 30 per cent of mining royalties goes into our regional road network.

That means that somewhere around \$78 million is going into that network this year. It is nice to see those funds being utilised in such a worthwhile project so that all communities can see the benefits offered by our regions, whether that is in the agriculture industry or the mining industry, albeit a little indirectly now, by offering roadwork projects such as the Northern Penola Bypass.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:45): I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2019-20

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:46): I move:

That the third report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2019-20, be noted.

The Economic and Finance Committee has an annual statutory duty to inquire into, consider and report on the Treasurer's determinations in relation to the emergency services levy. The committee has 21 days in which to report on the written determinations after they are referred to the committee.

This year, the committee received the Treasurer's Statement on 24 May. The Emergency Services Funding Act 1998 requires the statement to include determinations in respect of the amount that needs to be raised by means of the levy to fund emergency services, the amount to be expended for various kinds of emergency services and the extent to which the various parts of the state will benefit from the application of that amount.

The services funded by the emergency services levy as defined in the act are the South Australian Country Fire Service, the South Australia Metropolitan Fire Service, the South Australian State Emergency Service, Surf Life Saving SA, a member of Volunteer Marine Rescue SA and a service provided by the South Australian police department related to, assisting with or incidental to those organisations I have listed.

On 29 May, the Economic and Finance Committee held a public hearing and invited representatives from the Department of Treasury and Finance, SAFECOM, MFS, CFS and SES. The witnesses provided the committee with details on the proposed levy for 2019-20, and we are debating what was tabled. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the tremendous work our volunteer and paid emergency services responders do for our community, which we rely on, whether it be the CFS or MFS, Surf Life Saving or those who put themselves at the front line to protect our community.

In particular, I would like to recognise the Sturt SES Group in my community, whose members look after an area that covers approximately 320 square kilometres, and the Sturt CFS Group, comprising five brigades, including Belair, Blackwood, Cherry Gardens, Coromandel Valley and Eden Hills. These groups are made up of local volunteers who work incredibly hard to protect the people living in my electorate of Waite by attending to fires, vehicle accidents and rescues, amongst other situations.

On another note, I would like to congratulate the Coromandel Valley Country Fire Service, which celebrated its 80th birthday on 25 May. Every single volunteer past and present at the Coromandel Valley CFS has shown extraordinary dedication to their local community. It was great to be there and to present to Peter Magarey his 10-year service medal. Peter's grandfather was a founding member of the Coromandel Valley CFS when they started with an old truck and a couple of hessian bags, as the story relates, to put out fires in the orchards around Coromandel Valley at the time. It is fantastic to see that organisation still serving the community to this day.

The committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services for the 2018-19 financial year is estimated to reach \$324 million, which is higher than the \$318 million that was originally projected. The committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services is projected to be \$326 million in the 2019-20 financial year, funded in part by the \$145.8 million component through fixed property ESL payments on private land net of government-funded remissions.

The target expenditure is \$1.7 million higher than in 2018-19. The committee was told that this takes into account a \$7.6 million increase in the Community Emergency Services Fund

expenditure, including \$2.5 million of additional funding for the Department for Environment and Water for coordination of policy and planning for flood mitigation, prescribed burning on private lands, and support for bushfire response on private lands in regional areas. The additional investment in this year's ESL is just another example of how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting our regional communities, which we know is so important.

There is an additional \$1.6 million to the MFS for PFAS investigations and \$1.1 million for the CFS heavy vehicle compliance program. This includes the cost of our election commitments, which further increases emergency services expenditure. Once again, in this year's state budget there is additional money to support the CFS in terms of building replacement and asset replacement, which is so important. These costs will be funded outside of the rate-setting process to remove any impact on emergency services levy bills.

The committee notes that the remissions for general property, which were introduced in 2018-19, will continue in 2019-20, reducing the effect of ESL bills paid by property owners. These remissions will reduce 2019-20 ESL bills by \$90 million for South Australian households, consistent with this government's election commitment—and, more importantly, consistent with our approach and desire to assist families and households with cost-of-living pressures.

We saw the previous government use ESL as a cash grab to fund various pet projects and not reinvest it into our emergency services. However, we as a government are giving money back to South Australian households and at the same time we are investing additional money into emergency services, which is fantastic.

The committee notes that the government will pay \$129.5 million into the Community Emergency Services Fund in 2019-20, reflecting amounts equivalent to fixed property levy revenues forgone through remissions and pensioner concessions, in addition to contributions on its own property. The committee also notes that cash balances for the Community Emergency Services Fund are expected to be \$26.8 million by 30 June 2019.

The committee has fulfilled its obligations under the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998. I would like to thank the members of the committee for participating in the process in terms of the determination under the act. One of the most important things for the committee to note, as I said earlier, is our desire to reduce cost-of-living pressures, and that is why \$90 million a year is coming back into the pockets of South Australians through our management of this process.

I would also like to thank the departmental representatives from Treasury and Finance, the Chief Executive of SAFECOM and the chief officers of the MFS, CFS and SES who assisted the committee reporting on the Treasurer's determinations. Therefore, pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Economic and Finance Committee recommends to parliament that this report be noted.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:53): I also rise to make a contribution on this matter. As a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, a standing committee of the parliament, we once again, as is our responsibility, inquired into the emergency services levy settings for the coming 2019-20 financial year, which I note is already upon us. This current year the government is set to recover \$148 million from private property owners. That figure comes from the budget papers. This is a reduction from the last year of the former Labor government, which recovered \$213.8 million from private property holders.

It was interesting listening to the member for Waite because he claimed that the Liberal government has made good on its promise to return \$90 million in emergency services levy relief to households. The difference between these two figures, the difference between how much was raised by the former Labor government and how much is now being raised by the Liberal government, is not \$90 million. It is not even \$70 million. It is a whisker over \$65 million, so the government has not kept its election commitment at all.

In fact, it is only barely achieving two-thirds of its election commitment, which is troubling because of course we have seen in the most recent state budget more than \$100 million a year of extra fees and charges imposed on South Australian households and businesses. This welcome amount, at the time, of emergency services levy relief has been washed away in a deluge of higher fees, charges and taxes in the state budget. That is a huge disappointment to South Australian

households and businesses, and it is also an extraordinary broken promise from the Marshall Liberal government, who promised to lower costs for South Australians.

They also promised last year, of course, that they would deliver \$150 million of relief on average for households. They did not reach that figure either. For regional households the story is also not so good. The average saving outside metropolitan Adelaide is only \$73, 45 per cent of what was promised by the Liberals at the 2018 election. But the good news is that if you live in metropolitan Adelaide, and if you happen to live in a reasonably safe seat held by the Liberal government—like Unley Park, for example—you can expect much more of a saving. For a house valued at \$800,000, the ESL bill saving—

Mr DULUK: Point of order, Mr Speaker: there is no seat called Unley Park.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order, member for Waite?

Mr DULUK: The point of order is relevance, debate and if the member for Lee could just correct the record there, please.

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite, that is a bogus point of order. If you do that again you will be departing the chamber. Member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you for your protection, sir. For a house valued at \$800,000, which is in fact below par in Unley Park, the remission for people is \$270, nearly four times the amount of relief provided to regional Liberal constituencies. For a house valued at \$1 million, the relief is \$340, which of course is nearly five times the amount that major regional communities in the member for Stuart's electorate would receive. But I am pleased to report that still does not touch the sides of the maximum relief for the good burghers who live in the Liberal seat of Unley, and in the suburb of Unley Park in particular, because I am advised that the median house price in that safe Liberal seat in that particular suburb is a mere \$2.1 million.

I do not have the accurate remission figure for that, but I am assured that it is over \$500, nearly 12 times the amount of relief provided to the regional communities in the member for Stuart's electorate. Isn't it nice for the member for Unley that he has done so much better than his colleague? Unfortunately, though, there has been some cost shifting in the ESL settings for this coming financial year. We see that the Department for Environment and Water have managed to push off several million dollars of staffing costs from their agency budget onto ESL bills being paid by all South Australians.

We are also still concerned that with the exodus of senior staff that we have from the heads of emergency services, whether it is in SAFECOM, the MFS, or the SES, some of those recruitment costs may need to be borne by emergency services payers as well. We also have the curious matter of the treatment of pensioner concessions by this government, which continually changes year on year as if something needs to be hidden by the government. We have not got to the bottom of that; hopefully, the estimates process can help with that. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (YOUTH TREATMENT ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Controlled Substances (Youth Treatment Orders) Amendment Bill 2018 that I introduce into parliament today gives effect to the government's commitment to provide children and young people with drug dependency problems treatment for up to 12 months and to enable parents to legally force their children to attend drug treatment programs. Measures such as those in the bill are not proposed lightly by this government. They attempt to strike the correct balance between respecting the rights and autonomy of children and our special obligation to care for and protect children.

Under the bill, assessment, treatment and detention orders are provided as a measure of last resort, and in the case of a detention order it must be for the shortest period appropriate and be reviewed by the court at regular intervals determined by the court until the child is released from detention. The best interests of the child are the paramount consideration under the bill.

The bill amends the Controlled Substances Act 1984 to permit an application to be made to the Youth Court for a series of orders in relation to a child or young person under the age of 18 years with a drug dependency. The Youth Court is the jurisdiction in this state with specialist expertise in matters relating to persons under the age of 18 years. The bill does not establish any new criminal sanctions or impose additional penalties on children and young people who are subject to detention in a training centre. It provides the court with added scope to order medical assessment and appropriate therapeutic treatment where specialist clinicians judge this is required.

The bill is focused on a very specific group of children and young people who have refused to engage in the voluntary treatment system and who are at risk and for whom there are no other appropriate or less restrictive means available. It will complement existing voluntary treatment options, not replace them. Applicants may be family members or certain other interested persons. Applications will also be able to be made by a person prosecuting the child for an offence and by officers involved in youth corrections and child protection.

This reflects the likelihood in some cases that a child may already be before the Youth Court in relation to an offence or child protection proceedings or may be in detention in a youth training centre at the time that an application for a youth treatment order is considered appropriate. Applications will also be able to be made by a medical practitioner providing treatment to a child in relation to their use of controlled drugs.

The Youth Court itself may also make orders of its own motion if there are proceedings before the court involving the child. The bill anticipates that the court would first make an assessment order requiring a child to attend at a nominated assessment service. To make an assessment order, the court would need to be satisfied that there is a reasonable likelihood that the child is habitually using one or more controlled drugs, that the child may be a danger to himself, herself or to others and that the child has refused to voluntarily seek a relevant assessment.

In addition, the court needs to be satisfied that there is no other appropriate and less restrictive means available. The assessment service will be required to report to the applicant, the child and to the court following the assessment. Following the making of an assessment order, the court may make a treatment order requiring a child to attend a nominated treatment service.

For the court to make a treatment order, the child must have been assessed, whether pursuant to an assessment order or otherwise, as being dependent on one or more controlled drugs and the court must be satisfied that the child may be a danger to himself, herself or others, that the child has refused to voluntarily seek relevant treatment, and that no other appropriate less restrictive means is available. The treatment service will be required to report to the applicant about the child and to the court following its treatment of the child.

To provide guidance to the court, assessment services and others involved in the implementation of these reforms, the bill provides that the question of dependency on controlled drugs is to be determined by reference to diagnostic criteria for a dependent syndrome published by the World Health Organization. A chief executive of the Department for Child Protection, as the department administering the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017, must be given notice of proceedings relating to a child in his or her custody or under his or her guardianship and an opportunity to make submissions in the proceedings.

A child may be assessed or given treatment and reports provided, despite the absence or refusal of consent by the child. If the child has failed to comply with an assessment or treatment order, the court may make a detention order authorising the detention of the child for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the relevant order and must ensure that the chief executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing is notified of the making of the order.

An order made by the court is not binding on the child unless it is served personally on him or her. The court will only be able to make an assessment, treatment or detention order in relation to a person under the age of 18 years; however, an order for assessment or treatment will continue to

have effect after the child reaches the age of 18 years subject to a contrary order by the court. An order made by the court can only operate for a maximum of 12 months.

Aside from the general regulation-making power in section 63 of the act, the bill inserts specific regulation-making powers for the purpose of youth treatment orders. Regulations will be able to be made to regulate any matter relating to assessments or treatment provided pursuant to an order to make provision in relation to apprehension and detention of children subject to a detention order and to provide for reporting by assessment services and treatment services to the minister or any other person. Regulations can also be made in respect of compliance with relevant agreements, codes and charters or accredited requirements and for the operation and oversight of facilities in which children will be detained pursuant to detention orders.

Since the bill was first introduced in the other place, the government has received feedback from a number of stakeholders in the justice and health sectors. The government has taken that feedback seriously and both proposed and agreed to a number of amendments, which have both reiterated the government's original intent and improved the bill. The government supported amendments to ensure that a child will be able to have a family member or other advocate present during proceedings and will have access to government-funded legal representation and proceedings before the court and appeals from the court's decisions.

The recent budget has set aside \$1.75 million over four years for a government-funded legal representation scheme for children subject to a youth treatment order application. The bill, as amended in the other place, also contains a number of amendments, which are not supported by the government and which we do not support. The bill makes provisions of an administrative and consequential nature, including for the court proceeding in the absence of the child, for costs and for the variation or revocation of orders.

The bill imposes obligations on the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing to ensure that a child subject to a detention order receives appropriate care while so detained, including appropriate family visits, education and access to the Guardian for Children and Young People. The bill also creates annual reporting obligations.

Operationally, it is proposed to implement these reforms in two phases: firstly, in respect of children and young people already engaged with the youth justice system who have drug dependency problems and, subsequently, to other children in the community. The effective implementation of this legislative reform will require close consultation with and collaboration between health, child protection and justice agencies in the private and public sector. An interagency working group has been established by SA Health to consider the most effective youth treatment orders model to support parents, families and young people in accessing timely and effective treatment and to provide comprehensive advice to government, including on the budget and resourcing necessary to implement this commitment.

To determine the impact and effectiveness of the new legislation on young people, their families and health and justice systems, there will be a statutory review of the operation of the new legislation three years after its commencement. I commend the bill to members 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

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Controlled Substances Act 1984

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *treatment service* for the purposes of new Part 7A and makes a consequential amendment.

5—Repeal of section 35

This clause deletes section 35 as a new provision on accreditation of drug assessment and treatment services is being inserted in Part 8.

6—Amendment of section 38—Undertakings

This clause is consequential to the new definition of treatment service.

7—Insertion of Part 7A

This clause inserts a new Part 7A as follows:

Part 7A—Youth treatment orders

54—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions for proposed new Part 7A.

54A—Best interests of child are paramount consideration

The best interests of the child are the paramount consideration in the administration, operation and enforcement of the Part.

54B—Orders that may be made under this Part

This clause empowers the Youth Court of South Australia to make an order requiring a child to attend a nominated assessment service (an *assessment order*) or treatment service (a *treatment order*). The Court may also make detention orders to ensure compliance with an assessment or treatment order. Such orders may not operate for longer than 12 months and, until the prescribed day, a detention order may only be made in relation to a child who is detained in a training centre. Detention orders must be reviewed by the Court at regular intervals determined by the Court.

54C—Application for order

This clause allows the Court to make an order of its own motion or on application by a person of a listed class.

54D—Making of orders

This clause outlines the factors that the Court must be satisfied of before making an assessment or treatment order. This clause also provides that the Court may make a detention order in certain circumstances if the child is non-compliant with an assessment or treatment order. The clause empowers the Court to request information from the Department and requires the Court, before making an order in relation to a child who is in the custody, or under the guardianship, of the Chief Executive of the administrative unit of the Public Service responsible for assisting a Minister in the administration of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*, to ensure that Chief Executive has been given notice of the proceedings and has been given an opportunity to make submissions in the proceedings.

54E—Proceedings in the absence of child

Generally, in proceedings under the Part, the child will be a party to the proceedings and must be assisted or represented in the proceedings by a family member or advocate. This clause however empowers the Court to make an order under the Part in the absence of the child, or a representative of the child, in circumstances of urgency or where the child has been summoned and failed to appear or has refused to participate. In the case of an order made on the basis of urgency, the order will be an interim order and the Court must then summon the child to appear to show cause why the order should not be confirmed as a final order. The date for the hearing to which the child is summoned must be within 7 days of the date of the order. Evidence may be given by affidavit, but the deponent must make themselves available to give oral evidence if the child so requires. The Court may adjourn the hearing, for a period of usually not longer than 7 days. Another judicial officer may constitute the Court at the adjourned hearing. At the hearing, the Court may confirm or amend the order.

54F—Variation or revocation of order

This clause empowers the Court to vary or revoke an order of its own motion or on application by the persons set out at clause 54C. An application may also be made by the child with the permission of the Court, which may only be granted in the event of a substantial change in circumstances. The Court must allow all parties to be heard.

54G—Service

This clause provides that an order must be personally served on the child, and is not binding until so served. The same holds true for any confirmation of an order in amended form or any variation of an order. A copy of an order served on a child must be accompanied by a statement of legal and other rights. The clause also provides that an assessment or treatment order must be given to the assessment or treatment service nominated in the order and the applicant for the order must, on request, provide a copy of the order to a medical practitioner treating the child or a family member or advocate.

54H—Effect of order

This clause provides that, in accordance with the Part, a child may, in the absence or refusal of their consent, be assessed or be given treatment, and reports may be provided. A child to whom a treatment order applies may, in addition to being given treatment for dependency on controlled drugs, be treated (in accordance with the *Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995*) for any other condition or illness of a kind authorised by an examining medical practitioner. The clause also provides that treatment under the clause is limited by the regulations.

54I—Detention

A detention order does not authorise the detention of a child in a place other than an assessment service or a treatment service (unless the child is otherwise detained in a training centre).

54J—Treatment may continue after 18th birthday

This clause provides for the continuance of assessment or treatment after the person reaches 18 years of age, if the Court did not specify that an order was to expire on the person reaching 18 years of age.

54K—Costs of assessment or treatment

This clause gives the Court a discretion to make orders in relation to the costs of any assessment, treatment, or report. However the Court cannot make an order requiring payment of such costs by the child or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown. A person subject to an order for payment of costs may apply for variation or revocation of the order.

54L—Special provisions relating to detention of children

This clause imposes various duties on the Chief Executive of the Department in relation to children that are subject to a detention order and provides for monitoring by the Guardian for Children and Young People.

54M—Legal representation

This clause provides for the development of a scheme for the legal representation of children in proceedings under the Part (or appeals relating to the proceedings).

54N—Regulations

This clause provides that the regulations may regulate any matter relating to assessment, treatment, detention, and reporting. This clause does not derogate from the general regulation making power in section 63 of the Act.

54O—Reports

This clause requires certain information to be included in the annual report of the department.

54P—Review of Part

This clause provides for a review and report to be completed after the third, but before the fourth, anniversary of the commencement of the clause. A copy of the report must be laid before both Houses of Parliament within six sitting days.

8—Insertion of section 56A

This clause inserts a section (as a replacement for the current section 35 which relates to simple possession offences) allowing for accreditation by the Minister of drug assessment services or drug treatment services.

9—Amendment of section 63—Regulations

This clause makes consequential changes to the regulation making power.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

The Schedule preserves accreditations in force under section 35 of the *Controlled Substances Act 1984* immediately before the commencement of clause 8.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

HEALTH CARE (GOVERNANCE) (NO 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(12:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I rise to introduce the Health Care (Governance) (No 2) Amendment Bill 2019 into parliament. In July last year, the parliament considered amendments to the Health Care Act 2008 to establish governing boards for the local health networks. These governing boards will be responsible for the delivery of local health services within their geographic areas. Governing boards will consult with local service providers and the community to ensure that the services provided are reflective of local needs and priorities and are able to be provided within the resources available.

Governing boards will be required to operate within a clinical governance framework to ensure that these services are safe, high quality and accessible. The governing boards will also be responsible for the oversight of local health network budgets. The governing boards will appoint their chief executive officers, who will be responsible for managing the operations and affairs of the local health network services and will be accountable to and subject to the direction of the governing boards. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The governing board will be accountable to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing for the oversight of the delivery of health services in accordance with a service agreement negotiated between the local health network and the Department for Health and Wellbeing. The governing boards will also be required to comply with any policy frameworks issued by the department and any directions given by the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

The governing boards, through the annual report for the local health network will demonstrate their progress against the key performance indicators outlined in the service agreement and what measures they have instituted for to ensure the engagement of communities and health professionals in service delivery.

This earlier bill was the first stage of the government delivering on its election commitment to devolve decision making in the public health system to the local level. This will ensure that decisions are made as close as possible to the area and people affected, and with the full and effective involvement of local health professionals.

Following the passage of the Bill, chairpersons for the ten governing boards were appointed. Members for the transitional governing boards were appointed on 28 March 2019, resulting in a high calibre of individuals to assume responsibility for the oversight of the local health networks from 1 July 2019.

Since their appointment the board chairpersons have been working with the Department for Health and Wellbeing on the governance and accountability framework for the public health system, resulting in the bill before Parliament today.

This bill amends the *Health Care Act 2008* to:

- revise the functions of the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing
- include provisions for service agreements between the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing and the Local Health Networks and the SA Ambulance Service
- make provisions for the annual reporting and transfer of assets for the metropolitan governing councils that will be dissolved on 1 July 2019, and
- make minor amendments to sections of the Act to reflect the new governance and accountability framework for the public health system or clarify their intent.

I will now address the key amendments outlined in the bill. For those minor amendments will I outline the policy intent for the benefit of members in Committee.

The Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing is currently responsible for the administration of the public health system. The public health system is too large and complex for all authority and accountability to rest on one person to manage an expenditure budget of more than \$6 billion, approximately 32,100 full-time equivalents and around 77 hospitals and health services across the State. But this is the situation since the former Labor government abolished hospital boards in 2008.

With the governing boards now being responsible for the oversight of local health services in their geographic area the role of the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing will change to focus on the strategic direction and performance of the public health system. This is outlined in the new functions proposed for the Chief Executive of the department as the system manager of the public health system.

Inherent in this role is the ability of the Chief Executive to enter into service agreements with the Local Health Networks that will outline performance measures and operational targets for the provision of health services. The Chief Executive will be able to take remedial action or issue directions where these measures or targets are not met.

The ability of the Chief Executive to issue statewide service plans will also contribute to the governance of the public health system and serve as a means of achieving integration and coordination across the system.

The amendments proposed to the role of the Chief Executive will ensure that their role, and that of the governing board and the Chief Executive Officer of the Local Health Network, is clear to avoid duplication or omission.

The bill formalises the service agreements between the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing and the Local Health Networks. Service agreements have been in place through administrative arrangements for a number of years. However, as the governing boards will now be required to manage the performance of their Local Health Network against the performance measures in the service agreement it is proposed to formalise these arrangements. The service level agreements will be made available to the public providing transparency in how the local health network will be funded and managed. This will bring South Australia in line with other jurisdictions.

The governing boards will be accountable to the minister for monitoring the performance of their LHN. The boards also have legislative obligations to develop and publish both clinician and consumer and community engagement strategies. Requirements for the development of these strategies include consultation and anything prescribed by regulation. It is anticipated that the effectiveness of these strategies will be subject to scrutiny from the local communities invested in their development and at each new level of governance within the public health system.

The role of the department will also change under the new governance arrangements. This will be done via a robust and transparent performance framework through the service agreements. The Chief Executive will no longer have direct accountability and responsibility for the overall management, administration, and provision of public health services. The Chief Executive will instead play a role in monitoring the performance of those who are accountable for the delivery of services. The Chief Executive's functions will include overseeing, monitoring and promoting improvements in the safety and quality of health services; monitoring performance; and receiving and evaluating performance and other data in relation to the whole of the public health system.

The bill proposes to dissolve the metropolitan governing councils (which were set up as Health Advisory Councils under the *Health Care Act 2008*) that were created for each of the metropolitan LHNs. These councils previously acted in an advisory role for the LHN and their role will subsumed within the role of the governing boards from 1 July 2019.

There will be no change to any other Health Advisory Council established under the *Health Care Act 2008*.

The bill is the fulfilment of a clear commitment of the Marshall Liberal government to decentralise the public health system. Establishing governing boards provides the opportunity to establish local accountability, responsibility and decision making for local health services closer to where they are delivered. This will achieve better health decisions tailored to local needs and deliver a safe, high quality and financially sustainable health system into the future.

This government looks forward to working with communities, clinicians and stakeholders to deliver strengthened governance and better health services for all South Australians.

I commend the bill to members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Health Care Act 2008*

4—Amendment of section 5—Principles

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act to make provision for health services to be provided as part of an integrated system that is inclusive of primary health care networks, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health services and public health services provided in local government, aged care and disability sectors.

5—Amendment of section 7—Chief Executive

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act to substitute a number of the Chief Executive's functions.

6—Insertion of Part 3

This clause inserts Part 3, which establishes the office of the Mental Health Commissioner.

7—Insertion of Part 4A

This clause inserts Part 4A, which establishes a requirement for each incorporated hospital and SAAS to enter into a service agreement with the Chief Executive in relation to the provision of health services.

Part 4A—Service agreements

28A—Preliminary

28B—Service agreement with Chief Executive

28C—General provisions about service agreements

8—Amendment of section 29—Incorporation

This clause inserts proposed subsection (7) and (8) into section 29 of the principal Act to enable the Minister to transfer an asset, right or liability acquired by the Minister under subsection (6) of the principal Act to any of the entities listed in inserted subsection (7)(a) to (d).

9—Amendment of section 33—Governance and management arrangements

This clause amends section 33 of the principal Act (as inserted by the *Health Care (Governance) Amendment Act 2018*) to broaden the functions of a governing board of an incorporated hospital.

10—Amendment of section 33A—Engagement strategies

This clause amends section 33A of the principal Act (as inserted by the *Health Care (Governance) Amendment Act 2018*) to provide for 3 yearly reviews of a strategy that the governing board of an incorporated hospital must develop.

11—Amendment of section 33B—Composition of governing boards for incorporated hospitals

This clause amends section 33B of the principal Act (as inserted by the *Health Care (Governance) Amendment Act 2018*) to alter the cases in which a person is not eligible for appointment to the governing board for an incorporated hospital.

12—Amendment of section 33E—Chief executive officer for incorporated hospital

This clause amends section 33E (as inserted by the *Health Care (Governance) Amendment Act 2018*) to provide that the governing board of an incorporated hospital cannot give a direction concerning the clinical treatment of a particular person.

13—Amendment of section 34—Employed staff

This clause inserts subsection (8a) to provide that no direction may be given by the governing board of the incorporated hospital to the chief executive officer relating to the appointment, transfer, remuneration, discipline or termination of a particular person if the CEO of an incorporated hospital is designated as an employing authority or a power or function of an employing authority is delegated to the CEO of an incorporated hospital.

14—Amendment of section 50—Management arrangements

This clause amends section 50(4) to provide that the CE cannot give a direction concerning the clinical treatment of a particular person.

15—Amendment of section 78—Testamentary gifts and trusts

This clause amends section 78 in relation to preserving the intention of testators in respect of the distribution of testamentary gifts to prescribed entities that have been dissolved.

16—Amendment of section 93—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 93 to make it clear that any obligation about confidentiality does not prevent a person from disclosing information in connection with the management or administration of the Department as well as a hospital or SAAS.

17—Repeal of section 101

This clause deletes section 101.

18—Amendment of Schedule 3—Governing boards for incorporated hospitals

This clause amends Schedule 3 of the principal Act (as inserted by the *Health Care (Governance) Amendment Act 2018*) to make changes to provisions concerning the governing boards for incorporated hospitals.

19—Insertion of Schedule 3A

This clause inserts Schedule 3A, which provides for the dissolution of the Health Advisory Councils listed in Schedule 3A, clause 2.

Schedule 3A—Dissolution of Health Advisory Councils

20—Amendment of Schedule 4—Transitional provisions

This clause amends Schedule 4 to dissolve the HPC and to provide for any related transitional arrangements on the dissolution of the HPC.

41A—Health Performance Council dissolution

Schedule 1—Related amendments to *Mental Health Act 2009*

1—Amendment of section 106—Confidentiality and disclosure of information

This clause makes related amendments to the confidentiality provision of the *Mental Health Act 2009*.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (12:12): I rise as the lead speaker for the opposition in relation to the Health Care (Governance) (No 2) Amendment Bill 2019. The Liberal Party did not have much of a plan for health when they came to office, but one element that they did promise was to set up boards. That was pretty much the—

Ms Cook: The *Back to the Future* plan.

Mr PICTON: That is right. As the member for Hurtle Vale says, it was the *Back to the Future* plan for the health system. It was about the long and the short of their proposals in the healthcare system. As members would know, and as the member for Hurtle Vale alluded to, we have had boards in South Australia for a great deal of time. Each hospital used to have a board that provided oversight. We then had a health commission, then, obviously, the health minister. Then, during the Brown and Olsen governments, regional health boards were put in place over the top of those country hospitals.

We had local hospital boards, we had regional hospital boards and then we had a central health department and health minister. Didn't that work an absolute treat? No-one knew who was running things. It was a complete circus. We took quite a lot of action to try to reform the governance arrangements for the healthcare system during our last time in government. We introduced this act that is being amended, the Health Care Act 2008, following a very lengthy period of consultation regarding how our healthcare services should be organised in South Australia.

The focus really was on making sure that we had an integrated healthcare system, that we had the appropriate checks and balances and that we had a healthcare system that was accountable to the parliament as well, where the health minister is ultimately responsible for the delivery, via the chief executive, of health services across the state.

The Liberal Party's proposal is to rip that up and put in place boards, except they are not ripping up the entire system; they are creating this sort of hybrid model where boards are responsible for some things but the chief executive is responsible for some things. In many ways, being on one of these health boards is going to be quite an unenviable position because you do not set your budget, you do not set your staffing, you have to be lumped with whatever the Treasurer sets for you, you do not set your performance targets, you do not set your enterprise bargaining arrangements and you do not set your performance agreement.

Really, you are supposedly responsible for the delivery of health services in your area, but everything is tied up for you. When things go wrong, you will be to blame, but you do not actually have the power to address any of the fundamental causes that are leading to that. If the issue is that there is not enough funding going to a particular service, you do not have the power to do anything about that. If the issue is something to do with the staffing arrangements, the boards are specifically precluded from having anything to do with staffing arrangements except for one person, the chief executive, and these boards are completely subject to the directions of the Chief Executive of

SA Health. It is sort of the Clayton's version of having health boards in South Australia that the government is setting up.

You might think, 'This will be a cheap sort of affair,' but, no, this is still a very expensive proposition. The government did not talk about the cost of doing this when they promised it. No costing was attached to it back then, but now we know what the cost is going to be because the government has had to outline that in their budget. The cost is some \$15 million over four years. In this year, 2018-19, \$2.3 million is going to this, then it rises to \$3.6 million every year. That is not paying for extra doctors, it is not paying for extra nurses and it is not paying for extra surgery operations. This is paying directors' fees and bureaucrats. An extra level of bureaucracy throughout the health system is what this government is paying for.

People thought that they were electing a government that was going to invest more into health, but here we see more being invested into bureaucracy and directors' fees. Imagine what you could do with that \$15 million spent elsewhere in the system.

Ms Cook: Gayle's Law.

Mr PICTON: That is right. The member for Hurtle Vale recollects our discussion this morning about Gayle's Law and remote area nursing. Imagine what \$15 million could do in the remote areas of our state to improve health care for people in those areas.

This is a very expensive proposition. That \$15 million only accounts for some of the bureaucrats and the directors' fees. We know that this is leading to a massive duplication of staff that is happening right now because these health board arrangements were implemented at the start of this week. They came in from 1 July. What the government is proposing in this bill is not to set up health boards because they are now in place. This is their 'fix things up' bill because they did not get things right the first time. They are trying to rush this through the parliament to fix up what they think were their mistakes the first time.

We have these health boards running at the moment, but the government has decided it did not actually like the legislation it passed only a few months ago; hence, this is the No. 2 bill to go around and try to address all the issues that they did not think of or they stuffed up the first time. We know that one of the reasons for that was that the government basically did zero consultation on their first bill. They did not talk to key stakeholders, they did not talk to clinicians, they did not talk to people affected in the health system and they did not talk to health experts. In fact, the first time that many key organisations heard about the legislation from the health minister was when I sent it to them.

An honourable member: Oops!

Mr PICTON: Oops! I sent it out saying, 'This legislation has been introduced into the parliament. I am seeking your feedback on the government's bill.' When you do that, you usually expect that those organisations have been involved in the process, understand what will be in it and could probably copy and paste exactly what they have already sent to the government as part of the consultation process. But that did not happen in this case because the government did not talk to any of those organisations before they introduced the legislation. I seem to recall that this was part of their 100-day plan, the ill-fated 100-day plan with so many broken promises as part of it.

So they rushed this bill in to the parliament to meet that 100-day plan but they did not actually consult with people in the lead-up to it. They did not understand the implications of it and they are trying now to fix things up here. When we were talking to the government, when that bill was first being debated, so many things were being said such as, 'We do not need to worry about that now. This is just phase 1. That is a phase 2 issue. Don't worry about that until phase 2.' So even some very important conceptual issues about where organisations were going to fit, who they would be responsible to, how lines of responsibility would fit across the health system were all phase 2.

Now that we have this phase 2 piece of legislation, there are still so many questions open that the government is saying, 'These are phase 3 issues. We will work these out later. We will put these out down the track.' The truth of the matter is that the government is really playing catch-up with how this is actually going to work. They do not really understand how this is going to work. It is going to be a muddle for the health system for some time. It is going to be enormously disruptive.

Nowhere is this going to be more disruptive than in country South Australia. Country South Australia, for over the past 10 years, has been working together as one country health system. We have had local representation of people through health advisory councils. They have been advocating for people at their local level. But we have had a central approach to make sure that key aspects such as the safety and quality of care, financial controls, contracting controls, procurement controls and service planning will make sure that those country hospitals get the support they need to do all those things.

What we are seeing now is that this is all being split up. The government has drawn some lines on the maps and said, 'We are going to split up country South Australia into six boxes.' These six boxes will all operate supposedly independently. They will all have supposedly independent control of their health services. That is, except for a few things. One is they do not have any local ability to do that work. They have not given those boards and those new health services any extra resources to do that.

Only recently, I was speaking to a senior health official in one of those local health networks who was saying, 'This is a complete mess because we have been given all this extra work to do. We have no extra staff to do it, with no extra support to do it, but now we are responsible for a whole range of other things when we actually want to get on with the care of patients, which is what we are there to do.' But now all this extra bureaucracy is landing on their shoulders.

At the same time, the government says, 'We are decentralising everything. Everything is going to be great because everything is going to go out to the communities and the communities are going to run their health services.' But what they have not been so keen to promote is the fact that not mentioned anywhere in this legislation is that they are setting up this bizarre body called a rural support service.

This rural support service is quite interesting because it is going to sit under the auspices of the Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network and it is going to encompass some 219 bureaucrats, who left work on Friday working for Country Health SA in an office tower in the city, and when they went to work on Monday they were working for the rural support service. They have pretty much just changed the badge.

There is no devolution of those staff out to the communities. They are still operating in a centralised way, but the legal responsibility is being decentralised out to those communities. Those 219 people are in the city. We asked the minister about this the other day and he said, 'No, this rural support service is going to be headquartered in Nuriootpa.' We asked how many staff will be working in the Nuriootpa headquarters of the rural support service, and he could not answer that. He did not know that. I suspect that maybe 218 out of those 219 staff are working in the Adelaide CBD, and none of them have been forced to move to Nuriootpa or anywhere else in South Australia.

Earlier this week, I sent a request to the minister to visit the supposed headquarters of the rural support service at Nuriootpa. If it has 200 people working there, it must be one of the largest employers in the town. It would be a very big boost to the employment of Nuriootpa to have an extra 200 staff working there. I would imagine there must be a multistorey office building that has been built in Nuriootpa to contain these hundreds of staff who are working there, providing these centralised services for country South Australians.

You will be shocked to know that we have not had a response. There is no response yet to my request to visit there, which is pretty standard practice from the health minister, the Hon. Stephen Wade, who takes his good time to respond to requests from the opposition to visit health sites or to get briefings. Coming up, I am visiting the Murray Bridge hospital in the member for Hammond's electorate, which I requested to visit about six months ago.

That is the length of time and planning that we need to go through the bureaucratic rigmarole from the opposition to be able to visit and speak with country health sites. Obviously, I cannot just go there. There are protocols that the minister has in place to ensure that I cannot go there without his permission, so we need to go through this bureaucratic rigmarole through his office to get that.

Basically, we have this con being perpetuated on the people of country South Australia where the government is saying, 'We are devolving things to you. Everything is going to be great, except

all those central staff are all staying central in Adelaide, and we are also going to give the staff who are in those country locations more work and more responsibility with no extra resources.' Then, at the same time, we find out in the state budget that those same health services, that have now been split up into six for the first time, are having their staff reduced. Over two dozen staff across country locations in the state budget are to go. They have extra work to do, but they are going to have fewer staff to do it.

The minister is saying they are not targets: they are estimates. What a strawman argument. Yes, they are estimates. They are estimates of what you are saying you are going to reduce the staff by. They are what you have estimated you are going to reduce the staff by this year.

Ms Cook: Estimated targets.

Mr PICTON: Estimated targets. They have estimated across SA Health that they are going to reduce the staff by 1,140, which is massive. This would be the biggest reduction in health staff in the history of our state. At a time when we know the massive pressure that is on our hospitals, taking out that many health staff is incredible. They have to do this if they are going to meet the substantial projections for their budget savings targets that are baked into the budget over the next three years. They are basically suggesting in their budget that they are not going to increase health spending over the next three years. They are going to freeze health spending for three years even though we know the demand, the price, and the pressure on health services is going up and up and up. There will be no extra money to deal with that.

In real terms, it is going to be a significant cut. In health, two-thirds of every dollar that you spend in the health system goes on the health staff, so you cannot make significant cuts to the health budget without cutting staff in the health portfolio. That is why they have had to estimate that they are going to reduce 1,100 staff this year. That is an outrageous estimate and it shows how much worse things potentially could be over the next short while in this health system.

There are a few good things that have been put into this bill that were not there before, and there are a few bad things that were in it that have been taken out. For that, we have to say thank you to our colleagues in the other place. It will be interesting to see what the government's approach to that is. I understand that they have filed, so far, no amendments to this legislation, but it will be interesting to see whether they sneak some in at the last minute.

There are some very important things in this legislation now, first and foremost of which is to protect the position of the Mental Health Commissioner of South Australia, a position that we established a few years ago. This was a position that we committed to and established when we were in government. We appointed Chris Burns, who has done an incredible job and has been highly respected by the community. You cannot speak to anybody in mental health who has anything bad to say about him. In fact, I was delighted to attend a recent function hosted by the Mental Health Commissioner with people in the sports arena.

The issue of mental health in sports and recreation is an emerging issue. The Mental Health Commissioner worked with Sports SA to bring together a whole range of stakeholders and experts to look at how to improve things. I was there, the member for Reynell was there and the member for Waite was also there, and he gave what I thought was a really good speech in which he endorsed the Mental Health Commissioner of South Australia, Chris Burns, and the excellent work that he is doing.

Sadly, the health minister was not listening to that great contribution from the member for Waite. It pains me when people do not listen to the member for Waite's contributions. Sadly, the health minister was not listening because only a few days after the speech by the member for Waite, endorsing Chris Burns' role as the Mental Health Commissioner, the health minister basically put Chris Burns on the chopping block.

Ms Cook: He got the scissors out.

Mr PICTON: He got the scissors out. What the government is proposing to do with the Mental Health Commissioner is to reopen the position. So Chris Burns is out—just as we have seen with other positions under this government, such as the victims' rights commissioner, Michael O'Connell. Do you remember what happened to him?

Ms Cook: Yes—scissors.

Mr PICTON: Yes—out. The DPP, similar—out. We are now seeing that happen to the Mental Health Commissioner as well. The position will be reopened for whoever the Liberal Party deems appropriate for that position.

The Mental Health Commission was established as an independent office and was one of the executive service appointments of the government. It is one of the top bureaucrats of the government who has a contract with the Premier. It was established with its own office, its own resources and its own ability to work independently of the health department. What this minister is proposing to do now is gut the commission. He is proposing to keep a commissioner, but not this commissioner, but stick them inside the health department.

The government is proposing, as part of their changes, to corral together a whole bunch of bureaucrats, who have been doing a whole bunch of work on programs for many years, and give them a new name. They are going to call these bureaucrats Wellbeing SA. There is not going to be any extra money going in there. It is just going to be the same bureaucrats doing the same things under a different name. They are now going to stick the Mental Health Commissioner and his budget into that Wellbeing SA.

There will not be an independent office of the Mental Health Commissioner under the minister's proposal. There will not be independent staff for the Mental Health Commissioner to undertake the valuable work that he has been doing. There will not be independence for him at that higher level of the Public Service anymore. Whoever will be appointed by the Liberal Party to replace him, after they get rid of him, will be just stuck in the department and subject to departmental instructions.

What we propose, and what the other place has seen fit to include in this legislation, is to enshrine the Mental Health Commissioner in legislation as a statutory appointment, with statutory roles and independence and a report to parliament. I think that is a very worthy part of this legislation. I hope the government does not seek to withdraw that part of the legislation through last-minute amendments they may seek to find. I hope that remains in this legislation after it has left this house. That is going to be very important.

You only have to speak to many stakeholders in mental health, you only have to speak to people with lived experience of mental health conditions, to know the dramatic importance of this position and the huge amount of work that Chris Burns and his team have been doing since they were appointed. So that is really important.

How did this all come about, where the government decided to gut this position? They secretly established a review of mental health governance in South Australia. They did not tell anybody they were doing this. They did not announce they were doing it. They appointed a Victorian firm to do this work and they only released the report months after they received it. Very interestingly, the report outlined who the government consulted with as part of this. They had consulted with no outside stakeholders whatsoever. Everybody in South Australia they consulted with was in the health department or within the government of South Australia. That is hardly a consultation at all.

If I were conducting a consultation by talking to just the member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Enfield I could rightly be criticised that that was not a broad consultation, even though I am sure they would have very worthy views—

Ms Cook interjecting:

Mr PICTON: —very effective views to add. This was the worst possible example of consultation.

Then the government doubled-down on it. They said, 'We're releasing this report. We are releasing our response to this report endorsing the recommendations, but now were going to have some consultation publicly.' They held what is now being talked about—and what I am sure will be talked about for many years—as one of the worst consultation exercises that has ever happened in this state.

They brought together all these people who were very angered by what had happened, and I understand that the department deputy chief executive, who was in charge of this, came to give a short presentation to say, 'Well, this is what's happening.' Then he left. He was not actually interested in hearing what people had to say about the proposal and not actually interested in discussing it with them or exchanging views about it. He just wanted to say what was happening and then leave. That is not a consultation at all, and it has been significantly criticised by everybody who works in this space in South Australia because of how poor it was.

So here is a chance in this legislation, even though it is a relatively poor piece of legislation and a poor proposal. There is one good element here, and that is to establish the Mental Health Commissioner as a statutory body. I hope it stays in the legislation, I hope that is a way in which this legislation can be improved.

I mentioned before that there were some bad things in this legislation that were taken out by the other place. Again, it will be interesting to see whether the government defies what the other place has said and tries to reintroduce those things. First and foremost of those was that in the Health Care Act 2008 one of the central elements was to establish the Health Performance Council. The Health Performance Council is to sit atop the entire health system in South Australia; not just running hospitals, not just running state services, but to look at how healthy is our population, to look at are we doing everything we possibly can in Aboriginal health. Are we doing everything we possibly can for chronic disease management? Are we learning everything we possibly can from evidence from around the world?

An independent body providing advice to both the minister and the parliament, looking at our biggest area of expenditure in the state budget, there was no mention before the election that the Liberal Party proposed to abolish the Health Performance Council. There was absolutely no mention of that whatsoever. Also, there was no mention of that in the first bill we had months ago. There was no mention of that whatsoever. It has only come to this second bill, where they have tried to abolish the Health Performance Council and not have that independent oversight, not have that reporting to parliament anymore.

The government's line is, 'We don't need this anymore because we are going to have these boards and we're going to have the commission on'—I forget if it is the innovation and excellence or excellence and innovation, but we are going to have this commission. Well, this commission does not appear anywhere in this legislation. This commission is a commission in name only. It is basically going to be an office in the department because it is not going to have any independence and it is not going to have any ability to report to the parliament independently. It is going to be at the whim of the health department, and it is not going to have any transparency about what it is going to be doing.

I am yet to meet anybody who understands exactly what the commission for excellence and innovation or innovation and excellence is going to be doing. I have spoken to a number of people who are very concerned about it in the name of—well, this just looks like it is going to be a new version of a clinical centre; whereas in health I think it is important that we listen to doctors but that we also listen to a whole range of other health practitioners. There were a number of speeches yesterday in this house about nurses and the great role they play in our health system. They are, of course, the largest workforce we have in health—

Ms Cook: Huge—30,000.

Mr PICTON: —30,000 the member for Hurtle Vale says—and we need to be listening to them, too. We need to be listening to experts as well. This needs to be a very broad commission, but there is no idea, there is no proposal, there is no outline for the parliament, of how this is going to work because they are not proposing to put it in legislation at all. It is just going to sit in the department with no independence.

The government proposed to the parliament, 'We are going to take away this independent body that provides advice to you, to the parliament and to the people of South Australia. We are going to replace it with this body, but we're not really sure what it's going to do. We can't really tell you anything about it, and it's not going to have independence and it's not going to report to you.' Quite rightly, the upper house, the other place, rejected that proposal, rejected the proposal of

abolishing such a body, and amended the bill to take out those provisions. I hope that the Minister for Energy and Mining will not be reintroducing those provisions because I think that is the wrong move. I suspect that the other place will insist upon its amendments and that the government will further delay the passage of their legislation.

One of the other very significant things in this legislation is that the government is seeking to wind back what the minister himself had put in the legislation in terms of conflict of interest provisions. Even though, as I said, this is the Clayton's version of having boards, various health boards will still be signing contracts under this legislation. If you look at the city boards, for example, they will be signing contracts worth many, many millions of dollars. The budget for the Central Adelaide Local Health Network is some \$2.2 billion or \$2.3 billion of expenditure.

This is big money we are talking about. These boards will, technically at least, have control over more health expenditure than any other boards of any kind in the state government, let alone that most departments would love to have as much money as the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. We need to be absolutely robustly sure that we have provisions in place that protect taxpayers in terms of how those boards operate and the people who are on them and declaring any potential conflicts of interest that might arise.

When the first bill came through the parliament, the Hon. Kyam Maher, from the other place, and I proposed a series of amendments to try to improve that act and to try to make sure that we could have better disclosure of interests. We looked at what happens in parliament, what happens in local government and we proposed: why should the Central Adelaide Local Health Network board, with billions of dollars of expenditure, have less disclosure requirements than the Walkerville council, the City of Adelaide or the Onkaparinga council?

Why should councils with vastly less expenditure have less disclosure requirements? We were not successful in our pursuit of that because the minister himself brought in his own suggestions, his own requirements, to improve the bill and to undertake a better disclosure regime. Ultimately, his amendments were successful and they were incorporated into the legislation. Somewhere between that first bill passing and this second bill coming to the other place and now this place, the government has had an about face on the minister's own proposals.

The government has decided that they want to wind back the oversight, transparency and protections and make sure that they have less oversight, transparency and protections in place. There are a couple of fundamental ways in which they are doing that. One is about the potential conflicts and engagements that a person might have between their role on a board and other pursuits that they have.

I understand that in some ways this can be a difficult issue because you do want to make sure that people who might have a very tangential connection to health services are not precluded from being on the board. But, at the same time, what the government is proposing is that you could be on the board of a private pathology company and on the board of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, which, as the government has foreshadowed, may well soon be embarking upon a privatisation of that pathology.

How can that work? How is that good value for taxpayers? How is that providing us with the level of protection that we need in terms of people's interests? It does not. It is ludicrous. Already the government foreshadowed in one of our briefings that they think one board member has already fallen foul of this. I think an important question is: did the government remove that board member before the original legislation, with the original protections that the minister put in place, came into being on 1 July, or is that board member sitting on a board in breach of the legislation, in breach of the law of this state? That is a very interesting question that we will be examining when we get to the committee stage.

The other particular issue the government has been seeking to change is about the disclosure of conflicts of interest. Under the minister's proposal, which we got him to the first time around, if you had a conflict of interest you would declare it on a register and you would declare in the minutes of a meeting where that conflict had arisen. That seems very sensible; that seems entirely appropriate, particularly when we are dealing with billions of dollars of health expenditure.

What the government is seeking to do now is remove the second arm of that. The government is seeking to say: 'You should only have to declare your conflicts of interest in a central register. You should not have to declare those conflicts of interest in the minutes of the meeting.' For instance, the Central Adelaide Local Health Network starts a discussion about the privatisation of SA Pathology, which supposedly falls within its gamut and, for example, there is a board member on that board who owns shares in a pathology company.

I think it would be appropriate that that should be disclosed in the minutes so we can see the clear connection between that shareholding and the item that was discussed because that is not always going to be apparent. It might not be apparent in terms of the employment arrangements or the shareholdings or the interest that a person has just by looking at the register to see where those issues have arisen in the meetings and to see how they have been dealt with and appropriately looked after to make sure that taxpayers are protected in those meetings.

I have a very strong view that this needs to be altered. If the minister's proposal prevails on this, it is a real step backwards for the disclosure of conflicts of interest. I think what is being proposed defies common sense. These are public dollars. These are public institutions. This is not a private business and the public have a right to know, when those conflicts arose, why people were conflicted and what was done about them in terms of the management of that at the board level.

It is absolutely important that that disclosure takes place, and we know it is important because the minister himself said it was important by putting it in the original piece of legislation. So why has he now proposed pulling that out of the legislation and walking backwards from his own protections that he sought to put in place? We wanted to go even further than he was, but now he is walking back from the original protections that he himself proposed.

I think that when you look at our health system at the moment there are some significant concerns around how it is being managed in terms of conflicts and in terms of business arrangements, and you have to look no further than what is going on with corporate liquidators at the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. This is a really unprecedented move by the government.

We now know the full history of this. KordaMentha originally did a project for the government for which they did not have to go to public tender. They did not have to do any negotiations with any other bodies. The government did not ask anybody else for a quote on this work. They just went to KordaMentha and said, 'Can you do this work for us for \$1 million?' That appears to be a clear breach of the State Procurement Board guidelines—a clear breach. Anything of that magnitude of money should be going to a competitive process because this is taxpayers' money that we are talking about.

Lo and behold, who would have thought that, following KordaMentha's original report, they would have said, 'What you really need to do, government, is appoint some outside financial experts who can come in and administer the place.' The government said, 'That's a good idea,' and then KordaMentha said, 'We are the people who can do that work for you.' Lo and behold, when that work went to tender, KordaMentha were in the box seat to win that work.

Ms Cook: Bingo!

Mr PICTON: Bingo, as the member for Hurtle Vale says. This project so far has cost taxpayers over \$23 million, which is a massive amount of money. We have the \$15 million that is being spent on board members. We have the \$23 million that is being spent on KordaMentha, and that only takes us up to a few months' time. After that, if this contract continues, then it looks likely that the scales could tip somewhere between \$40 million and \$50 million going to this firm.

Let's run through this. This firm has no prior experience in running hospitals. They have never done that. They have no-one in Adelaide. I think they might have just hired one person, but their entire team is a fly-in fly-out team from Melbourne and Sydney. The only economic benefit that South Australia is getting out of this is taxis and hotel rooms because all of that money is going interstate.

The South Australian Industry Participation Policy guidelines set such high criteria in tender assessments for local procurement, so it is astonishing that this proposal, which had zero local procurement, got through that process and apparently the contract was awarded. That is very peculiar to me and I think it is worthy of much more investigation.

All this money is going interstate. They have no health experience, but these people have now been appointed. In an unprecedented way, we have now appointed two external consultants to be executive employees of the South Australian Public Service while they continue their role at KordaMentha interstate as corporate liquidators. These people are sometimes wearing their hats as public servants and sometimes wearing their hats as KordaMentha external corporate liquidator consultants. This is a very fishy set of arrangements.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: I have been following the debate. I am always interested when the opposition chooses to engage in the health space after recent years, but straying from—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kaurna, could you take your seat, please. The member for Heysen has raised a point of order. Could you identify your point of order, please?

Mr TEAGUE: It is relevance, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am reading along in the bill. The member for Kaurna has now strayed for some time into subject matter that is loosely connected to the clean-up we are engaging in in the health space, but it is not any longer—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Heysen, for your spontaneous speech regarding relevance. I will listen carefully. The member for Kaurna is the lead speaker for the opposition on this, so obviously I will listen carefully. It is important that we keep to topic. As far as I can tell, he has been pertaining to health thus far, but I will listen carefully.

Mr PICTON: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker, for your protection against that ridiculous speech from the member for Heysen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna, you are now called to order.

Mr PICTON: This is all about the governance of health in our state. The member for Heysen does not think that bringing in corporate liquidators to run our hospitals has anything to do with health governance. It has everything to do with health governance, absolutely everything. It goes to how this government propose to run the health system, who they are bringing in to do it, how they are doing it and what potentially could happen under this legislation. It is absolutely connected. I remember many speeches by those opposite about cows when we were talking about Corrections bills. I think that, in this regard, this is very deeply connected.

When we look at this KordaMentha administration, I think it raises very significant issues about the interaction between private management and private consultancy and what should be the administration of public health services that should be in public hands. The chief executive officer, who has particular powers in this legislation, has signed on these corporate liquidators to be administrators in the health system at the same time that they hold these external positions, at the same time that they are the vast beneficiaries of this significant contract that the government has entered into.

This contract is massive; some \$23 million has been spent so far. The fees that people are being paid daily out of this are astronomical. Almost any South Australian worker would never dream of being paid some \$700 or \$800 per day to work on a contract. It is just astronomical what these people are being paid. At the same time, the government say, 'We need these people to save this money in the health system.' Well, the evidence is in from the first year and it is not looking good. Last year, what did the health system save? Not much. What did it cost? It has blown the budget by \$258 million in the last year. That is the evidence so far of what KordaMentha has been doing.

Members interjecting:

Mr PICTON: That's right. The minister for flogging off trains over there is laughing that the health system has spent \$258 million. Maybe if that had not happened, he would not have to flog off railways.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, minister! Member for Kaurna, this might be an opportune time to seek leave.

Mr PICTON: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Petitions

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale): Presented a petition signed by 224 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reverse its decision to discontinue the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme from 31 December 2019, and to continue the scheme indefinitely akin to other Australian jurisdictions or engage with the disability sector in helping to create a new scheme enabling South Australians the transport freedom and flexibility they deserve.

SERVICE SA MODBURY

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

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. R. Sanderson)—

Children and Young People in State Care in South Australian Government Schools
2008-18—Report June 2019

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:02): I bring up the 22nd report of the committee, entitled 'Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital emergency department upgrade'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 23rd report of the committee, entitled Yatala Labour Prison Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. Has the government now finally decided that the first of the three Service SA centres identified for closure in last year's budget will close in September, a second in November and a third in February 2020?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:04): In relation to that question, we have said early, often and always that these centres will not be closing until alternate service delivery models are in place. That remains the current position and will remain the current position until those alternate pathways are in place. A lot of work is being done in the background currently to get ourselves ready for what is looking to be a very exciting future for the way that we deliver these transactions.

We don't accept that the way these transactions have to be undertaken by the people of South Australia is the way that they should be undertaken. Again, it's an antiquated process that is overly bureaucratic and does not deliver good customer service outcomes. We have used this opportunity to innovate a lot of the way that Service SA currently undertakes its functions, and there is a huge opportunity for us to do good things: to improve our online and digital platform, to improve our physical face-to-face transaction capability and also to be able to deal with some of the bureaucratic difficulties that exist in the background that can actually make it easier, not only for people to transact but also for those staff having to deal with those transactions.

We, as an opposition before the last election, said often and always that we wanted to reform the way the government operates and that we were here to help deregulate the way government undertakes its functions. As we will see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —there is an extremely positive future for the way people transact with the state government, especially in relation—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to motor vehicle registry transactions, and that is quite exciting. I do find it a little bit odd that there are those who don't want the centres shut—

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —who then are trying to tell us that we should hurry up and shut them sooner.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order, minister, by the member for West Torrens. Is it about debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir, it is about debate. It was about—

The SPEAKER: I have the question. It concerned, amongst other things, the alleged closure of three Service SA centres and time lines.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir—September, November and February 2020.

The SPEAKER: Yes. It's a fair point of order. The minister has been quite germane, but I expect him to keep to the substance of the question. Has the minister finished?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Yes, I have finished, sir.

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Has the government established a time line for the closure of the Service SA centres?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): As the minister has already informed the house, but I am very happy to reiterate, we are working through all of those issues as we speak. What we have always said is that we will not be closing those Service SA centres without coming up with—

Mr Malinauskas: Have you got a time line?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —an adequate alternative. We want to make sure that people are provided with adequate access to government services. This is something which is a focus of our government, something which we are investing in. This was something which was not put into this year's budget but in fact last year's budget and, despite the bleatings of those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —telling people and scaring people that all of a sudden their Service SA centre was imminently closing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader! The member for Badcoe is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the fact of the matter is, sir, as you would be more than aware, all of those Service SA centres are still open and we are working through the issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We make this commitment to the people of South Australia, that we want them to have improved access to state government offices and state government services, and that's what the minister is working through and that's what the department is working through, and I am extraordinarily satisfied with the progress that they are making.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call the following members to order: the member for Wright, the leader, the members for Kaurna, Ramsay and Hurtle Vale, the member for Cheltenham and the Minister for Child Protection. I warn the member for Ramsay and the member for Kaurna. The Leader of the Opposition.

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister rule out that the government has a time line to close the three Service SA centres in September, November and February?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:08): Essentially, that's the same question.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But I can assure the house that there is a contingent motion on the table here essentially that the alternate pathways need to be in place before the centres close.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There is a condition precedent that must be met and that condition precedent is that we have alternative pathways in place.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland—I will come back to the leader—and then the member for Florey.

LOT FOURTEEN

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the establishment of the MIT Living Lab at Lot Fourteen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I thank the member for Newland for his question regarding Lot Fourteen and an extraordinarily exciting announcement for our state today. I think most people in this house know about our government's ambition for Lot Fourteen. It was previously the Royal Adelaide Hospital site. Those opposite, when they were in government, wanted to turn it into a 1,300-person apartment block. We have always had higher ambitions for this extraordinarily strategic location in our state and we have, of course, announced our plans and are well underway in implementing our plans to establish Lot Fourteen, which I think is the most exciting urban development project in the country bar none.

We already know that the Australian Institute of Machine Learning, which is a collaboration between the University of Adelaide and Lockheed Martin, will be established on that site by the end

of this year. We were delighted in December last year when the Prime Minister came to Adelaide and announced that the Space Agency headquarters would be on Lot Fourteen, a very exciting announcement for our state. Not only that, but it was followed up soon thereafter with the announcement that we would host the Mission Control and the Space Discovery Centre.

Earlier this year, we heard that we would have the SmartSat CRC capability on that site. This is the largest space-related research project in the nation's history, and it is based here in Adelaide. This is a massively growing sector of the global economy: satellites to provide data and observation and improved productivity of traditional sectors like agriculture, mining and construction. I think it is going to be massively important for us to have that capability here in South Australia.

We have spoken often in this place about the importance of the cyber sector going forward, and we will have exciting things to talk about regarding cyber because this is a growing sector of our economy. But the missing part, if you like, was around data and data analytics. That is why we couldn't have been more excited than we are today. During the lunchbreak, I headed down to Lot Fourteen and met with Professor Sandy Pentland from MIT and also Dr Thomas Hardjono—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: There's another million square kilometres of South Australia.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —who are here from MIT. MIT is the number one ranked university in the world and we announced today that we will be opening an MIT Living Lab on Lot Fourteen. This is a project which will be done in conjunction with two partners, BankSA and Optus. Optus will be the technology partner for this site. Can I make this point: there is no cost of this project to the taxpayers of South Australia. These are projects which both Optus and BankSA have been very generous in supporting. It will be of great benefit to our state.

We can't wait to get started on the projects which we know will be of benefit to our citizens. We know this because this is not the first MIT Living Lab in the world. In fact, there are living labs in Beijing, New York, and some other cities in the world, and we've got the latest one right here in Adelaide. It is a three-year agreement with MIT.

We are going to be able to take data—whether it be from government sources, transactional sources, geospatial sources—in a de-identified aggregated way and use it to inform government policymaking, decision-making, which I believe will unequivocally improve productivity, economic growth and, importantly, jobs in South Australia going forward.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, today we have a community group from the electorate of the member for Torrens. I welcome them to parliament. I also acknowledge in the gallery today Kael Thorson, who is a guest of the member for Lee.

Question Time

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the \$2 million in savings to be delivered in the 2018-19 financial year, as a result of the service SA closures, actually been delivered?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:13): I think that the member can avail himself of the 2019-20 budget, which details the 2018-19 actual performance of the department. I think that speaks for itself and the financial performance that DPTI has been able to deliver over the 2018-19 financial year. That information is publicly available.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurua is called to order. Leader.

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier or the government taken any action to place into private hands any services that are currently being provided by Service SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:14): I don't have any information on that, sir.

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the government taken any action to place into private hands any of the services that are currently being delivered by Service SA?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:14): Can I say in regard to this that I think the Leader of the Opposition should actually ask the member for West Torrens that question because he full well knows that, as part of the sale of the lands titles office, the motor vehicle registry—

Mr Malinauskas: I'm asking you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order, minister. Minister, please be seated for one moment. Member for West Torrens, the point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. The first words out of his mouth were: 'The member for West Torrens.'

The SPEAKER: Yes, we have the question. Minister, you have made your point. I ask you to keep to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Certainly. Before we came to government, the lands titles office was sold. As part of that contract, there was an \$80 million payment made to the government that placed an obligation on government to look at the sale of the motor vehicle registry system, otherwise we have to hand the 80 million bucks back. That was a little nugget, a little booby trap hidden by the former government.

Mr Cregan interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The answer to that question is: yes, we have to consider it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —because you forced us to consider it, lest the taxpayers of South Australia—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —be out of pocket \$80 million.

The SPEAKER: I believe the minister has concluded his answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, my point of order is about debate. I ask you to rule on it.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. The minister has finished his answer, so I am going to move to the member for Florey, then the member for Waite and then I will come back to the leader.

SERVICE SA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:16): This was by way of a supplementary to an answer that the Minister for Transport gave earlier. My question is to him, the Minister for Transport. As you approach this mythological future time when you believe you can deliver the same or better services for future SA customers, what criteria will be used to target centres in the staggered approach you are not denying by your answers to the questions of the leader today?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:16): I thank the member for Florey for the question. I do believe there is a degree of it being hypothetical but, regardless, I will try to answer the question.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: the remedy for a complaint about a question which is purportedly not in order is to raise a point of order, not to debate the matter in an answer.

The SPEAKER: I believe the minister said there may be a degree of a certain type of answer. He is close to the edge, I agree, but I will hear his answer. Let's get on with it.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I suppose I didn't need to get my chief to buy me dinner in order to ask him that question. I can do that during business hours without costing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the taxpayers a dime.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But, member for Florey, if the question that you are asking is: are we going to make sure—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Come on, let's get on with it.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: If the question is are we going to make sure that those alternate service delivery pathways are in place in the areas where the Service SA centres are closing as a matter of priority, then I think that is a very high consideration on our agenda.

SERVICE SA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:18): Supplementary: does that mean your previous answers to this house, where you say you will not close these centres until those services are in place, are untrue?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:18): Not at all. In fact, what I am trying to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We said: alternate pathway in place, then shut the centres. The question, as I understood it, was: will you give precedence to those areas where the centres are shutting? My answer was, yes, that is something that we are giving huge consideration to right at this moment.

LOT FOURTEEN

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister please update the house on recent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! Contain yourselves. Member for Waite.

Mr DULUK: My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on recent developments at the start-up hub at Lot Fourteen?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:19): Yes, I can, and it's getting very exciting down at that address. Can you imagine how uninteresting it would have been as a housing estate—the proposal from those opposite?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Last week, the Premier and I announced leading innovation hub managers Stone and Chalk as the anchor tenant for the fixed start-up hub at Lot Fourteen, establishing the hub as part of the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to accelerating the growth of start-up business here in South Australia and to making South Australia the nation's start-up capital.

South Australia provides an ideal environment for entrepreneurs to develop their ideas and take them to market. The start-up hub will support innovators and entrepreneurs to thrive in new and growing industries, such as cybersecurity, defence, space, artificial intelligence, data analytics, robotics and creative industries.

Increased entrepreneurial activity, jobs and economic growth will see South Australia at the forefront of global innovation and enterprise. The hub will attract entrepreneurs and start-ups looking to scale into national and global markets and will support up to 650 workspaces. It will have conference rooms, event facilities and meeting spaces designed to promote innovation and collaboration between entrepreneurs.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: On Friday night, I had the privilege, along with the Premier and the Chief Entrepreneur, Jim Whalley, to launch the Future Industries eXchange for Entrepreneurship, or the FIXE strategy. The event attracted 450 entrepreneurs, innovators and those who support them. After extensive consultation with the local start-up community, the strategy was developed under the leadership of South Australia's first Chief Entrepreneur—don't you just love that, Mr Speaker, South Australia's first Chief Entrepreneur? What does that say about South Australia? It says that things are changing in South Australia—and, of course, his entrepreneurial advisory board.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The FIXE strategy will help create an environment of business opportunity. The FIXE strategy is linked to our overarching objectives, which are to inspire, equip, enable and celebrate entrepreneurship here in South Australia. It will accelerate South Australia's economic growth and prosperity as it recaptures the entrepreneurial spirit that founded and built this state. It will see more South Australians becoming ambitious, successful entrepreneurs and attract more entrepreneurs and future industries to invest in South Australia.

The appointment of Stone and Chalk as Lot Fourteen managers, in conjunction with the FIXE strategy launch, is key to our ambition for entrepreneurship and the expanding career opportunities here in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government is encouraging more South Australians with entrepreneurial ambitions to reach their full potential.

This is happening through initiatives such as the Research, Commercialisation and Startup Fund, the South Australian government's Supporting Innovation in South Australia visa pilot (that is a pilot for an entrepreneurial visa exclusive to South Australia), continued investment in digital infrastructure through GigCity—the member for Giles and the member for Mount Gambier will be

pleased to know that very soon they will be hooked up to the GigCity network here in Adelaide—and, of course, the Adelaide City Deal.

These are just some of the things that are happening in South Australia, and the Marshall Liberal government is making South Australia the destination of choice for entrepreneurs and careers in the new economy.

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier rule out that the government will place into private hands any of the services that are currently provided for by Service SA? Yes or no?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): I have already provided an answer to the house on this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier and the deputy leader are called to order. Leader.

SERVICE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister rule out the privatisation or outsourcing of any of the services that are currently being provided for by Service SA?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:23): I refer the member to the Premier's previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Stinson: Excellent! Well, we're getting somewhere now.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

Mr Malinauskas: No privatisation agenda.

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet. Member for West Torrens.

Members interjecting:

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

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier met with any representatives of Keolis Downer and has he ever met with them at a Liberal Party fundraiser?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): Not that I'm aware of.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Did representatives of Keolis Downer at any stage suggest to the minister or his representatives that trams should be specifically included in phase 2 of the public transport services tender for metropolitan Adelaide that was released this week?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:24): I can confirm that there has been no discussion about outsourcing of tram services with any operator. It's a decision that was taken by cabinet and discussions that have been had internally within the department. Until that tender was released on Tuesday, nobody external, certainly not from the mouth of myself or anybody from cabinet, was made aware at all of any such tender.

The SPEAKER: The member for King.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

CANINE COURT COMPANION

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:25): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on the DPP's newest victim and witness support measure?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:25): With pleasure, and I thank the member for King—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —for this important interest that she has in this matter.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As we all know, any person's contact with the criminal justice system will probably be one of the most stressful times of one's life. The courts and the Office of the DPP recognise this also. That is why we have commenced an innovative program, formally known as the Canine Court Companion, since April this year. The Canine Court Companion is, in South Australia's case, an adorable black labrador called Zero. He lives with us in the Attorney-General's building.

He was originally trained as a guide dog, but so empathetic was he that he was deemed too sensitive to graduate and instead was trained as a therapy dog by Guide Dogs SA/NT. Zero's positive influence on anxious and vulnerable witnesses can already be seen. I have had glowing reports of how he settles anxious witnesses prior to them going to court. Since his commencement, Zero has now completed 30 appointments with vulnerable victims—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —who have been prosecution witnesses, including the victims of child sexual offending and domestic violence and people with intellectual disabilities. Zero is helping to break down the apprehension and anxiety that many of these victims can face when entering the Office of the DPP for the first time. It enables staff to build rapport with victims and the victims to settle more quickly, being comforted by Zero's presence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have read a testimonial from a mother, whose daughter has a disability, who wrote of her daughter's great anxiety prior to the first meeting, at which Zero was not present. Following that meeting, she writes of her daughter's inability to sleep or eat for several days. Her reception, however, at the second meeting was quite different. She was engaged throughout and was fine following the meeting; indeed, she was chatty. Having Zero present changed her entire perspective of her interaction with the process and alleviated stress and disquiet.

I commend the Director of Public Prosecutions' office for implementing this important and innovative program, which has already demonstrated results for the benefit of witnesses and victims. Zero is AGD's newest best employee.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:28): My question is for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise the house what amendments were made to

the registration of interest tender documents for phase 1 of the east-west bus service tender on 28 June 2019?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: is the member asking the minister to identify publicly available documents?

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow the minister an opportunity to answer.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: You tell us everything else that's public.

The SPEAKER: Member for Light, let's not complete the trifecta today.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:28): I will have to make inquiries. This tender has been open now for some time. Departmental executives, including the chief executive, have appeared before the Economic and Finance Committee for members of this parliament to avail themselves of the opportunity to interrogate that tender. I will make inquiries as to what else has changed in relation to that, but certainly nothing has been brought to my attention.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Did the State Procurement Board approve any amendment to phase 2 of the invitation to supply process to specifically include light rail?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29): I am happy to make inquiries in relation to that but I would like to clarify something. The member did ask, and did ask yesterday, in relation to why there was no reference to light rail as part of the phase 2 bus tender process. I was a little bit bewildered at the time and went back and had a look at the tenders website, which actually says that DPTI is undertaking:

...a ROI process to register interested parties participation in an Invitation to Supply (ITS) process to operate bus and light rail services in Metropolitan Adelaide.

It is there in the first paragraph on the landing page of the tenders website.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But in relation to tenderers getting access to documents, we don't just hand out these documents to all and sundry. They contain quite confidential information in relation to the way these services operate. So the way that the process works is that interested parties submit a registration of interest for the tender, i.e., 'Hey, we want to be involved in the tender.' What happens then is that request is reviewed and validated as a bona fide transport operator, i.e., you have to be somebody who operates transport in order to be considered appropriate to participate in the tender. The operator is required to complete various documentation, including non-disclosure agreements in related documents, after which access to the data room is granted. Then an invitation to supply documents will be made available in the data room. That is the way the process works.

Again, on the landing page on the tenders website, it makes reference to light rail. Operators can then register their interest; from there, the department will undertake the bona fide checks that people would expect governments to undertake to make sure that these people are the people who are experienced operators in this regard, and then they are given access to that data. We think that that is a process that maintains integrity and probity, and I think quite adequately, and more than adequately, it deals with some of the assertions that were being made yesterday.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has Keolis Downer, or any of its associated companies, ever submitted an unsolicited bid to own, operate or extend the tram network to the minister?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:32): Not at all to my knowledge, no. I must admit I have

absolutely no knowledge of that. The unsolicited bid process is actually something that gets submitted via the treasury department and they undertake that process on behalf of cabinet. But certainly I am not aware of anything in that regard.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on supports for Aboriginal students in our education system?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:32): I am very pleased to be able to receive this question from the member for Narungga. I understand his very strong interest in supporting our Aboriginal students across South Australia, including in his electorate, to fulfil their potential. With next week being NAIDOC Week, and this month being NAIDOC Month, it's a very timely question.

There is a lot of good work that is being done in the education department to support our Aboriginal students and, indeed, to support the endeavours of reconciliation more generally. This isn't all new work. Some of it has been going for some time. I acknowledge the works of previous governments who have always taken steps forward and forward, as has been the trajectory of South Australia as a community. But particularly, I think, in the education department there are a lot of good-spirited people working very hard to ensure that future generations of Aboriginal students are able to be better supported to achieve greater results and greater achievements than they have potentially been in the past.

We have an Aboriginal Education Strategy which was helped to be developed by a committee, led by Peter Buckskin and the department's chief executive, Rick Persse. I think the first meeting of that was at the beginning of last year and subsequent meetings since the election have seen that work develop. It was launched late last year and it was a privilege to be able to launch that strategy. It is an ambitious strategy. It has at its heart the idea that our ambitions and our hopes for all Aboriginal children should be at no less a level than for any other child across the education system, and the strategy contains a number of actions that are being undertaken.

The committee continues its work in a slightly revised form where, of course, the committee is no longer developing the strategy but, rather, developing measures for which the education department may be helped to be kept accountable to that. Of course, the education department and all our schools are working very hard to achieve the goals set out in the strategy and in the action plans undertaken.

That work in the education department is led by the Director of Aboriginal Education. Last year, the Director of Aboriginal Education, April Lawrie, was appointed as our Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People, the first commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People in South Australia. April was a terrific appointment and she is doing great work. Today, I am very pleased to announce that Bronwyn Milera has been appointed as the new Director of Aboriginal Education.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would recall, she is the principal at Kurna Plains School and is an extremely well-regarded Aboriginal educator and an extremely well-regarded principal in our education system. She is a proud Kokatha woman and has a great level of experience in education as well that is well regarded. I am looking forward to working with her as the newest addition to our senior executive group in the education department. She won the role after a nationwide call, an advertisement, from a very strong field, and I thank all those educators who put themselves forward for consideration.

There are a range of other works that are underway. Indeed, the South Australian Secondary Training Academy (SASTA) continues its work apace. It has changed its name this year from Sports Training Academy to Secondary Training Academy to reflect the evolving way in which its work is engaging and supporting Aboriginal students to complete their SACE and gain employment pathways not just through sport but through a wide range of other endeavours.

Indeed, this week it was a privilege, with the Premier, to be at the Ocean View College, one of our four Clontarf Foundation academies that has benefited from new investment from this

government of \$2.8 million over the next three years to roll out those academies in Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Whyalla and the Ocean View College in Taperoo.

It is a wonderful step forward, and those kids are going to school in proportions they weren't before—185 already engaged students who were not attending school much last year, and the kids I spoke to were very proud that they have hardly missed a day this year. It is great work, it is important work and we are proud to continue it.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will all current DPTI staff, including tram and train drivers, working—

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: All DPTI staff—how many thousand?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The tactician. Will all—

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining is called to order. I would like to hear the question. Can we start the question again from the start, please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you. My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will all current DPTI staff, including tram and train drivers, working on the public transport system transferring over to a successful tenderer, a private operator of Adelaide's tram and train networks, maintain their existing wages, conditions and entitlements?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:37): When asked this question on Monday, the answer I gave and that I continue to give is that that is something that will be worked through as part of the tender process. Certainly there are—

Mr Malinauskas: You make it up as you go along.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There are conditions that exist within the current enterprise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —bargaining agreements that essentially—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —provide opportunities there, and we will be making sure that we utilise those EBs to make good on the provisions that are there within those enterprise bargaining agreements. That is something that will have to be dealt with as part of the tender process. You have to ask private operators, to a degree, how they want to operate and then work that through with them.

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Certainly the commitment I gave is that we will be using the tender process to make sure that there is the broadest range of opportunities for staff within that area as they transition. Again, that is something that needs to be done through the tender process.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): A supplementary question to the minister: has the minister had the courtesy to contact the branch secretary of the RTBU regarding the tram and train privatisation?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:39): There are actually, as I understand it, five or six separate unions that are potentially affected: RTBU, TWU, CEPU, PSA, AWU and AMWU. Essentially, each of those—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Each of those was provided—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Each of those was provided with an opportunity to meet. We provided that opportunity, basically, as soon as the announcement was made. I understand that there is a meeting—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —potentially today between—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —departmental staff as well as the union. I have previously—

Mr Malinauskas: But not you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I have previously met with the secretary of the RTBU.

Mr Malinauskas: Yeah, whoop-de-do. I have asked if you have met them about this.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

An honourable member: Throw him out.

The SPEAKER: I might today. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think it entirely appropriate that the information the RTBU would be seeking is best furnished by the department. They have an existing relationship—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and existing processes for being able to deal with matters.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We provided that opportunity at the first opportunity. Essentially, I think there are a number of unions that have availed themselves of that opportunity, but certainly the invitation was made as soon as was practicable.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister assure the house that all DPTI staff currently working on our rail, tram and train network, transferring over to a successful private tenderer, will maintain all of their continuity of service entitlements, such as pro rata and long service leave?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:41): Again, the answer will be the same as two questions ago, in that there are existing enterprise bargaining arrangements in place and those will be complied with in full. Where there is any ambiguity, again that is something that will be worked through going forward.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But, again, there are existing arrangements in place. They are the arrangements that will dictate how it is that the relationship with employees and the department essentially is undertaken going forward.

APY LANDS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:42): My question is to the Premier in his capacity as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the Premier tell us what actual progress is being made to make a real difference, in health and education especially, on the APY lands and make sure basic things like salt-free water for appliances and providing housing are being delivered?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42): I thank the member for Florey for her question. Since coming to government, we have made a number of substantial changes in the management of this portfolio. Firstly, we have moved the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division back to the central agency, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I have personally taken responsibility for this portfolio, but I have been working with my cabinet colleagues to develop a whole-of-government approach to improving outcomes for Aboriginal South Australians.

As the member sort of indicated in her question, much of the need is not need which can be addressed specifically through AARD itself. It is actually all of the other departments of government, and that's why we were very proud late last year to launch our first Aboriginal action plan in South Australia. We were very keen not to have it as another lofty, ambitious long-term strategic plan but more of an action plan dedicated to specific outcomes for Aboriginal South Australians. It covers all portfolios in South Australia. It has been published. It has been made clear to the people of South Australia what we plan to achieve.

My understanding is that of the 30-plus action items on that document the vast majority are on track; some of them have already been achieved. We plan to provide to the people of South Australia reports on the progress on the identified goals on a six-monthly basis. It is my understanding that the next iteration of that is due out very soon. We have recently provided a progress report not only to the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Dr Roger Thomas, but also to the SAAAC (South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council). I can inform the parliament today that the members of the SAAAC have had their tenure on that extended through to the middle of next year.

We are very grateful for the input and advice that they provide to us in government. They have been extraordinarily diligent in looking at each of those areas. They meet on a regular basis with members of departments and also have regular meetings with ministers, holding them to account but, more than holding to them to account, actually providing them with practical advice on ways that we can improve our performance. Only today, we had members of the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council providing advice to government on a range of issues which dealt with diverse portfolios, including Corrections, policing and other areas of government.

Whilst I haven't got specific advice regarding water on the APY lands, I can tell you that this government is taking its responsibilities with regard to Aboriginal affairs extraordinarily seriously. I think it was the right move to bring it back into DPC but, most importantly, for the Premier, myself, to

take responsibility so that we can have a whole-of-cabinet approach to dealing with some of the disadvantage and the opportunity that exists within the sector.

RECONCILIATION ACTION PLAN

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:46): Super-quick supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

Ms BEDFORD: Very super-quick. What progress has been made on the RAP for Parliament House?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:46): A very important question. As members know, a RAP is a Reconciliation Action Plan. We don't have a Reconciliation Action Plan for Parliament House. I have written to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. My understanding is that this is under active consideration. I have made subsequent follow-up suggestions with regard to elements of that RAP they might like to consider.

While I am on my feet, I would like to commend the government agencies that have been working on not only their Reconciliation Action Plans but their Stretch plans and, in some cases, their Innovate plans. I think this is a major step forward. I know that Erma Ranieri is looking at an additional plan that will go right across government as well as the individual plans in departments. I have to say that I have been delighted with the way that individual chief executives and ministers have embraced the concept of making sure that we do have workable, positive Reconciliation Action Plans in place. This being the very start of NAIDOC Week—

Ms Bedford: NAIDOC.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —NAIDOC; you say 'tomahto', I say 'tomayto'—which really is now extending for a full month, it is really important that we do concentrate on these practical ways that we can achieve reconciliation here in South Australia.

HARTLEY ELECTORATE ROAD UPGRADES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the intersection upgrades in the Speaker's electorate of Hartley?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:48): The whip is obviously seeking to curry favour. That is a wise move—although, with his use of the whip, I think that we should all do as we are told anyway.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear this.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I am pleased to update you, sir—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —especially considering we took the opportunity only in the last few days to go across and have a look at the progress on some of the commitments we made at the election and also how this last budget has also added to those commitments as we deliver to improve better traffic solutions in the beautiful eastern suburbs, in the electorate of Hartley certainly, visiting down Gorge and Silkes roads and looking at the progress that has been made there in terms of the number of designs.

In fact, seven different designs have been put in place for how we fix that intersection, and it is certainly one that has been made more complex by the building of the Aldi supermarket there. I think it is a great opportunity to be able to fix a bottleneck that has plagued residents along Gorge Road for a long time as we whittle down those different options. Going out and chatting to the community on what is best for them and what they think is the best solution to put on the table I think is quite exciting and long overdue for a congested part of our road network.

We then move across to the Newton-Graves intersection. There is a lot of progress that is being made on that intersection, too. The planning and design work is done and the land acquisition is also in its final stages, so much so that construction will be starting in a few short weeks' time. In fact, we were down there and able to see there's spray paint on the ground already detailing what changes are going to be made there. That will be finished in the new year. Again, it is an intersection in a part of town that has been neglected for a long time. This is an intersection where, even as we were there, there were a couple of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —near misses—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, be quiet.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —where we saw that the turning interactions between different types of vehicles were quite dangerous.

The installation of a separate left-hand turn and right-hand turn lane from Graves onto Newton; the installation of a new right-hand lane from Newton Road, coming off and going onto Graves Road, to make sure that the Newton Road traffic actually can flow freely; the removal of a pedestrian-actuated crossing just little bit further down by the church so that we don't increase the level of congestion for the through traffic, are also pretty important, as well as a solid median and provision for cyclists, which we always do when we undertake these projects.

We then took the opportunity to go down to Portrush and Magill roads to look at our \$98 million commitment to fixing one of the major bottlenecks on Portrush Road—a section of road that looks after 62,000 cars a day—and the opportunity especially for those people travelling inbound on Magill Road, a huge opportunity to get them past a troublesome intersection much more quickly. Again, for all the very important heavy vehicle freight, as well as passenger vehicles heading down Portrush Road, there is the opportunity to remove a key bottleneck in our road traffic network.

These are but small parts of the huge program that this government has put on the table to address traffic congestion across Adelaide, and I am glad that we are getting on and delivering what we promised people at the last state election.

GUARDIANSHIP ORDERS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Is the minister aware of a reduction in the level of financial support available to carers entering long-term guardianship agreements since March 2018?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:52): I thank the member for her question. Firstly, there have been no changes to the financial circumstances for the long-term guardianship orders. In fact, the last 12 months has seen the largest increase in people taking up long-term guardianship orders from any other 12-month period.

I am very grateful to all of the foster carers who have shown that commitment to take on and give permanency and stability to children who are in their care. I can't speak more highly of our foster carers and kinship carers, who do such an amazing job, and I can assure this house that there have been no changes. Any of the payments that were eligible for the child before long-term guardianship orders are still there currently.

GUARDIANSHIP ORDERS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Since March 2018, how many carers have discontinued their applications for long-term guardianship?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:53): I would have to take that on notice, but I know that there has been a net increase of 46, which is the largest ever. We have plenty more before the court, so there are a lot in the pipelines as well, and I am very pleased with the way the department has been handling this.

GUARDIANSHIP ORDERS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Child protection. Is the minister aware of a new or revised policy within her department that reduces the financial entitlements of carers if children move into a long-term guardianship agreement?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:54): I believe I have completely answered that with my previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Wright, you can leave for the rest of question time under 137A.

The honourable member for Wright having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop. I will come back to the member for Badcoe.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the government is assisting our regions to grow?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:54): Yes, I can. I want to thank the member for MacKillop for his question, particularly around the Marshall Liberal government's commitment, a 10-year commitment for the Regional Growth Fund. It is \$150 million going to our regions. I particularly want to thank the member for MacKillop because over the past weekend he was down at Kingston in the South-East to formally announce funding of \$335,000 from the strategic pool of the Regional Growth Fund. It is going towards the main street stimulus project that is improving the streetscape.

Kingston is one of the great tourism destinations, a great fishing town in the South-East. That town was looking for some beautification of its main street. It has received funding, matched funding, and they are now getting on with the job of beautifying Kingston, so that's great work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Not only does it help Kingston but it helps the state and the tourism destinations of the South-East. Kingston is a coastal town and it's looking to improve visitor numbers. I am pleased to announce that round 2 of the Regional Growth Fund competitive pool opened on Monday this week and applications are in. I urge all regional businesses and community clubs to come forth with their projects. In round 1, 82 projects came to the department with a value of \$61 million. That is great news for regional South Australia, which has long seen a development fund come to the regions that picked winners, and it really did drive a wedge between those community businesses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: It created some resentment between those who got it and those who did not get it. Here, we are relying on the three Cs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —collaboration, clustering and community. That has been the success of the Regional Growth Fund.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: I would like to mention some of the recipients in the first round:

- the member for Stuart saw \$387,000 go towards a purpose-built health clinic through the Royal Flying Doctor Service;
- I was joined by the member for Finnis when \$490,000 went to PipiCo, and that was a great announcement down there;
- the member for Heysen and the member for Morialta joined me when \$400,000 of funding helped out the apple and pear growers, particularly with pumping capacity and being able to reduce their power costs;
- the member for Giles was also pleased to see some funding come his way; and
- the member for Flinders also saw funding towards upgrades to community and tourist facilities across the outback, and that is a great initiative supporting outback communities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What we saw particularly in Hammond were essential power upgrades at Bowhill Engineering. I want a shout out to Bowhill Engineering for the Darlington upgrades, those overpasses, the green and yellow steel structures.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: That is a small engineering company in a river town. They are doing great work, and I want to commend the work they are doing in a regional community and they thoroughly deserve their upgrade. I was joined by the member for Kavel—\$400,000 towards the Lot 100 Consortium. It is a great destination for anyone who visits the Adelaide Hills and wants to have a great experience: distillation, brewing and wine. It's just a beautiful experience up there and it's great to see.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: These are all stellar examples of how collaboration can work in our regional communities. It's about unlocking economic development, unlocking economic potential. I am hoping that round 2 of the Regional Growth Fund will be even more successful than round 1 because the Regional Growth Fund states #RegionsMatter.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the Rail Commissioner remain the employer of all train and tram staff, as set out by statute, at the completion of the minister's plan to outsource our train and tram services?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:59): I do know that conversations have already been had with ONRSR, with Sue McCarrey, and certainly the feedback I have had is that there is a high degree of comfort about the process we are going through. Obviously, there are particulars that will still need to be worked through, but certainly those initial conversations have been had because maintaining the Rail Commissioner as essentially the vehicle by which we maintain our accreditation to utilise the rail network is extremely important, and that is certainly something that has been a key consideration in preparing this tender and preparing for a transition.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. When did the minister inform his party room that the government intended outsourcing and privatising tram and train networks?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00): I think if the member for West Torrens wants to know the answer to that question, he can seek to join the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is called to order for leading that cacophony.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. When did the minister begin discussions with the national regulator regarding the employment structure with the Rail Commissioner and tram and train staff being outsourced?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:01): It's not a discussion that I have had; it's a discussion that the Rail Commissioner has had.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: TB-S.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: That is the shortened name by which some of us speak about him. Can I also confirm that the Rail Commissioner, otherwise known as the Chief Executive of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Innovation and Skills and the member for West Torrens, can you please stop this.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —doesn't actually have a purchase card. The CE of DPTI currently does not have a purchase card. He doesn't feel it necessary to take me out to dinner—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and crack open the booze.

The SPEAKER: I ask the minister to come back—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please come back to the substance of the question.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The Rail Commissioner has already had those discussions with the regulator. Those discussions, quite clearly, will be ongoing at various parts throughout the process, but certainly the update I provide is that that is progressing well at this early stage.

PROJECT RENEW

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister update the house on further progress of CFS Project Renew to revitalise facilities for volunteers?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:02): I certainly can—a very good question. I thank the member for Heysen for his interest and passion for our volunteers,

and we note the great work that they do. Also, I acknowledge the member for Heysen's interest in building South Australia right across the board, something that the Marshall Liberal government is very passionate about.

As we mentioned a number of times in this place, we are building South Australia from an infrastructure point of view, from a safety point of view, and also looking after our emergency services. We want to make sure that we are taking everyone on the journey. In the recent budget, the member for Heysen would have noticed another \$2.5 million to continue our Project Renew. This has been a wonderful success, especially out amongst all our CFS volunteers, whereby we have been able to upgrade a number of facilities right across the state as a way to say thank you to our volunteers for the great work that they do. Again, this is part of our positive plan to build South Australia.

It was a pleasure to be at Echunga with the member for Heysen just the other day, having a look at one of the projects we delivered there: \$33,000 to improve the wall of the station that was actually falling down. We also put a bit of a safety fence, if you like, around the big tower there. It was great to see Mark Clothier, the brigade captain, and to catch up on a chilly afternoon with the member for Heysen. His young son came out as well to have a look at the fire trucks. It's amazing how fire trucks always excite communities and inspire volunteers into the future. That's one part of the investment.

It was also great to join the member for Morialta for a couple of Project Renew announcements: \$34,000 for a roller door replacement. This roller door, very sadly, had been in a state of disrepair for a while and would often get jammed and it was very hard for people to open, so we are fixing that by replacing the old sliding door with a roller door, as I said, at a cost of \$34,000. Doug Munn, who is the retired group officer, served for 40-odd years in that region, if memory serves me correctly, and he is still involved. He is another one of our great volunteers.

We then went on with the member for Morialta to Summertown, where we saw the brigade captain, Andrew Schinnic, and \$24,000 went there to repair an external wall. They had a generator put in not so long ago. Unfortunately, water was getting in on the side of their building and potentially damaging their generator. This generator is obviously very important in the case of an emergency up in the Hills, so it was with great pleasure that we put money towards fixing that project. Again, it was another one of those little projects, as part of Project Renew, that has been so well received right across the community.

Of course, in the CFS we have 13,000 volunteers. Again, I want to take this opportunity to thank them for the wonderful work they do. But the success of this project has meant that we have actually looked across to the SES. In the most recent budget, it would be noted that another \$1 million has gone towards upgrading SES facilities as well. Again, it's a way to say thank you to the volunteers.

I have said it in this place before and I will say it again: you can't pay the volunteers for the number of hours that they give back. I know that on this side we are incredibly grateful to everyone for what they do, so to go and recognise them and make sure that we are giving them facilities that keep them safe and upgrading where they go to do their wonderful volunteering work and helping out their communities to make them just that little bit nicer is a really great outcome.

As I have travelled around the state, I have noticed that so many of these facilities were left to run down over 16 long years. So to be injecting funds to help build that part of our state is so important because we want to build South Australia right across the board, from the infrastructure projects at the top end that the Minister for Transport talks about through to safety and security, through to sporting, police and other emergency services—we are investing heavily in those. To be investing in our volunteers is one of the best things that this government can do.

Grievance Debate

STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to rise and address the house at the end of a very, very important

sitting week. I think some of the travails of the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party and their long record of disunity have been well documented in recent history.

We just heard the Minister for Police and Correctional Services referring to 16 long years of Labor. What was undoubtedly true across those 16 years of Labor government was a unified outfit committed to their cause. During the course of those 16 years, we saw a Liberal Party tearing themselves apart at the seams, not exactly sure who their leader was, going through leader after leader and deputy after deputy.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: it has been alleged that the Labor Party was unified. I think that when members say things that are wrong, it should be drawn to the house's attention. Speaker Atkinson's valedictory speech is very helpful—very, very helpful—on this issue, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta can leave for half an hour under 137A. That is completely bogus. Leader.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

Mr MALINAUSKAS: About as bogus as the unity that underpins this government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has the call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Multiple leaders, multiple deputies—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That's right, Vickie, we know all about it, that's right. The Attorney-General knows all about it, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who sits here, Mr Speaker?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who sits here? The irony of the Attorney-General. Who could possibly rule out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —that the Attorney-General is not up to her neck in the machinations of this week? Nobody could rule it out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: There was a brief period where it looked as though there was a semblance of unity within this outfit. Their Premier, the member for Dunstan, has got them all back on the same page. They are working together now. That mythology ended this week—ended with the spectre of not one, not two, not three, but four Liberal MPs crossing the floor and voting directly against a minister and directly to undermine the Premier. Do not worry, the Attorney-General has a big smile on her face. We all know why. But ultimately—

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, be seated for one moment. Is the minister's point of order 'reflecting on the vote of the house'?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I think the leader has made his point and I would advise him to be cautious on that issue. Thank you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Let's go on to another important issue that has been traversed this week within the parliament, and that is this Premier's credibility. Ultimately, a government trades on its credibility. The Premier promised the people of South Australia two things before the election. He promised lower costs; that is what he said he would do. What he said he would not do was privatisations. This week, we have learned that this state government has made a conscious decision, presumably in conjunction with the entirety of the party room, to break that promise and deliver privatisation of a key public service that 70,000 people rely upon.

But something else has transpired just today. Just today, we heard the Premier and the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure fail to rule out the privatisation of Service SA. That is a revelation. Why not rule out the privatisation of this key government service? We have seen this move before. They started by saying, 'We won't rule out the privatisation of trams and trains,' yet here we are. Now we are hearing that they are not ruling out the privatisation of Service SA.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We now suspect, for very good reason, that this government does have plans to privatise Service SA. The backbench looked dumbfounded, just as they did when we heard about the proposition of trains and trams, but this is now a live proposition that is worthy of scrutiny.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is warned.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yet again, the now unassailable, undeniable fact is that this government does indeed have a privatisation agenda, not just the Remand Centre, not just hospital transfers, not just trains and trams but also now the prospect of privatisation of Service SA. Of course, that comes on the back of the lower costs promise. Are we going down a path of privatisation to reduce debt in this state? No; debt is going up big time, unprecedented to record levels.

Are we going down a path of privatisation to pursue a lower costs agenda? No; \$513 million of brand-new taxes is evidence of that, taxes that every South Australian will have to pay—particularly in your electorate, Mr Speaker, when it comes to land tax. We know that there are other costs being imposed upon South Australians: every car they drive, every boat they register and if they so much as have a trailer, if they are a tradie, bad luck; they have to pay an extra tax. If you so much as put your bin out, this government is going to tax you more. There is nothing that moves that they are not taxing. There is nothing that moves that they are not selling. That undermines this government's credibility, and that will not be forgotten in March 2022.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SPORTS FACILITIES

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:12): Can I say that it is good to be building SA. It is good to be with a government that is building South Australia right across the state. Right across our regions, we are building this wonderful state.

Yes, it has been left to run down for a number of years—16 long years of Labor. Boy, aren't we disappointed when we get out to our communities and speak to people and see the sights of what has been left to deteriorate. From a sporting perspective, if one more sporting club—and I have been to hundreds and thousands—comes to me and says, 'Our facilities have been left to go to rack and ruin under the previous government'—it is a disgrace.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As a government, we have put \$100 million into sport since coming into government.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is \$100 million, and don't the people of South Australia like and appreciate that.

Ms Hildyard: How much less than we invested? So much less.

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: They hate good news. We have put \$100 million into sport. Of course, our Sports Vouchers program is absolutely outstanding. Young people right around the state love the support that we are giving them there. On the local front, I have been very fortunate. We have invested \$2 million into the Brighton sports complex, one of the sports complexes that, under the previous government, was left to deteriorate.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have been into the Brighton footy club a number of times. I have said in this place before that, with the state of their facilities, I would not let my dog go in there. It is absolutely appalling, but we are fixing that. We are working with the member for Morphett and the member for Black, who are very supportive of this project, and the federal member for Boothby, who has got right on board and injected funds as well.

Combined with the Holdfast Bay council, who are very supportive, in total \$13.7 million is going into this sporting complex. That will link with the primary school at Hight Avenue to create a wonderful facility that will get people active and get people moving. There is the Brighton rugby club, the lacrosse club, the cricket club, the football club, the croquet club, a dog club in the back corner and even a pigeon club involved. The opportunities to grow other social benefits out of this through other community clubs are endless.

This is a wonderful investment and this is part of how the Marshall Liberal government, working with all tiers of government, is building South Australia. We just had the sod turning the other day. The Premier was there for the sod turning as well. He is wonderfully excited. This full development we are hoping will be done by autumn 2021. It will be wonderful for our community.

When I was re-elected as the member for Gibson in March 2018, I also made a firm commitment that we would provide a community garden for the Stella Maris Parish School, a Catholic primary school located in Seacombe Gardens. They came to me with a wonderful idea and I was very keen to support it. The students have done a marvellous job putting together this garden. They have the garden inside the school grounds and they have put an orchard, if you like, with some citrus and other fruit trees, out on the street for the community to be able to access as well.

I went to have a look and the students have done a stellar job. They really have. They have brought together some innovative ideas about collecting water and growing their produce. What they are also looking to do—and I thought this was just fantastic; in fact, the Minister for Innovation would like this—is market and sell their produce through the school and then reinvest that money into growing the garden and making it sustainable.

It is a wonderful effort, at the Holy Spirit Catholic Church in Seacombe Gardens, where this crew has done an absolutely wonderful job. I commend everyone involved and the new principal who has taken over from the outgoing principal, Sean Hill. I congratulate Sean Hill on all the wonderful work he has done there. The community is over the moon about this project.

The community is also getting close to seeing the results of funding delivered. In conjunction with the Marion city council, the state government put in some considerable money, as part of our election commitment, to upgrade Crown Street Reserve in Dover Gardens and Hamilton Park

Reserve in Warradale. Both these reserves were in desperate need of rejuvenation and infrastructure that would encourage more locals to head down to their local park for some fresh air and to get more active.

At Crown Street Reserve, works are well underway to construct a three-on-three basketball court that the community asked for. We are adding a netball ring there as well, access paths and new bench seats to encourage more people, young and old, to be more active in their community. Works began in May and construction is expected to be completed very soon. Progress is also well underway at the Hamilton Avenue reserve. Last month, the old clubhouse and tennis courts were demolished for a new state-of-the-art Exeloo, which is due to arrive very soon.

These are some wonderful projects. It is fantastic that the Marshall Liberal government is building South Australia across every level. To be delivering these projects in my community makes me very proud.

STATE BUDGET

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:17): I rise to speak again about the cruel, heartless, cash-grabbing budget of those opposite and its terrible impact on South Australians—a budget all about higher costs and higher debt, not at all focused on the wellbeing of South Australians. In particular, I want to relate to the house the story of a woman who lives in Reynell who came to see me, distressed about what the unprecedented increase in the cost of living will mean for her.

Sue lives in Christie Downs. She is a lovely, clever, hardworking 64-year-old woman who sadly lost her husband 11 years ago. She spoke with me about him and the life they shared together with their children, who are now grown and living elsewhere, and how during his life he had worked hard alongside her to make sure that they were set up for retirement, a retirement that she will now face without him since his passing.

Sue is a cleaner at Flinders Medical Centre, employed by Spotless, and has been doing that work for five years. It is hard, physical work that she does to keep one of our major hospitals clean for all who are ill, have treatment, visit loved ones or work there. She does this day in and day out to make ends meet. Sue often finishes work around 11pm and it is solely her income that pays bills and her mortgage and contributes to her retirement savings. Her entitlements were also recently negatively affected by the change of contractors by SA Health, making things even harder.

Sue came to my office, deeply distressed, angry and worried, immediately on hearing about the unprecedented increase in the cost for her to park at work. Sue brought her pay slips in with her and she showed me how she would lose between one and two weeks' pay per year because of this increase—a financial situation which, for Sue, is utterly untenable and will mean she can no longer make ends meet. Sue was stressed about how she would manage this. Was it less food she would buy, a bill she would not pay or her mortgage she would default on?

Sue is so worried about this that she went to see her employer to find out if it would be acceptable if she parked in free, two-hour public spaces and then left work every two hours to go out and move her car. This was apparently not possible, so Sue began to check out the bus routes to see if this could work. In the past, she had caught a bus from FMC to the Reynella Interchange and then from there the 733 to Flaxmill Road to walk a short distance to her home.

Sue checked out the routes to see if this was still possible but, no, it was not. Lo and behold, the last 733 bus of the night has been cut. Shocking; but, being the resilient woman that she is, she checked out the other routes. She can catch a different second bus to get home, the 721 to Noarlunga. What this will mean for Sue is two buses and a 1.2 kilometre walk in the dark, close to midnight, to get home from work. Well, it will mean that whilst it is still running because—surprise, surprise—that service will potentially have route cuts as well.

What I would love to know from those opposite is how on earth this government's sickening, phony mantra of lower costs and better services was ever envisaged to work for Sue. Sue's situation, and the situation of many others in our community, highlights that this empty promise has no substance and that what they are actually focused on is the complete opposite of those words. I am writing to the government about this and I cannot wait for their answer, and neither can Sue or the

many others they have cruelly disregarded with these increases in the cost of living and their cuts to essential services.

Sue and many, many others are angry, upset and worried about how they will make ends meet. They are also deeply worried about the selling off, by those opposite, of parts of our public transport system, not something contemplated in the empty 'lower costs' words. In fact, something it was they said was not on their agenda at all. We know that the Sues of the world are also not on their agenda. Well, they are on ours, and we will keep fighting for Sue and for every South Australian to be treated with the dignity and respect they deserve.

RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:21): On Monday 1 July, the first patients received dialysis services at Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital. This is an important milestone in my community. Before the election I doorknocked my community, and I was grateful that many people raised their concerns with me. Often they welcomed me into their homes.

One important issue raised with me was whether haemodialysis services could be delivered locally. If they could be, patients would no longer have to travel to Adelaide or Murray Bridge to receive dialysis. I met and raised the issue with the shadow health minister, now the Minister for Health, Stephen Wade MLC, in the other place. I extracted from him a commitment that if we won the election and formed a new government we would review local dialysis services.

Immediately following the election, I raised the issue with the minister again, and I have worked closely with the minister to ensure this issue remains squarely in focus. It is important to remember that in the 16 years of the previous government the service was not delivered. I commend and thank the Marshall government for its commitment of \$800,000 to ensure these services can be accessed locally in the Hills.

Renal dialysis is part of a significant investment by the government in local health care. In the first 15 months of the new state government, we have funded an ongoing contract for 24-hour doctor services, appointed Russell and Yelland Architects to design a new master plan for Mount Barker hospital, made more funds available for paediatrics, and secured funding from the commonwealth for an emergency department upgrade.

I was honoured to attend the Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital with the Minister for Health to visit the first dialysis patients. The first patient to receive dialysis locally was Mr Marty Liebelt. Marty is 77 years old. He is a deeply loved local farmer and community leader. With the assistance of his wife, Betty, Marty has been travelling three times per week well outside the district to receive dialysis. Despite the stress and time spent travelling, Marty and Betty are remarkably resilient and positive.

It was also a great pleasure to visit Mr Keith Woodman and his wife, Jan. Keith and his wife, Jan, have been travelling to Adelaide three times a week for four years to receive dialysis. Jan is an exceptionally capable artist. I also want to recognise in this place John and Anne Taylor, Kevin and Roslyn Tischer, Ernest and Caroline Kennedy, and Allan Menadue.

John and Anne have welcomed me into their home as a friend. For many years, they ran the community store in Nairne. They are deeply community minded. With great care and love, Anne has assisted John with home dialysis. It is a long and difficult process to continually set up, run and clean a dialysis machine and, without any word of complaint, Anne and John have managed John's dialysis needs at home.

Ernest and Caroline Kennedy have also welcomed me into their home, and I am grateful for the time and care they have given to educate me about the needs of dialysis patients and the careful steps they have taken over many years to manage their health care and their family's health care. They are remarkable people. I raise, too, the service of the Tischer family, who I hope will also benefit from local dialysis. Kevin and Roslyn Tischer I know well through the Mount Barker Football Club where I was a trainer, and I am grateful for their family's service to the club and to our community and for the time they have taken to inform and educate me about the importance of local dialysis services.

I raise these names to make plain that this issue is personal for me. That is the nature of country communities. It is certainly the nature of my community. I am very grateful to the government, as I mentioned, and to the health minister, that we have been able to resolve this issue quickly, at least in the context of the time it takes for government departments to make decisions.

Now up to 12 patients each week will be able to receive dialysis treatment in the dual-purpose chemotherapy and haemodialysis unit. I am advised that the chemotherapy unit has been converted into a dual-purpose chemotherapy and haemodialysis unit with three chemotherapy chairs converted to dialysis chairs to provide care locally and ease pressure on metropolitan services. The chemotherapy unit was previously open three days a week, providing low-risk chemotherapy treatments. By converting three of the six chemotherapy chairs to dialysis chairs, we can now provide chemotherapy services six days a week.

HYDROGEN

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:26): I rise today to talk principally about hydrogen. There was a question asked yesterday of the Minister for Energy and Mining. Of course, the Minister for Energy and Mining is my neighbour in the vast north of the state. I have respect for him, and I think he is a decent and moderate individual, but I have stood up now on a number of occasions to correct the record, if you like.

The question was a worthwhile question. Hydrogen is something that might well present a number of opportunities for our state, so I do not have a problem with that. What I do have a problem with is the failure of the minister to acknowledge that he is actually building on a very solid piece of work, both in a tangible way and a research way, that the previous government undertook when it came to hydrogen in this state. I am one of those old-fashioned people who believes that credit should be given where it is due, and the previous government—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Are you going to thank Malcolm Fraser? What about Malcolm Fraser?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HUGHES: —should have been given some credit when it comes to the work that is being done on hydrogen. I stood up in May last year, also in response to a Dorothy Dixier to the minister. That was in May last year, just after the election, when the minister got to virtually rebadge a whole range of projects that were going on in South Australia as things that the Liberal government could lay claim to regarding energy policy.

All those projects, whether it was development approval, financial closure or actual physical commencement, had started under a Labor government. We were talking about renewables. Some opposite had some real problems with renewables. It is good to see they have had a road to Damascus conversion now that they are in government and like to boast about the state being on track to achieve a 75 per cent renewable energy target. I think the minister was actually talking in Melbourne about a 100 per cent target. I have no problem with that. That is excellent stuff and is an indication of the of the fantastic legacy that a Labor government left.

I have a particular interest in hydrogen and not just because of the contribution it could make to addressing global warming. I come from a community that could benefit very significantly from hydrogen production or, alternatively, ammonia production, with ammonia potentially being an export vehicle for hydrogen. The reason why the community in Whyalla should be interested in hydrogen is that we do have the only hydrocarbon export facility in the state at Port Bonython and to replicate a facility of that nature these days would probably cost somewhere between \$750 million and \$1 billion. That is already in place in Whyalla in a location close to massive renewable energy resources both in terms of wind on Eyre Peninsula and elsewhere and the massive solar resource in the north of our state.

There is not just the hydrocarbon export facility at Whyalla but there are also the steelworks at Whyalla. The steel industry globally contributes something like 2.3 billion tonnes of CO₂ emissions a year. It is a significant contributor to CO₂ emissions. To put that in some sort of context, energy generation globally is around 13.6 billion tonnes a year. Hydrogen is one way that you can address

that and produce clean iron and clean steel, given that using coke as a reducing agent in a blast furnace is about up to 90 per cent of the steel industry's contribution to CO₂ emissions.

The Swedes are moving in this direction. It is going to be long-term work and they are talking about their first commercial steel plant using hydrogen as a reducing agent by 2035. As a state, we should get involved in an international collaborative effort when it comes to looking at hydrogen, and especially given that, as a state, we have over 10 billion tonnes of magnetite in reserves.

RIVERLAND WEST CITRUS FEST

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:31): I rise today to acknowledge one of the great festivals in the Riverland I recently attended, the Waikerie citrus fest, the inaugural Waikerie citrus festival and a celebration of what the Riverland is so synonymous with—that is, some of the world's best citrus. It was really a themed festival and brought people from far and wide to show their culinary skills, their growing skills and some of the artistic skills that the festival draws to Waikerie.

Waikerie is renowned for their signature rubbish bins, large fibreglass orange replicas. The council do not like them, but they understand that they are a symbol of Waikerie and that they really do put a signature on the town. Anyone who comes into town notices these bright oranges that have a rubbish bin lid. It was great that I was asked to go along to the festival. I did pose a little bit of competition to the jam and cake makers because I was asked to go along and be the judge. Hence, I was not able to put my jam in the competition or put my cake in the competition. Sonia Fowler—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: They were scared. Sonia Fowler, the chair, asked me to come along. It was an absolute honour to look at some the great artwork and displays that were set up there. I know that Carol Walker did the main stage display, which had hundreds and hundreds of oranges on it. The artwork and the way it was put together was just outstanding, and it was just one of many. It gave me the opportunity to judge the cakes, and in the end there was a citrus cake I judged. It was a tough job because there were many cakes.

Teish Lochert, who is a relative of Lochert's, the famous name of Crusta orange juice, has kept in the family the award-winning citrus cake. It was just a delight to judge. Once I cut it open, not only were there vibrant citrus colours but there was also the taste, and that is what is really important about cooking, of course—don't we know that. Teish Lochert won the award for Australia's best rainbow citrus cake, so congratulations to Teish.

Some of the other awards included for the best citrus marmalade, which went to Grace Kalisch, and the best citrus-themed photography, which went to Pat Leske. Waikerie's best citrus-themed shopfront went to Waikerie Intercare. It brought the community out and it brought the community together to celebrate what the Riverland is so famous for, and that is having a bit of fun and celebrating a festival, particularly around citrus.

I would like to commend the organisers of the committee who run a really good show. They brought people from far and wide: from Victoria, Adelaide and right around the Riverland. It filled up the main street and really gave Waikerie's economy a shot in the arm. It gave everyone an opportunity to taste some of the beautiful new-season citrus that was before us.

Sonia Fowler is the chair of the Riverland West Chamber of Commerce and headed the committee. Kevin Myers is vice chair, Jill Kerr is treasurer and Sandra Schober is secretary. Other committee members include Kym Webber (a great stalwart of the Waikerie community), Di Hausler, Paul McCormick, Linda McKay, Jenni Searle, Stephen Kleemann and Angela Lukacs.

What I witnessed there was great community collaboration. It themed the town for the day, and people are now working towards next year's event. I have put out the challenge to all those jam and cake makers: there is going to be pressure on them next year because I am not judging. I am going to take my jams and cakes along to the Waikerie citrus fest, just as I am going to take my cake along to the Coonalpyn Show, because we know that for all MPs the challenge is there: if you are going to make a cake, you take it to Coonalpyn to be judged and to see who is best. We know what happened last year, ladies and gentlemen!

Congratulations to Waikerie. The citrus fest was a great community event, and it is an event that I am sure everyone should consider visiting next year.

Bills

HEALTH CARE (GOVERNANCE) (NO 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:37): I delight in continuing my contribution on this important matter of the Health Care (Governance) (No 2) Amendment Bill 2019. Before the break, I was talking about what is happening at the moment in the governance of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network where the government has appointed, in a completely unprecedented way, two administrators from an external consulting company, a corporate liquidation company—KordaMentha—to be public servants of that organisation.

This is a contract and a process that has so far cost taxpayers at least \$23 million, and that only runs for the next few months. After that, it will be substantially more. We have seen so little evidence of any benefit whatsoever out of this process, except for the people who work for KordaMentha who are getting the profits out of this arrangement to the point where, as I spelled out before lunch, we saw in the most recent budget a \$282 million blowout in the health budget over the past year.

It is pretty incredible how ineffectual this process has been, despite how unusual it is and despite how many questions there are about the procurement of how this was entered into and how it is going to be running now. Ultimately, we do know from the report that was delivered by KordaMentha in their first contract with the government for some \$880,000 that they propose to cut very significantly into our health services, particularly at two hospitals, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, where they are proposing to cut over 170 beds.

They outline very clearly in the report how many daily bed nights will need to be lost, which works out that every single night over 170 beds would have to close at those hospitals. We also know, because it is spelt out in the report, that they are projecting to significantly reduce the activity of those hospitals, and they are looking at reducing what is called equisep, which is a measure of activity of hospitals, by the equivalent of about 3,500 hip operations, so a very substantial reduction in operations would happen under the plan.

The proposal they put forward was to cut some \$460 million over three years. In the first year of that, only \$40 million was going to be cut, which means that some \$420 million has to be cut over the next two years at the Central Adelaide Local Health Network to meet these savings tasks the government has set through this administration. That is a very significant reduction. At the same time, we clearly have at the moment some very significant demand on our hospitals. We have overcrowding basically every single day.

We have Code Whites happening in in our emergency departments every single day. We have ramping happening every single day in our hospitals. To cut staff, to cut beds and to cut operations while we are seeing this unprecedented flu season, at this time of the year, and while we are seeing very unprecedented ramping happening in our health system is just a recipe for disaster. That is a very significant concern about what is going on in the governance of that local health network.

Before the break, I was talking about the consultation that occurred in relation to the first piece of legislation the government presented to us, where they did not really consult at all. In fact, we were leading the consultation by talking to people after the bill had been submitted to the parliament, and they had not seen the details of the bill at all. This time around, the government said that they were going to try to do things differently. They said that they were going to consult with people and, in fact, they did send out the draft bill for people's comment, but they gave people only a very limited amount of time to do it.

In fact, they introduced the legislation into the other place the day after the stakeholder feedback ended. The closing date for the feedback from all those organisations was one day prior to

the bill being introduced. I am sure that anybody who is familiar with the processes of government would realise that between receiving stakeholder consultations and introducing a bill, if you are going to take the process seriously you need a lot more than 24 hours to do it.

You cannot seriously have people believe that within the space of 24 hours the minister and the department read and considered all the stakeholder submissions they received, sought advice on all the submissions they received, made amendments through parliamentary counsel to the legislation, as was required, based on their understanding of those submissions they received, went through the cabinet process within that 24 hours, went through the party room process within that 24 hours and had it introduced all within 24 hours. It is absolutely impossible for that to happen.

No doubt what actually happened was that we had the stakeholder submissions closing just so that they could say, 'We did some stakeholder consultation.' None of those comments at all were considered before the bill was introduced into the parliament because there was simply not time to do that within that day. It is pretty clear that a whole range of comments were raised by people during the consultation that were not incorporated into what was ultimately presented to the other place. We know because those people have told us, and we know that because we have seen some of the stakeholder submissions that were made on the draft legislation, and it is pretty clear that people were unhappy in a lot of ways about the legislation.

Some of those ways we, with the crossbench, have sought to remedy in the other place, and we have been successful in doing so by amendments we brought forward to the legislation that was presented originally by the Minister for Health, but in other ways there are still a lot of issues that need to be resolved in how that works. I will soon go through some of those submissions we received, and submissions the minister in fact received, about those issues. I want to clear up a few other things about the bill before going through those submissions in detail.

One of the issues that we have been particularly concerned about is the engagement of consumers in our health system. We need a health system that properly engages consumers and patients. Something that has been recognised for at least the last two decades is that we need to improve patient-orientated healthcare provision. To do that, we need to listen to the patients and the consumers of those services. To do that properly, we need to empower those people to speak up, train them to do so and create advocates for the consumers of those particular health services.

There will always be very strong voices in the health system coming from particular employment groups, there will always be a very strong voice for doctors, there will always be a very strong voice for nurses and there will always be a very strong voice for paramedics and other groups, but it does need support to make sure that there is a very strong voice for patients. That is why the previous government, very early on in the term of the Rann government, created and helped establish the Health Consumers Alliance of South Australia.

It was to be an independent organisation, separate from government but supported by government through peak body funding, that would advocate on behalf of consumers and patients in the healthcare system, that would train those consumer and patient advocates to represent them and take steps, as required, to be involved in discussions, planning and consultation right the way through the health system to make sure that at every stage of those discussions and developments consumers are at the table and have a voice, as do all those other groups. That is what the Health Consumers Alliance has been doing for the last 16 years.

Sadly, what we saw in the last budget was that all that funding was cut. The entire funding for the Health Consumers Alliance was cut—not 50 per cent, not 70 per cent but 100 per cent of their funding was cut. The government is saying, 'We don't need that because we've got these boards now,' even though the boards basically have no representatives of consumers on them at all—one or two maybe, but hardly what they were promising people.

This is an organisation that is needed but, because of this budget cut, they have had to make very significant cuts to their staff and they have had to get rid of their office. They are working in a co-sharing space at the moment, which is hardly ideal for training consumers and dealing with sensitive issues and experiences that patients have had in the healthcare system. They have had to remove most of their staff who were doing that. They are basically hanging on by a thread to their existence.

One of the things that the other place insisted upon as part of this legislation is that we should have a voice for consumers and that it should be mandated that the government should have to support such a voice. If we could have legislated in such a way as to say that the government should restore that funding they cut from the Health Consumers Alliance, then we would have done so. Clearly, within the powers and vestiges of the upper house, they did that in the best way possible in making clear that one of the roles of the chief executive is to make sure that there is an organisation that supports consumers in the health system—i.e., to make sure that an organisation such as the Health Consumers Alliance is in existence and continues to play the very important role of representing patients and consumers in the health system.

One of the great worries we have is that this government, bit by bit, is trampling those voices that sit across the whole health system and provide guidance and independence for the entire health system. They want to get rid of the Health Performance Council. They want to gut the Mental Health Commission. They are basically setting up the Health Consumers Alliance to close down. This is all very different from the hallmarks of transparency that the now government talked about when they were in opposition. It is a complete 180° turnaround from their so-called promises back then and it is very disappointing.

There are a few other issues that are emerging, one of which is that the government set these boards up and has said that one of the reasons for doing that is to give people in regional communities a strong voice, independent of government, about their health services. But, lo and behold, one thing that the government has done is that they have slipped in a charter for these boards and how they are to operate that says very clearly that board members are not to say anything, that board members are not to speak in the public discourse—in the media—about anything that is going on and that it should be through the chair.

It also says that board members have to be reminded that they speak for the department and for the minister. I thought these people were meant to be independent representatives of their community, but here we have this government document that sets out that they are speaking on behalf of the minister and need to be mindful of that. So which are they? Are they independent representatives of their community who are able to advocate or are they people who have to be pulled into line by the government? It seems that it is the latter.

It seems that, once again, this is a sort of Clayton's version of independent governance of the health system that the government is putting in. None of this was ever announced anywhere. Recently, it has just popped up on the governance page of the health department. I think that board members who went onto those boards thinking that they were going to represent their communities will be very disappointed to read that. Their communities, who were expecting that promise to be articulated and represented in the government, will be very disappointed with that outcome.

There are some very significant questions about how this system is going to work in terms of leadership, in terms of who is ultimately responsible for the running of the health system. So much of how this new structure is going to work is going to come down to the service level agreements. This was something that has been in the health system for some time, but is now going to have such added importance because of the inherent conflict between the minister and the department and those boards that it is all really going to come down to what is in this service level agreement.

It is going to be quite difficult for boards if they do not have a proper say in how that service level agreement should be articulated. What happens if there is a conflict is very unclear. What happens if there is a conflict between the Chief Executive of SA Health and a board about what should go in their service level agreement? What if the board says, 'Minister and department, you are not giving us enough funding to do all the things that you are telling us to do and we need a change to that agreement to say that we can't do that'? There is no mechanism in this legislation to solve that.

The answer from the minister and the department so far seems to be, 'We don't think it will come to that.' I think that is pretty significant. The minister's second reading speech in the other place had very little detail of what would happen in the event of a dispute between the Chief Executive of SA Health and the boards over funding, priorities or service level agreements. This is also an issue that has been raised by other groups in consultation.

Interestingly, the interim board chair, who is now the board chair of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Mr Mark Butcher, appointed by the minister himself, wrote to the minister saying that there should be additional details surrounding service level agreements to specify the volume, scope and standard of service provided to a local health network. I think it is very telling that the government has chosen not to act on that advice by the local health network.

It is pretty clear that there is a disagreement between the boards and the government already about how that system is going to work, and there are significant concerns about that. There are also some big issues about who the employers of staff are. The minister promised this legislation months and months before it actually came into the parliament. He promised it would be passed well before July and here we are in July with it only recently being introduced into the house this week, if not the week before.

This is a big issue in terms of who is actually employing people. This has been a big issue of contention between the local health network boards, the minister and the department. Remember that the boards are in this unenviable position where they take all the blame for things but they do not set their budgets, control their staff or necessarily control their targets and service level agreements. They are saying, 'This is pretty bad. Why shouldn't we be in control of the staff who work in this agency?'

Likewise, a lot of the employee representatives say, 'We don't want to have a whole range of different employment local level agreements. We think that workers' rights should be protected across the board.' There is inherent conflict. We understand that this escalated to the point where the chairs of the boards got together and made a beeline—not to go and talk to the Minister for Health because, as anybody who studies the Marshall government knows, ministers are not really in charge of their portfolios. Who do they make a beeline for? The Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, because he is really running the government.

A crisis meeting was held between the chairs of the boards and the Hon. Rob Lucas, the Treasurer, to decide how this process was going to be decided. The Treasurer ultimately carried the day: these decisions would be held centrally. Yet again, this is another step by which this is not actually devolved. None of those 32,000-odd FTEs in SA Health, which is many more employees by headcount, report to their local boards: they all report to the Chief Executive of SA Health, just as they did before this legislation came in.

There is no change to the staffing arrangements at all in terms of who is ultimately responsible. It puts the boards in an awkward position where they are responsible for what happens in their hospitals but not responsible for who works there and provides all the services, which I think is going to be very odd in terms of how that actually works.

Over the past almost 16 months, we have seen the impact of the Marshall government on our hospitals. While we have corporate liquidators running around earning big bucks, we have hospital beds closing. While we have board directors being paid \$15 million over four years, we have record ramping. Ramping is now more than double, every day, every month, what it was back when we were in government—more than double. There are now more than 2,000 hours when ambulances are delayed, stuck at emergency departments, waiting to offload patients.

That is time when they could be out helping other patients. That is time when they are not on the road, responding to call-outs. Ultimately, that means that in the past year we have seen some very significant declines in response times for ambulances, which is of very significant concern. That situation is only getting worse and worse. Every week now, we see ramping at extraordinary levels in South Australia, and there is no plan to do anything about it except to cut staff. In fact, they have now delayed important emergency department upgrades.

We put in place a plan for a \$52 million upgrade of the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which is one of the fastest growing hospitals in our state given the fast growing population of the northern suburbs. That has now been pushed back a year by this government. They had said in their last budget that they would spend \$12 million of that funding upgrading the hospital emergency department in the financial year that has just gone, the 2018-19 financial year. Well, they spent only \$1.5 million of that. They have hardly turned a sod in the ground. Very little work has happened on that project. Meanwhile, we have very significant ramping happening across the health system.

At the same time, I think that there are very big questions about what will happen with SA Pathology, and that directly relates to the governance of the health system. The governance of the health system at the moment, both under the old system and the new system, is that statewide services such as SA Pathology, SA Dental Service, and Drug and Alcohol Services of South Australia (DASSA) reside within local health networks. They report to those local health networks, not centrally. That is now enshrined in the legislation that the government has passed.

It was one of those issues where they were umming and aching about whether to change it but they have decided to keep that in place. I think what that creates here is the question: how is the privatisation that the government has mooted of SA Pathology going to happen? Is it going to be a decision by the government centrally? The way I read the legislation now, this would be a decision of the local health network. The local health network could decide to privatise SA Pathology because it is within their remit to do so.

Who is really in charge of that? We know that the current acting chief executive or acting executive director of SA Pathology is also the Deputy Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing. This same person is responsible for a whole range of other things across the entire health system, including finances, human resources, communications—very significant responsibilities—and, I think, even procurement. They are massive responsibilities. But in her spare time, she is meant to be in charge of SA Pathology, which is much more than a full-time job in itself.

It also raises the question: when she is working for SA Pathology, who is she reporting to? Is she reporting to the Central Adelaide Local Health Network (CALHN) and reporting to their board, or is she reporting to the Department for Health and Wellbeing? I think there are big questions about how that is running in practice and who ultimately is responsible for those statewide services.

We have recently seen the government announce that they are going to cut 100 staff from SA Pathology, and that is just the beginning. The minister has outlined that it will potentially be up to 200 staff who will go from SA Pathology while the government is considering whether or not to privatise it. There is no way that that can happen, particularly with an increase in the number of patient tests that we have seen, without hitting South Australians in terms of the performance of those services, the delays in getting services, but also, very importantly for South Australia, the research and the teaching in our health system that are so important and where SA Pathology provides such an important role.

Unfortunately, we have seen some other very significant cuts come about which are going to impact upon the hospitals covered by this act. We have seen cuts to sexual health services. SHINE SA provides fantastic community health services. It had its budget slashed in the last budget and, ultimately, that has led to them having to close down two important centres, one in the northern suburbs and one in the southern suburbs. This is at the same time that we are seeing the rates of infection going up. At the same time that we should probably be seeing improvements in those services, we are seeing closures thanks to this government.

We saw the closure of an important HIV service in South Australia, Cheltenham House, due to 100 per cent of its funding being cut by the government. We have seen no winter plan from this government, just a website and a TV ad, and no additional resources going to help the situation. At the same time, we are stiffing nurses, cleaners and other hospital staff with \$725 extra per year in car parking costs. We are stiffing patients, carers and loved ones with 20 per cent more car parking costs. We are also now jacking up the rates of getting an ambulance to over \$1,000 for the first time, which is a massive impost for somebody, particularly on a low income, who needs emergency treatment. This is the record of this government and it is particularly disappointing.

I will run through a number of issues that have been raised by some of the stakeholders, particularly those who were consulted in terms of the legislation. There was consultation with the Health Performance Council, a body the government proposed to cut in its entirety. The minister received a letter from the chair of the Health Performance Council, Mr Steve Tully, which sets out in no uncertain terms his concerns over the legislation and his concerns in terms of the direction that the government was going in. He said:

The council sees many opportunities, and is working to contribute to your government's efforts to provide quality care for all South Australians. In its current form, this bill focuses too narrowly on public health services and a

process perspective rather than a population-wide and whole health systems perspective. This will be to the detriment of understanding all-of-SA population health outcomes. A picture of health system performance that only draws on public hospital activity is incomplete and may be misleading.

In our role under our act, the council advises you on significant trends in the health status of South Australians and considers future priorities for the health systems in South Australia. This whole-of-system approach can identify movements in health outcomes, including trends that relate to particular illnesses or population groups, as well as reviewing the performance of the various health systems established within the state. For example, in the latest four-yearly report (December 2018) patient movement between the public and private health systems remains a huge data blind spot in South Australia, and oversight is important so that the SA population is adequately and safely served.

The Health Performance Council output has a distinct and strategic role that can authenticate and support service level agreement implementation. We offer a whole-system perspective with legitimate challenge to information aggregated under service level agreements, and tests this information by drawing on different sources of intelligence, quantitative and qualitative, most especially in forming advice about how to tackle disparities between outcomes for specific population groups.

The Health Performance Council has a practice of designing review projects with stakeholders and community, and works in favour of publication of our work to promote transparency. Aboriginal peoples' inclusion in the health performance process is intrinsic to the Health Performance Council way of working. For example, we proudly co-host Aboriginal Leaders' Forum...[with] SAHMRI, and I look forward to welcoming your visit to our next forum meeting...Aboriginal Leaders' Forum originated in the recognition that more was needed to deliver Aboriginal intelligence and sense-checking to health statistics and health service performance assessment as it reflected the reporting of Aboriginal population health and the design of policy and service improvement.

There you have a letter from the government's own independent council overseeing the health system, providing strategic advice, saying that this bill the minister drafted did not cut the mustard, did not provide a whole-of-system approach. It did not look at the whole continuum of health services, and abolishing the Health Performance Council was going to be not only a detriment to health care in South Australia but actually a detriment to the implementation of the minister's own supposed reforms themselves.

I mentioned before the issues around those service level agreements. The Health Performance Council have outlined how they can play an important role in making sure those health service agreements can be dealt with. One of the very important consultation documents we were presented with was a joint statement on behalf of a very significant number of health bodies in South Australia that were concerned about this legislation.

It was submitted to us, the government, and all the crossbenchers in the other place. They then followed up by having a consultation forum with all those bodies represented to talk through their issues with legislation and try to get improvements to them, many of which I am glad to say the upper house took heed of. I hope we do not see the government amending those back to the way the government originally wanted them here in this house.

Those bodies were quite varied and wide. We had the South Australian Council of Social Service (SACOSS), the Health Consumers Alliance, the Aboriginal Health Council, the Lived Experience Leadership and Advocacy Network, the Australian Association of Social Workers, the SA Network of Drug and Alcohol Services, the Australian Health Promotion Association, the Public Health Association, and the Mental Health Coalition. As part of the consultation session we had with all those bodies and all those parties represented in the parliament, the Australian Medical Association also took part and reflected a lot of these views as well.

They had a number of recommendations that needed to be addressed in terms of the legislation. Firstly, oversight and independent safeguarding bodies: retain the Health Performance Council as a mechanism for an independent line of accountability and therefore oppose clauses 4, 5, 7, 17, 18 and 22 of the government's bill. If the government want to replace the Health Performance Council with a new commission, they should come to the parliament with a bill to enshrine that commission, its powers, oversight, reporting and independence, before abolishing the HPC.

As I was saying before, we have this government saying they want to set up a commission, but there is no actual meat behind it, there is no legislation behind it, and there is no independence behind it. It is just going to be an office in the department, and all these bodies are saying, if you want to replace the Health Performance Council with that, you should legislate for it. You should actually design it and implement it with the blessing of the parliament and with reporting to the parliament.

They also recommended amending the acts to give consumers and those with lived experience an independent voice. This could be done by inserting into section 7 a requirement that the chief executive shall ensure a percentage, to be set by regulation, of a funding amount allocated to the LHNs through their service agreements is directed to an independent, non-government health consumer organisation for individual and systemic representation and advocacy and to ensure evidence-informed consumer and community engagement in healthcare services policy, planning and services.

As I was saying before, we have the Health Consumers Alliance that has been completely defunded by the government. Here we have a recommendation to try to bring that back through this legislation. Unfortunately, that could not be the case due to the Constitution Act, essentially, but what has passed through the other place is a provision that the chief executive should have to establish a process by which health consumers are represented and establish a body to do so, which I think is vitally important.

There was also a recommendation to statutorily enshrine the Mental Health Commissioner as an independent statutory body under the act with appropriate powers and independence. Enshrining that in the legislation, thankfully, is in here at the moment. I hope that the government does not amend it out because that is so important in making sure that body is not just going to continue to exist but is actually going to be independent and have the powers and resources that are needed. There was also a recommendation to amend the functions of the Health CE to include:

- a focus on health promotion and primary health care, including in policy and practical programs;
- ongoing engagement with external stakeholders and consumer representatives to inform and influence healthcare services policy, planning and services;
- public reporting on the performance, population health outcomes and patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) at a local level and systemic level to inform and influence services policy, planning and services; and
- the ability to direct broad-based systemic change and specific programs and service.

There was a recommendation to amend the functions of the board in section 33(2) of the 2008 act to give LHNs more focus on health promotion and primary and Aboriginal health care in their local areas. The functions as drafted are currently very hospital based. The service agreements in clause 8 of this bill must be developed in consultation with community representatives and peak bodies and with reference to the applicable standards of primary health, health population, Aboriginal health and consumer engagement to ensure inclusive, non-discriminatory healthcare services as well as policy and planning that is informed and influenced by evidence-based consumer and community engagement.

It was recommended that the bill be amended to reflect the requirement for the public health system and services to work in a cohesive way to ensure integrated care around a person's needs. The health system should be inclusive of private providers, primary health networks and public health services provided across local government, aged-care, disability and Aboriginal-specific health services. A requirement should be inserted for LHN boards' service agreements and functions and the role and functions of the Health CE to specify that barriers in access arising from the fragmentation of services should be measured and reduced over time.

The probity of boards is an area that I think is immensely important. Clause 12, which removes the requirement for attaching the pecuniary interest to a particular conflict in board minutes, needs to be amended to increase transparency about decisions where a conflict is declared by a member. A further recommendation is to delete clause 11, which broadens the eligibility of board members to include people who are engaged with the LHN. This could include people who are on the boards of private pathology companies or part of a consultancy to the LHN, etc.

I think that last point is particularly important and is something I addressed briefly earlier. That, sadly, was one area where we did try to amend the bill but were not successful. We will be opposing that clause when we get to the debate in the committee stage because we cannot have a situation where, say, you are a KordMentha executive and you have been engaged by the

government for a local health network and you also go on the board. What a massive conflict of interest that person would have if they had to keep those services running and keep flowing work to the consultancy that that person was engaged with. What a massive conflict of interest that would be, and it is being opened up by the government through this legislation.

The government's answer is, 'What about a baker who provides bread to the government?' I do not think that anybody would suspect that that would have been covered by the original legislation. This is about specific engagement to the LHN that creates a very specific conflict of interest, which should be prohibited. We should not allow such a blatant conflict of interest to stand where somebody can be a highly paid consultant to an LHN with one hat on and then an independent board member supposedly representing taxpayers and the public interest with another on, with a board that is dealing with multimillion-dollar contracts in potentially billion-dollar budgets. What is being proposed is absolutely obscene.

All those proposals were put by SACOSS, the Mental Health Coalition, the Health Consumers Alliance and all those other groups to all the parties and the vast majority of those suggestions were picked up. I think not all of them are quite able to be picked up because, ultimately, it is a bit hard to change legislation so far down the track in the way that the government has sought to draft it. I think the crossbench and the opposition in the other place did the best they possibly could to amend the legislation, listening to those concerns that have been raised, to try to make sure that this becomes a better bill and ultimately better for the people of South Australia.

I mentioned before that the AMA were also part of that consultation, and they raised a number of concerns as well. They raised these back in April with the minister when he asked for their thoughts on the governance bill back then, and none of them were really taken up. We saw such a dismissive view of the consultation on this bill, and none of these issues were addressed. The AMA raised some the issues in a letter that was written by John Woodall, the acting chief executive of the AMA, on 30 April 2019 to the Hon. Stephen Wade, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Under 'Objective and rationale for change', they state:

The AMA(SA) is yet to see the strategic intent in the measures to decentralise governance. South Australians have endured vast overhauls of the health system in recent years, and it might be argued that health has not improved through this cycle of change...We are concerned at the absence of any robust search, evidence or modelling with which to assess or demonstrate the likely success of yet more—albeit limited—reforms as outlined in this Bill.

They also said:

In addition, without clearly defined strategies, objectives and targets, we are concerned that the impacts of change may be felt most keenly in rural and remote regions, where the ramifications of 'siloes' on already under-serviced residents and a stretched health workforce will be most dramatic.

That goes to what I was saying earlier in terms of what the impact will be in regional health services. Every time you talk to anybody in the health system about these governance changes, a few things come out. They say, 'Yes, we have to go through another change,' and there is a bit of change fatigue. Secondly, I think people think boards in the city will probably be okay, but everybody is worried, all the health experts are worried, about what this split-up of Country Health is going to look like and how this is actually going to work.

Here, the AMA spell out clearly that they are particularly worried about what the ramifications will be on rural and remote regions of our state where we are going to see more siloing, more bureaucracy and more pressure on people who work in those health services to meet these new bureaucratic requirements that have been put in place. They also had comments in terms of the Commission on Excellence and Innovation in Health. They said:

Without clear understanding of the role and functions of the Commissioner or the Commission—which we understand is still 'in the design phase'—it is difficult to gauge whether the Commission will fulfil the valuable functions of the Health Performance Council, which you are proposing to abolish.

We would also be concerned if the Commissioner were to report solely to the CEO of SA Health, and not have direct access to the Minister. Similarly, we would query the value of a Commission that was able to report only on the public [health] system and not include an overview of the private system and its interaction with (and resulting impacts on) the public system...

The AMA(SA) is concerned that in abolishing the Health Performance Council the Bill will eliminate the independent and objective oversight of the system the Council has provided since 2008. The AMA(SA) has in the past

supported the Council as an independent body that investigates, gathers data and provides recommendations for change. We believe it is vital for our health system that we have in this state an independent body that can investigate and assess the performance of the state's health systems—and that [it] can do so without fear or retribution.

The Council has additionally proven its value in examining the pieces of the health system—public and private, state and national, primary and tertiary—and the issues within it. It has also performed the role of examining the impact of programs that start and stop; to measure their success; and to pinpoint reasons, such as the limited access to data or the absence of measurable targets, that such measurement may not be possible...

In addition, the Council advised that SA Health policy-makers were not paying attention to the needs, ideas or experiences of SA Health staff—the very people on whom a high-quality efficient system relies.

The AMA(SA) is also acutely aware that the Council has identified issues affecting vulnerable South Australians—including the aged and those at the end of their lives, people from culturally and linguistically diverse groups, Aboriginal South Australians, people in rural and remote areas, and young people. We seek reassurance that the 'decentralised' system will be responsive and have sufficient capacity to identify and address these issues, as well as serve the healthcare needs of everyone in South Australia.

The AMA(SA) wishes to ensure that the independent, objective oversight of the system the Council has provided will continue as a mandated element in the new Commission.

Then they talk about system oversight:

Our health system requires evidence, so that we can make the right decisions based on the...knowledge available at any time. The AMA(SA) is concerned that the new governance frameworks are being introduced on 1 July 2019 without clear strategic objectives to guide change or the retention of existing structures. For example, we have only just been asked to comment on a 'design proposal' for the operating structures of regional LHNs. If such structures are only now being designed, we question the readiness of the 'new' to replace the 'old'; what may be missed in the meantime; and who will be accountable for errors that...occur.

That is a particularly stinging comment at the end of April. Only at that point in time was the government starting the process of designing how the local health networks that just started on 1 July were going to operate. I find it very difficult to believe that in two months, May and June, suddenly the government was able to design and perfect and implement a massive structural change for those regional local health networks.

The points that the AMA raised in terms of what would happen if things went wrong, what protections are in place and who will be accountable if they do go wrong, if errors do occur, is a very significant issue. It is worth reminding ourselves that one of the very serious issues, where the previous Health Care Act came about, was about the safety and quality of healthcare services in our state and was when we had boards in regional South Australia going in different directions, getting different equipment, having different processes and different contracting arrangements and having different safety and quality protocols. There were errors that resulted from that.

Who is going to be responsible if we do see errors in this new system? Who is going to be responsible if patients are affected because of that? I fear that the minister is going to try to buck the blame to anyone else. Ultimately, it is a system that he has created, a system that he alone has sought to implement and legislate for the parliament, so ultimately the responsibility will lie with him.

I mentioned before the Charter for Local Health Network Governing Boards, which has been recently put on the website and was established under the Health Care Act 2008, Volume 1, May 2019. A lot of it is replicating what is in the legislation that was passed earlier in terms of the roles of boards and in terms of procedures. But where it gets particularly interesting is in relation to talking about media and communications. On page 12, section 7.5, Media and Communications, states:

Members have a requirement to ensure appropriate and consistent communication occurs. All public comment, including that to any media organisation on behalf of the Board, is to be made by the Chairperson.

The Chairperson may specifically authorise another person to comment on a particular matter. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Deputy Chairperson (if appointed) will address media enquiries on behalf of the Board.

On occasions members may be asked their opinions and when talking to the media members should:

- let the Board Chairperson and SA Health Media Unit know if they have been contacted by, or intend to speak to the media, in advance of making comment;
- make clear the capacity in which they are speaking i.e. whether they are expressing their own personal views or speaking on behalf of the Board'

- remember they are representing the Government and Minister;
- remember that decisions of the Board are made collectively, and members share equal responsibility for Board decisions; and
- be mindful of, and aligned to, the Board's governance role.

Operational and management media and communications concerning LHNs are managed by the SA Health Media Unit in accordance with the SA Health Media Policy Directive.

The government is saying, 'We are creating these boards. There's going to be independence. Everyone is going to be happy in regional South Australia. Oh, but wait, we're going to issue this directive telling you that all media inquiries are to be dealt with by City Centre, Hindmarsh Square, Adelaide, and you're not allowed to say anything about what is going on in your regional communities. All inquiries have to flow there. Oh, and, by the way, remember you are representing the government, not just the government but the minister as well.'

Far from being independent, SA Health is specifically outlining for these members that they have to represent the minister and that they have to pass things through the SA Health Media Unit. I do not see anywhere in the legislation that says that. So much of this policy document outlines what is in the legislation, but nowhere in the legislation is there any requirement or prohibition, from what I can see, in terms of prohibiting members of the boards from speaking publicly about their local health services. Nowhere does it say, 'You have to go to Hindmarsh Square if you want to say something about what's going on in the health system.' That is something that has just been snuck in very sneakily.

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

The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey): There not being a quorum, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: A quorum is present. The member for Kaurana.

Mr PICTON: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I am glad that you are here to hear my contribution on this speech. I was just talking about how the government is seeking to limit the rights of board members to have their say and speak publicly about issues in the health system. I think that the internal dilemma in the system that the government is seeking to operate is going to come to the point where there will be issues and we will have to see board members speaking up publicly about their concerns.

Already one board member has written directly to the minister outlining their concerns specifically with this legislation, and that is the board chair (or he was the interim board chair at the time) of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Mr Mark Butcher. He wrote to the minister on 30 April, again just sneaking in before the minister was able to introduce his legislation, and no doubt I think it is pretty clear did not take account of any of these suggestions that were made by people. He raised a number of significant issues. He said:

In preparing the response, I have given consideration to communications I have observed and contributed to at the Department of Health and Wellbeing (DHW), within SALHN and within the group of metropolitan LHN Board Chairs and LHN Chief Executive Officers.

Not only is it his views but it is also reflections upon what he has seen from the other LHNs, who are clearly talking together about some of these issues. He saw a particular issue in the amendment of section 7, the role of the chief executive, and he said that the proposed legislated change of role of the chief executive is noted. He goes on to say:

The new system may benefit if the accountability framework for the [Department for Health and Wellbeing], and its obligations within service agreements, was more clearly defined. Without this additional clarification, the health system's governance reform program is open to interpretation by individuals who may lack essential detail to effect the reform required to underpin an effective holistic system.

He also raised issues, as I was saying, in terms of service agreements and went on to say:

The proposed provisions as described in Part 4A—Service agreements are unidirectional in intent. That is, the sole context is of the Chief Executive negotiating a service agreement with the Local Health Network's (LHN) Chief Executive Officer for services and obligations of the LHN. There is no reference to the need for, or required terms of,

service agreements between the LHN's Chief Executive Officer and the CE of the DHW for services and obligations of the DHW to the LHNs.

The service agreements may be enhanced if they specify the volume, scope and standard of services provided by the DHW to the LHN. Amongst other matters this may include such matters as services provided by the DHW's:

- Digital Health agency;
- Wellbeing SA; and
- Commission on Excellence and Innovation.

He also raised significant concerns, as I mentioned earlier, in regard to employed staff. He said:

Whilst there is a case for the LHNs to assume the role as employer for their respective staff, at the meeting between the Interim LHN Chairs, you and the Treasurer, on Friday 5th April 2019, the Treasurer explained the rationale for the continuation of the CE SA Health as the employing authority. In so doing he suggested that the service agreements would set out significant delegations for matter of employment, effectively transferring significant authority to the LHNs CEOs.

That is very interesting. That does not appear in the legislation, but apparently there has been some agreement by the Treasurer, who we really know is in charge of the government, in terms of what will be part of the service level agreements. He goes on to say:

Without these effective delegations, retention of the CE SA Health as the employing authority poses a risk to a LHN's Governing Board's ability to deliver on their legislated functions...

Specifically, continuing the CE SA Health as the employing authority, in the absence of delegations in the service agreements, may present a tension for the CE SA Health with the new expectations of their role which as proposed, will not have direct accountability and responsibility for management of public health services. Section 14 may benefit from additional clarity in that regard.

This relatively short letter really does set out a number of the contradictions, a number of the issues and a number of what I think will be the brooding problems with this slapdash approach that the government has insisted upon for setting up these LHN boards.

Here we have the CE of the Department for Health, who supposedly is no longer responsible for any health services but is responsible for all the staff who work in those health services. Here we have the LHN boards saying, 'We need some power to manage our staff if we are going to deliver on these service level agreements.' We have the Treasurer saying, 'Don't worry, it's all going to be taken care of in the service level agreements,' but none of that is in the legislation to be dealt with at all, so I would not have any confidence if I were them that any of that would be addressed.

We also have specific concerns about what will go in those service level agreements and, particularly, what will have to come the other way. It is the old: 'What will you do for me?' not, 'What I will do for you.' There is a lot in there about what the LHNs will do for Health, but not a lot about what Health will do for the LHNs. I think Mr Butcher raises a number of concerns in relation to particular areas where the government has chosen to keep control at a central level, such as the Digital Health Agency, such as Wellbeing SA and such as the Commission on Excellence and Innovation.

LHNs will be reliant upon the department for those services, but it is not necessarily clear whether they will be part of the agreement and that there will be targets that the central health department will have to meet in their delivery. It is particularly important when you are looking at Wellbeing SA, which, as I said earlier, is an organisation where the government has sought to combine a whole range of functions that were already done centrally within the department.

The rumour is that the way the minister is trying to get around the fact that the Treasurer will not give him any money at all to run any out of hospital programs is that maybe he is going to pull out from those local hospital networks those services that are done out of hospital and stick them in Wellbeing SA. Not only will they then be stuck centrally in Wellbeing SA but the government may well go about a process of privatisation of those services. This is being talked about. That is a very significant change. We know from discussions this week this government's love for privatisation that they have shown already, so it may well happen that we will see a centralisation and then a privatisation of those services.

At the same time that the government is saying they are devolving things, they are just devolving the hospitals. All those other services that those hospitals rely on to reduce their pressure are going to sit centrally and those boards will again be in a tough position because they will not have the ability to control them. They will not have the ability to have any oversight and they will not have the ability to know whether those services are actually being delivered or not.

They also will not have the ability—and I would have thought this was pretty central in the role of running an LHN board—to decide, if they have X amount of money, how much they are going to spend on the acute system, how much they are going to spend on the primary system, how much they are going to spend on digital health and how much they are going to spend on a range of other areas of the health system, because the government is hoovering up some of that. They are holding it centrally and just being told, 'Well, you're just running hospitals.' Well, that is a very narrow lens through which to view the health system.

These were specifically set up in the Health Care Act to be local health networks, not local hospital networks, because it is so important that they have a broader remit than just running the hospital. I think that they should be doing more, not less, in that and that would certainly help the running of our health system. That is a very significant letter to get from a significant person that the government themselves have appointed to be in charge.

This is a bill that has improved significantly from where we started. Originally, we were facing a bill that I think was going to cause a huge amount of damage by setting back by quite a long way our oversight of the system with the Health Performance Council being abolished. Sadly, the government wanted to pursue that. Luckily, we have taken that out in the other house. I do note that I think that there was one amendment that the upper house missed that still references getting rid of the Health Performance Council, so we will seek to oppose that in the committee stage here.

We will also be opposing one other section that slipped through the Legislative Council in terms of the oversight of the system by members of the board who could be engaged themselves as consultants for, say, a KordaMentha-type company while at the same time they are on the board of the company. That is a massive conflict and I think we need to stamp that out.

But there are elements of the bill that are good now. There is an element of the bill to enshrine the Health Performance Council. I note that the government is saying that this is not a perfect way of drafting it. Well, of course not. We did what we could to try to save this organisation. It would have been good if you had done it and we did not have to do it, but we are trying to save this organisation from you gutting it—gutting all its staff, gutting its independence and sacking the existing commissioner, who everybody regards as having done an exceedingly fantastic job since he has been appointed.

We were also trying to make sure that the bill continues its clause in relation to consumers and a chief executive having a role to make sure that there is at least a body centrally that is representing consumers—

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order: sir, it is my solemn duty to draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PICTON: As I was saying, we think it is important that we do not have people who are engaged by the local health network and on the board of the local health network because that is a direct conflict of interest, particularly when such vast sums of taxpayers' dollars are at stake. I have to correct one thing I said earlier when, off the top of my head, I said that some of the people who work for KordaMentha are being paid in the order of some \$800 a day. Deputy Speaker, I regret to inform you that I vastly underestimated the figures. On double-checking my listing from off the top of my head, I referred to an article from the *Adelaide Advertiser* dated Thursday 7 February 2019.

Mr DULUK: Point of order, Mr Speaker: it saddens me that the member for Kurna referred to you as Deputy Speaker when, of course, you are the Speaker of the house.

The SPEAKER: That is true. I am sure he will correct himself in future addresses.

Mr PICTON: It was a mere mistake. What gladdens me is that the member for Waite is paying such attention.

The SPEAKER: He never misses a beat.

Mr PICTON: He might be very interested to know—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICTON: —my correction of the payments that KordaMentha staff are receiving. On 7 February 2019, an article by Mr Brad Crouch in the *Adelaide Advertiser*, called 'Health repairs a costly business', outlined the payments being received by KordaMentha staff. What do you think the daily rate is? I said \$800 before but, no, that is way off. Is it \$1,000? No. It is not \$1,000 a day, \$2,000 a day, \$3,000 a day or \$4,000 a day. It is \$5,166 per day that these staff receive as part of this administration. There are three staff on that rate. One staff member, a subcontractor, was getting \$6,492 a day.

Mr Odenwalder: That's a lot of nurses.

Mr PICTON: 'That's a lot of nurses,' says the member for Elizabeth. That is right. How long would a nurse have to work to get \$6,492, let alone a cleaner? Quite a lot longer than one day, I suspect. At the same time, this is a government that is putting up car parking rates by \$725 a year for some of our lowest paid workers in the Public Service: cleaners, orderlies, care assistants and enrolled nurses. Those people are being stiffed.

These people, who are all interstate, who are all external contractors who live in Sydney, Melbourne and other places—they do not live here—are getting paid thousands and thousands of dollars every single day. That is the sort of governance that we are seeing under this government. That is the sort of approach that they have to the health system. It is delivering awful results so far under their tenure. We see the results getting worse every single day.

We have a confused, mismanaged approach to this governance reform that is being criticised across the board, from stakeholders and clinicians to even the board chairs themselves. It is set up to potentially send our health system backwards. I hope that the health minister actually listens to some of these people who have raised these significant concerns because, ultimately, if these systems fail, then people will suffer as a result. I conclude my remarks in regard to this bill.

Members interjecting:

Mr PICTON: I am happy to keep going. I think it is very important that the elements of the bill that were changed by the Legislative Council remain, and that those clauses that I have outlined that need to be opposed are opposed by this house so that there is a chance of this system slightly working and not being further to the detriment of health in this state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER: I rise to make a statement regarding a privilege matter regarding the awarding of a transport contract. I refer to the matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens in the house yesterday in relation to an answer to a question given by the Minister for Transport. More specifically, the member for West Torrens asked the following question to the minister:

Is the minister aware of the performance report received by the New South Wales government in relation to Keolis Downer and its operations in Newcastle?

The Minister for Transport, in responding to the question, made a few preliminary remarks and then stated the following:

I think we can judge the performance of Keolis Downer on their merits, and we can judge the way that Keolis Downer is viewed by the department and the government by the contracts that they get awarded. In 2011, it was

obviously concluded that they were the company to run parts of our bus network. I think that is a reasonable performance report—

The member for West Torrens, in raising the matter of privilege, states:

The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure informed the house that Keolis Downer was awarded the contract in South Australia in 2011. That is not correct.

Later that day, the Minister for Transport made a personal explanation to the house and stated the following:

I wish to update the house to say that in 2011 the bus contracts were tendered. ATE, trading as SouthLink, was awarded the areas of outer north, outer south, and the Hills. In 2015, Keolis Downer purchased ATE and, under the contract conditions, ministerial consent was required as the control of the company had changed. The ministerial consent was granted at that time.

The member for West Torrens alleges that the minister, in providing incorrect information to the house, has committed a contempt by deliberately misleading the house. Deliberately misleading the house is one of the matters that can be found to be a contempt. To establish that contempt has been committed, it needs to be established that:

1. a statement had in fact been misleading;
2. the member knew at the time the statement was incorrect; and
3. the misleading had been deliberate.

In addition, to amount to a contempt, the action would need to genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties.

I have had the opportunity to examine the *Hansard* record, including the minister's personal explanation. On the evidence available to me, I conclude that there is a discrepancy between the information provided to the house in the minister's answer and his personal explanation to support the contention that incorrect information was provided. However, having said that, I believe that the incorrect information provided to the house by the minister in an answer to a question was inadvertent and not deliberate.

For that reason, it is not clear that a prima facie case has been made that would amount to or be intended or likely amount to an improper interference that could genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties.

Accordingly, I do not propose to give precedence which would enable this matter to be immediately pursued as a matter of privilege. This decision, however, does not prevent the member for West Torrens or any other member from proceeding with a motion on the specific matter by giving notice in the normal way.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD EXPLOITATION AND ENCRYPTED MATERIAL) BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of message No. 95 from the Legislative Council.

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendments Nos 1, 3, 8 to 11, 13, 20 to 22, 25 and 26 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

(Continued from 3 July 2019.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I indicate that the government is no longer insisting on the amendments presented to us from the Legislative Council. Chair, you will recall that they were made, they came to us, they were rejected, and they have been re-presented to us. We are now accepting them. Clearly, the Legislative Council was determined to limit the application of the bill in relation to the offences to which this would apply for the purposes of the police having these extra powers. I indicate that the government will accept the same.

Ms STINSON: I rise to support the amendments to the Statutes Amendment (Child Exploitation and Encrypted Material) Bill. As the Attorney-General said yesterday—and again today, in fact—the Legislative Council has amended the bill, and we support those amendments. I am

pleased to see that the Attorney and her team have come to this decision to support the amendments made in the other place to get this legislation moving.

The bill will now rightly cover child exploitation and will not have a broadbrush approach dealing with other matters covered by existing legislation. We on this side think that we now have a bill, and I am sure those on the side do as well, that will shine a light on child sexual exploitation, giving police the best possible chance to stop these heinous crimes against children.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019

Appropriation Grievances

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.

(Continued from 3 July 2019.)

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:53): It is a great opportunity to speak today on the 2019-20 Marshall government's state budget that was handed down by the Treasurer a few weeks ago. It is certainly a budget that will build on this government's first budget, which delivered on all its election commitments, while at the same time cleaning up the mess left to it by the former government. To refresh, those commitments were to lower costs, create more jobs and provide better services. This 2019-20 budget continues to progress this government's priorities of increasing economic growth and jobs and also providing better public services for South Australians.

In between these two budgets, there has been unfortunately a significant reduction in the expectation of the GST revenue coming into the state as a result of changes to how the available national GST pool is allocated. It is principally because of weaker national consumption expenditure and also a softer housing market that has reduced investment in dwellings, but there has also been a decrease in South Australia's share of the GST grants. Combined, these changes result in an expected reduction in GST revenue of some \$2.1 billion over the next four years.

This softer housing market that I mentioned has also meant a reduction in expected conveyance duty revenue of approximately \$184 million over these four years. One wonders how much of a dampener the possible election of a high-taxing Bill Shorten government had on consumer confidence and certainly the retreat of investment dollars of aspirational Australians into our economy. Thankfully, as you and many others would agree, the Morrison government was re-elected on 18 May. It is an election result that bodes well not only for Australia but for South Australia as well. It really would be a positive if, in some future budgets, these GST writedowns were not as large as have been estimated at this point in time.

However, we can only deal with what we have. Faced with these significant writedowns in our GST revenue, the government has chosen to continue to encourage economic growth and jobs growth and not put the handbrake on some of the positive signs of growth being shown here in South Australia since the Marshall government was elected in March 2018. Certainly last year's budget set a strong foundation. We made some difficult decisions at the time, aiming to create a surplus budget and then allowing these surpluses to continue in the future.

The 2018-19 budget is estimated to be a small surplus of approximately \$100 million, and then each year from now the budget is projected to be in surplus through to 2022-23. This is certainly in contrast to seven deficits in the 10 previous years from the former government. Faced with this significant writedown in GST revenue, fees and charges have increased in the budget to cope with this. However, the budget still contains commitments that the Marshall government took to the election and that have been delivered via this budget and last year's budget. These include the promise to reduce the emergency services levy by \$90 million each year.

For a family with a median-valued house valued at \$480,000, the saving next year will be \$163 compared with the payment it would have been without these ESL remissions and what was policy under the former Labor government. For a family with a house value of \$750,000, the saving is much greater at \$254. In addition to these costs, the costs of running a car will reduce as of 1 July (just gone), with compulsory third-party premiums for running a car in the metropolitan area reducing by up to \$114 for each car.

For households with two cars, this can be a saving of more than \$200 for each household. The Treasurer outlined in his budget speech that there are 340,000 households in South Australia that fall into this category of having more than one car. Another cost initiative that is certainly very popular in my electorate and others is the continuation of the \$100 sports vouchers that can go towards the cost of membership or registration fees for primary school-aged children. Businesses also benefit from the reduction in their ESL bills and the abolition of payroll tax in last year's budget.

Small businesses with payrolls up to \$1.5 million will have no payroll tax applicable. In addition, this budget begins the process of reducing the top land tax rate by 0.1 per cent per year to become 2.9 per cent from 1 July 2027. To go with this responsible management to create a sustainable budget position that delivers lower costs, the budget also builds a better future for South Australia with major investments in our public infrastructure, such as hospitals, schools and roads in both metropolitan Adelaide and also the regions. This \$11.9 billion investment into productive infrastructure to help grow our economy will create a lot of activity and will lead to more South Australian jobs.

Just this week, the RBA governor, Philip Lowe, made the following points on how governments throughout Australia, from Queensland to Victoria, Liberal or Labor, can push the economy forward. Mr Lowe said, 'One option is fiscal support, including through spending on infrastructure.' He went on to say:

Another option is structural policies that support firms expanding, investing, innovating and employing people. A strong, dynamic, competitive business sector generates jobs.

I think you will agree, Mr Deputy Speaker, that this is exactly what this government is doing. I talked about the payroll tax, the emergency services levy cuts, the land tax and now also the \$11.9 billion into infrastructure investment.

If I can just touch on some of those investments across this state, there has been a significant investment of \$3.2 billion into road infrastructure in both regional South Australia and metropolitan Adelaide to make regional roads safer and also to bust congestion in high-use intersections throughout Adelaide. One such project is the grade separation at the Hove crossing on Brighton Road, a \$171 million project and certainly one of those that will bust congestion. It is a joint state and federal government initiative. I know that the member for Black and the member for Gibson, as well as the federal member for Boothby, have been instrumental in ensuring that funding occurs for that intersection.

It is certainly a very busy intersection and, while just outside the electorate of Morphett, in the afternoon pick-up time, because of the significant number of times the boom gate comes down, the roads are quite congested right up through to Somerton Park, which is part of the electorate I represent in Morphett. So it will certainly be very welcome not only to those in Gibson and Black but also to the constituents of Morphett. This project, and other intersection upgrades like this, will slash commute times and, in so doing, will make our city more livable and boost productivity. Some of the commuters who come along Brighton Road will no doubt be travelling either to or from Glenelg Primary School, depending on the time of day.

This is a fantastic local school where, alongside the Premier and the Minister for Education, this government announced a landmark high-speed internet project with Telstra worth more than \$80 million that will connect nearly every government school here in South Australia to high-speed fibre-optic internet. Glenelg Primary was one of the first schools to connect, and just this week we had the Minister for Education inform us that 111 schools have now been connected. This project is part of a comprehensive investment into public education in this state. It also includes the transition of year 7 into high school to match what has happened across the rest of Australia.

I would like to touch on some other initiatives that will be welcomed in Morphett, particularly around Morphettville, which is, of course, home to thoroughbred racing here in South Australia at the Morphettville Racecourse, but also in the surrounding area of Morphettville, such as along Bray Street and Morphett Road, where a number of horse trainers have their stables situated. The initiative is a \$24 million racing industry support package, which is in addition to the \$4.85 million this government provided in last year's budget.

As I said, this budget allocates \$24 million to assist the industry starting with \$8 million this year, which includes \$4 million for general industry assistance and also \$4 million for infrastructure upgrades. This will be very valuable to the racing industry and will keep racing here thriving. Future years will see the racing industry receive 1.5 per cent of the net wagering revenue from the betting operations tax, which is a similar formula to that received by the Victorian racing industry.

As I said, the infrastructure upgrades will certainly improve the sustainability of the industry here and, while not trying to compete with Sydney and Melbourne racing carnivals, it will certainly compete against those regional Victorian and New South Wales racing meets. It will allow trainers to be based in South Australia and employ local jockeys and stable hands. This budget builds a better future for the people of Morphett and South Australia.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (17:03): I rise also on the Appropriation Bill 2019 largely to put on the record my disappointment in the failings this budget has for the western suburbs of Adelaide and the contempt for local residents and also for the business community, for the schools and of course for the community at large in the west. It is not a great surprise that the west feels abandoned by this budget by this government, the same government that only a couple of months ago chose to not even run a candidate in the Cheltenham by-election in which I was lucky enough to be elected.

This is a budget that right at the heart cuts two hours of free parking at The QEH. To put this in some context, this is a saving per year in the cuts to The QEH car parking that is less than a ministerial office spends in a year, less than the Minister for Health's ministerial office spends in one year. This is a joke. I am not sure what in-kind legal support the Attorney receives in a year, but I am sure that it is somewhere up around that as well.

It is mean-spirited and it also spreads the pain to local residents in the west. We know that local residents around The QEH are already feeling the strain from car parking as people look to longer term car parks. They have raised this with me. It was one of the reasons the former Labor government announced and started to build the 500-car car park at The QEH—to attempt to alleviate some of this pain for local residents.

It is because of these policies that local residents in the west now need to decide on the frequency with which they receive care from The QEH. Is it guided by clinical care? Is it guided by the best advice from their medical professional, or is it about how much car parking they can afford? These residents attend weekly; they attend biweekly. They have already spoken to me and said, 'We simply can't afford to attend The QEH with the frequency which we expect under these new changes.'

No matter how you end up at The QEH—whether you drive there to see a sick or unwell family member, whether you are unlucky enough to be under the care of The QEH itself, or whether you attend in an ambulance—your fees, your costs of going to hospital to seek care, are going up. That is just a small part of the \$500 million in new fees that this budget implements. It is a kick in the guts for the local residents of the western suburbs.

Perhaps it is the brazenness of the government's approach that is leaving even the most ardent cynics scratching their heads. We have also seen a massive increase in debt—\$20 billion in debt. That is a strange thing in that those rusted-on economic and fiscal conservatives on the government benches are simply silent. Comrades on the other side of this chamber are silent when it comes to the enormous debt that, even under the Treasurer's own advice, will not be paid off in his lifetime.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you would expect that after 16 years in opposition this government would have had some time to properly articulate in an unambiguous way their vision for their pledge to this state, to the people of the state. Their pledge was this: more jobs, lower costs and better services. This government have not only failed in every single measure but they have also simply stopped trying. They have broken their promises and commitments. They say one thing in opposition and do another in government. It is in this time of post-truth in politics that this government are doing their utmost to live by the mantra that if you simply say something enough it becomes reality. Well, the reality is far from that.

This is a government that claims to be pro small business. They have almost in an evangelical manner cut and gutted programs that support and reward creativity, entrepreneurship. They scrap and gut programs that promote local South Australians supporting local businesses. At the heart of this is also the abject failure of a plan for jobs, jobs that South Australians need so badly, a plan to transition young people from their formative years in education or training into real and meaningful work, a plan for secure and meaningful jobs, a plan to help people find a job that they can count on in an environment where wage growth continues to stagnate. It makes people in our community worry and lose sleep because they simply do not know where their next job will come from. There is simply no plan. This government has abandoned working families.

In the west, they are failing working families and businesses alike, just as they have failed to deliver the promised upgrade to the Cheltenham Parade-Port Road intersection. It is an intersection that I travel on daily, and I know that the member for Lee also travels on daily, as it sits on the border of our two great electorates of Cheltenham and Lee. Every day, 43,000 vehicles use that intersection. Even though funding was provided in February 2018 to upgrade that intersection, we are still no closer, there is still no plan and there is still no start date. The residents of the west continue to drive through that intersection, through the congestion, and spend time there because of the lack of attention to the west, rather than spending time with their families, time at work or time contributing and being productive in our economy.

If commuters sought to look to our trains and our trams for relief, well, the government said, 'Hold my beer,' because we have privatisation or we have franchising. When the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure was talking about franchising, I am not sure whether he was talking about his dad's butcher, but no matter what way you look at it this is privatisation. The government can continue to be cute about what this is, but the public see through this. In the short amount of time since this has been announced, the public and the residents of the western suburbs of Adelaide are rightly outraged.

They are rightly outraged about what this means for our public transport system. The government have pointed to Melbourne and they have pointed to London. Of course, we know how that went. What seemingly was a good day on social media for the Premier and the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure turned into an embarrassing backflip because, of course, we know that the London Underground was such a failure that it was re-engaged into public hands and continues to be to this day.

I can look back to the ETSA debacle. Sadly, the same Treasurer was involved in that, and it seems as though the promises that were made back then around price freezes, and now fare freezes, are simply occurring in the echo chamber of this pursuit towards privatisation. When it comes to trains and trams, 21 years after the failings of ETSA we have the new conductor, minister Knoll, who is ushering us all aboard the ETSA express. He promises that it is going to be a one-way stop to better service, lower fares and better outcomes for the government. Well, the residents of the western suburbs of Adelaide know that is rubbish.

Whether you are a motorist, a commuter, a hospital patient, a small business, a renter or a property owner, you have every right to feel abandoned by this budget, or you have had the right to feel that the social contract the government set before the election has been torn up. Our message is very clear on this side of the house: we will fight privatisations and we will stand up for our community.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (17:13): I would like to make a small contribution to the Appropriation Bill and the 2019 budget. We have heard a lot of negativity from the other side, but there is also a lot good. I think that it is a budget that has had some real challenges set as its foundation. As some might realise—and some might choose to forget—there is an \$2.1 billion GST shortfall over the next four years. That really does set the tone for the challenges that South Australia and the government face in setting our budgets and looking at ways that we can best spend to create economic prosperity and to create an economic opportunity here in South Australia.

At the same time, looking at what the GST challenge will mean, we are still picking up the pieces of what a previous government have left behind. I think we will look forward now, and as a responsible government we will work to look at how we can bring South Australia to prosperity, how

we can drive the confidence that we can instil in business and external investment into South Australia so that we can look at ways to create jobs and ways to have infrastructure spend. It cannot just be totally reliant on the government spending on infrastructure and putting money into major projects. We have to bring private money in so that we can get a better balance, a better state of play when it comes to South Australia rebuilding after a long time, in particular in the regions of South Australia.

We have seen some record spending into the regions of South Australia. It has been a stimulus. I particularly see this travelling around the regions, which I do extensively, not only as someone who lives in the regions but as a minister responsible for regional development and primary industries. The messages I am getting very loud and clear are that we are putting a stimulus in place to drive some confidence so that we do see external investment into our regions and particularly into metropolitan Adelaide.

We look at Lot Fourteen. That is a huge incubator. It is a huge stimulus for developing entrepreneurship, looking at developing what industries we think can be part of our future, not only the space and defence industries but the large amount of tech and the large amount of cyber that comes into South Australia's grasp. If we can just bring that in, harness that energy and harness the potential for a future in South Australia, I am positive that this will be a huge stimulus.

I want to touch a little bit on primary industries. For many years we have seen primary industries that really have been kicked around, and they have received little attention and little infrastructure spend. By and large, the departments that are responsible for the regions and primary industries have been belted from pillar to post. In every budget leading up to the 2018 budget, we have seen no money put into initiatives in primary industries. We have seen reductions in SARDI, we have seen reductions in Biosecurity SA and we have seen reductions in the stimulus, the R&D programs, that those sectors rely on.

I have talked in this place many times about some of the core platforms that the primary industries rely on: grain, red meat, wine, horticulture, tourism. We know that a previous government used to shine the light on tourism, but it was always an hour or two's travel from Adelaide. It was never much further away than that, and if it was it might have been a slip of the pen. What we are seeing now are the opportunities we would like to create as a government. It is about stimulating a conversation and driving confidence for businesses out in those far-reach areas. Whether it is regional South Australia or outback South Australia, we are seeing some stimulus there.

This is not only for initiatives within tourism. We see that an extra \$30 million has gone into marketing to help drive and continue to drive tourism within South Australia, but we also see the economic growth, the opportunities. This is not only through the Regional Growth Fund and not only through infrastructure spend. There are also initiatives, R&D programs. There is the \$7½ million dollars into the Red Meat and Wool Growth Program.

We have seen now the collaboration between the commonwealth government and the state government, and it is not just about the \$1.1 billion that is going out into regional South Australia for fixing up long, problematic roads that have been ignored for a long, long time. We look at money that has gone into the Horrocks Highway. We look at money that is going into the connection from the West Coast to the western border. We look at the money that has gone into the Sturt Highway—\$87 million. That is one of the busiest highways, one of the busiest logistical routes in South Australia.

There are almost 10,000 vehicles a day, and a large percentage of those vehicles are commercial vehicles—trucks by and large. We look at the upgrade of those trucks and their capacity and road trains on a lot of our roads to try to drive some efficiencies. We are responding by not only finding efficiencies in those roads but understanding where those roads need to go.

We need to draw attention to some of the money that has gone in there. Allocations of money that have gone into Biosecurity SA have been great initiatives. We know there has been a \$25 million collaboration between commonwealth, state and industry. It has been a long time coming and it is here. The pastoralists, the industry leaders, including Livestock SA, by and large have welcomed this initiative with open arms, and rightfully so.

This year we have seen many more than 20,000 lambs taken by wild dogs. There is an initiative that is safeguarding a livestock sector—the sheep industry and the beef industry—that is under siege because of not only wild dogs but also drought and high feed and grain prices, so we have to do everything we can to help them. We look at ways that we are now putting audits in place so that we can actually supply the intensive livestock sector.

These are initiatives that we are putting in place to provide support against the prolonged deficiencies, if you like, that are coming with the vagaries of primary production. We have worked again with the commonwealth. As far as the state budget goes, it is what surrounds the budget. It is about working with the commonwealth, bringing drought initiatives into South Australia, futureproofing businesses and our farms so that when we do encounter dry, drought and those hardships, we are better prepared.

It is about putting the water infrastructure in place, and there is now money on the table. It is about putting in the \$1 million for 25 councils here in South Australia. They are initiatives that sit next to the budget because we need to put in building blocks to futureproof and droughtproof our farms. The amount of \$7½ million is about helping to support an industry that is one of the main platforms of our economy.

We know we have to put initiatives in place to put accountability into our red meat sector. We have seen a number of issues with some of our export markets that have created some headwind for growing some of those free trade agreements that we are now becoming very much more reliant on. So to drive that red meat and wool program is a very important seed-funding initiative that the industry will build on, just like the external investment at Thomas Foods and the external infrastructure going into that project.

We look at the external infrastructure that is going into the South-East around Teys Brothers. We look at working with the communities in the South-East so that we can house more migrants through the DAMA. We look at initiatives that will help those businesses down there. It is not about putting money directly into their pockets: it is about putting initiatives and infrastructure around those projects so that as a government we are acting responsibly in helping to drive one of the main economies. A small amount of money has recently gone into the blueprint for the grains industry. Again, that gives the industry targets and opportunities to grow, just like this budget does.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (17:23): I, too, rise to speak on this Appropriation Bill, although I think the big question on everyone's lips at the moment is: how many Liberal members of parliament does it take to turn off a light? The answer is four from what I have witnessed today—very impressive work, indeed.

This second budget from the Marshall Liberal government, much like the one before it, is certainly no new agenda for South Australia. In fact, it is just a continuation of an agenda that began all the way back in 1993 and was rudely interrupted by the election of a Labor government in 2002. I think we have seen no better example of this than the announcement this week that the state's tram and train network will be privatised.

We must remember, of course, that it was a former Liberal government in this state that privatised our bus system back in 2000. It is very clear now that the Treasurer had intended to complete that privatisation agenda all those years ago but had to wait until being re-elected last year to do so. I think he spent those 16 years in opposition sitting quietly in his office in this place fuming and working out how he was going to take revenge, and it has begun.

We should not be surprised, then, that this is taking place, except for the fact that before the last state election the Premier told people publicly—and we have all seen it on video again this week—that he did not have a privatisation agenda. Perhaps the Premier does not have a privatisation agenda, but the Treasurer certainly does, and everyone in this place knows who is calling the shots in the cabinet room. That agenda is now in full swing.

In 16 short months we have seen not just the privatisation of the train and tram network but we have also seen the announced privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre, the planned privatisation of patient transfers between Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals and the threat of privatisation continually hanging over SA Pathology. This is about, at its heart, reliable, low-cost services for South Australians. It is a concept that you would be forgiven for thinking this government

understood, given that it went to the last state election with a mantra of lower costs and better services.

It may well have been better costs and lower services—not better costs for South Australians but better costs for the Treasurer. Clearly, this was just another throwaway line, just like the line the Premier used, the assurance he gave publicly, that he did not have a privatisation agenda. As of Tuesday this week, 1 July, we saw the commencement of the government's higher fees, charges and taxes: half a billion dollars of hip pocket pain that will hit motorists, public transport commuters, hospital patients, small businesses, property owners, tradies, regional communities and mining companies, just to name a few. Do not for a second think that these are adjustments just for CPI.

Do not think for a second that the government is adjusting these fees and charges by just 1.3 per cent. We are talking about an increase in motor vehicle transaction fees of up to 42 per cent, an increase in tradie expenses of up to 10 per cent, an increase in motor registration fees of 5 per cent, an increase in driver's licence renewals of 4.5 per cent, an increase in public transport fares of 2 per cent, and, most notably, as we have heard, an increase in the solid waste levy of firstly 10 per cent and then 40 per cent from 1 January.

If this is not hypocritical enough for you, local councils are now burdened with the dilemma of whether or not they can absorb that 40 per cent increase in the solid waste levy, or whether they have to pass it on to their ratepayers. In the north and north-eastern suburbs, Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury councils have already voted to increase rates by an additional 0.2 and 0.4 per cent respectively in direct response to the increase in the solid waste levy. If elected members of those councils had voted to pass on the full cost of the levy hike, it would have meant an additional 0.7 per cent increase in council rates simply due to the increase in the solid waste levy.

But, if that hypocrisy is not breathtaking enough, this is from a government that has been advocating for a cap to council rates whilst simultaneously cost shifting enormous amounts of money on to the very same councils that they are demanding cap their rates. That hypocrisy was summed up beautifully in the very same week that we heard the announcement about the solid waste levy going up by 40 per cent. In my letterbox in Gulfview Heights, I got a lovely glossy brochure from the Hon. John Dawkins in another place—who is a terrific bloke, I might add—espousing the virtues of rate capping. What impeccable timing.

At its core this is really, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned after question time today, an issue about credibility, and that is the credibility of the Premier of South Australia. This Premier's track record so far is a litany of commitments not met: things he said he would do that he has not done, and things he said he would not do that he has. There is no better example of this government's failure to keep its commitments than what is happening in the north-eastern suburbs: no mention of closing the Modbury Service SA centre before the election, not a squeak; an unequivocal promise to never, ever again privatise Modbury Hospital or any of the services that are attached to it; and no mention that the contract to build the new park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza would be scrapped.

All that really leaves us in terms of projects that are occurring in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide are legacy projects from the previous state Labor government. Even these, according to this budget, are being whittled away. The budget papers show that the upgrade of Modbury Hospital is now way behind schedule. In fact, of the \$22.6 million that was budgeted to be spent on the upgrade in the 2018-19 financial year, only \$7 million has been spent.

The member for King and the member for Newland are very fond of posing for photos and videos in front of the building, in front of the scaffolding that is there, with the Minister for Health, but I can tell you that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs have very long memories—very long memories indeed. They remember what happened last time this party was in government and the privatisation of that hospital, and they are not easily fooled. The Lyell McEwin Hospital has not escaped either. The much-needed expansion, a doubling of the emergency department, has been delayed now by 12 months despite some of the worst ramping that we have ever seen in this state occurring there now on a routine basis.

Then there is the upgrade of the Golden Grove Road. The former Labor government committed \$20 million to this project in the 2017 Mid-Year Budget Review. It was not an election commitment; it was money that we committed. That was matched by those opposite. When I say

'matched', what they really meant was that they were committing to not cut the funding we had already given.

Now we know even that was not true. At the very same Tea Tree Gully council meeting where the solid waste levy was being considered, it was inadvertently revealed that this government is going cap in hand to the council again, this time to demand \$2 million of ratepayers' money towards the upgrade of The Golden Grove Road.

But there is one item in the budget that says more about the priorities of this government than any other, and that is the huge increase in the cost of car parking at hospitals. It is one thing to shift the burden of making savings onto local councils, but it is another thing altogether to push that burden onto hospital staff, patients and the loved ones of patients. At Modbury Hospital, the annual cost of parking for staff will rise by \$725 a year, from \$562 to \$1,287. That is an increase of 129 per cent. The cost will rise by 20 per cent for patients and their families, too. Add to this a jump of 5 per cent in ambulance fees, which is going to see the cost of an emergency 1 callout fee rise by \$49, breaking the \$1,000 threshold for the first time.

If anyone who is listening is surprised by the magnitude of these increases, if anyone is surprised by the fact that hospital staff and patients are being targeted by this government for their savings task, all they need to remember is that we have a Premier who proudly told us before the election that he was not in it for the social issues. What little shred of credibility this government had left is all but gone. It was sorely tested last year in a budget of cuts, closures and privatisations, but it has all but evaporated now that this government has reached its hands into the pockets of some of the state's most vulnerable people.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (17:33): This is a terrible budget for South Australia: mean, tricky, nasty and full of actions that go against what the Liberal Party promised the people of South Australia when they went to the election last time. It is a direct repeat of what happened the last time the Liberals were in power, when they said they would never, ever privatise ETSA, but they did. We have seen that now with what they are intending to do with the tram and rail networks here in South Australia.

The meanness of this budget has hit home right across the seat of Mawson, and nowhere more than on Kangaroo Island, a place that is 4,500 square kilometres with 4,500 people. It has a set of—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, I will give you a few extra seconds.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you very much, I appreciate that. Kangaroo Island is a very special part of South Australia. It has a set of unique circumstances that mean the people over there need a bit of a hand because of the isolation they face. The only way you can get to and from the island is via ferry or by flying in and out.

For years and years, there was a concession for people who owned motor vehicles on Kangaroo Island. This budget has done away with that. We will now see the 50 per cent rebate or discount that the people of Kangaroo Island had for their vehicles taken away. If you have a tipper truck, where you are paying \$1,500 rego with the discount, you will now be paying \$3,000. All the people who own farm vehicles or cars they drive around the island will also be slugged with a doubling of the price.

You wonder what is behind a government that makes this sort of decision. I have asked ministers in questions on notice whether they have been to Kangaroo Island since the election of last year. We are talking 16 months. I have had some responses, and it turns out that half the cabinet has not been to Kangaroo Island since the election 16 months ago. How are you meant to look after a part of South Australia that faces a heap of unique challenges if you do not go there?

The second question I asked these ministers was: when was the last time you went? I believe that some of those seven ministers have never, ever been to Kangaroo Island. Not one of the ministers has responded to that. They referred me to the previous answer that was given, which was: have you been there since the election last year? I think it is time for these ministers to fess up. I

want to know: have they been to Kangaroo Island ever in their lives? I am just going to go through the seven ministers who have not been to Kangaroo Island since the election.

The Hon. R. Sanderson: Yes, I have been.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Excellent, glad to hear that. They could do with your assistance over there at the moment. Half the cabinet, including the Treasurer, the health minister, the education minister, the police and emergency services minister, the child protection minister, the human services minister, the recreation, sport and racing minister and the mining and energy minister have not been there since the election. That is just not good enough.

We hear people saying, 'In their 16 years, Labor neglected regional South Australia.' That is just rubbish, and the people out in the regions know that because they saw us out there all the time. We did country cabinets and we made regular visits. We have the member for Narungga here, and I was quite often calling in to see his dad at the *Country Times* because I got out there and spoke to people who were involved in business, involved in farming and involved in tourism. I know that a lot of my cabinet colleagues were doing exactly the same thing. No-one believes you when you come in and say that.

We have the evidence here: answers back to my questions from ministers saying that in the 16 months they have been in government half the cabinet has not bothered to turn up to Kangaroo Island to see what is happening. I can tell you what is happening, and I said it in here the other day: tourism is falling through the floor over there because of the negligent attitude of the Minister for Tourism, who does not get it. He does not understand it. As I said the other day, some of you people sitting on the backbench should be putting your names forward to get onto the front bench because someone needs to look after it.

This is heartbreaking. As a bloke who spent five years building the visitor economy, from \$4.9 billion a year to \$6.8 billion a year, how do you reckon it feels to see this downward spiral where every quarter there is more and more money coming out of the visitor economy in terms of investment and there is more and more expenditure from people from interstate and overseas coming out of the visitor economy because people are not coming here?

Guess why they are not coming here? Because you are in a competitive environment and you need to advertise South Australia. You need to advertise all our regions to people here in South Australia, to people interstate and to people overseas. You need to be out there in that competitive environment, marketing the wonderful attributes, the wonderful natural features and the wonderful experiences you can have right here in South Australia.

What are we seeing from this government? We are seeing an \$11 million reduction in funding to the South Australian Tourism Commission. That is \$11 million they do not have to market South Australia. We are seeing the poor people down at the SATC literally pulling their hair out, asking, 'How can we do this job?' With an injection of funds from a Labor government, as I said, we took it from \$4.9 billion up to \$6.8 billion. There is a target there that by the end of next year the visitor economy in South Australia will be worth \$8 billion. There is no way we are going to make that target if we keep going backwards by \$100 million a quarter. You cannot go from \$6.8 billion to \$8 billion if you go backwards to \$6.7 billion on the way, which is exactly what we saw in the last figures.

For people to come in here and say, 'We're great. We're out there in the regions. We're doing all this; we're pumping more money into tourism,' do not believe the spin, do not believe the spin of your minister because I do not think he actually understands. He will go down as one of the worst tourism ministers South Australia has ever had. That is a great pity. The 18,000 tourism operators in South Australia and the 40,000 people employed in the visitor economy around South Australia will have David Ridgway's elevation by the Premier of this state to tourism minister to blame for where the visitor economy is going in South Australia under his watch.

The people of Kangaroo Island, Aldinga, McLaren Vale, McLaren Flat, Willunga, Myponga, Yankalilla, Normanville, Rapid Bay, Second Valley, Cape Jervis, Delamere and Inman Valley deserve better than this government has put up. This is a government which lied to the South Australian people at the last election, which has come in here with a privatisation agenda, which has doubled the vehicle registration on Kangaroo Island and which has cut services, valuable services,

to people right across this state. I think the Marshall Liberal government has defined itself over these past few months. People do not forget quickly.

As a community, we talk about the one-way expressway and the privatisation of ETSA as two of the greatest disasters in South Australian political history. People do not forget. People do not forget who was responsible for that, and now they are seeing a repetition of that. We saw the member for Finniss with the transport minister and the Liberal candidate for Mayo announcing a Victor Harbor road duplication to McLaren Vale. It does not start in this term. The work does not start for another four years. It is not even in the forward estimates. The people of McLaren Vale and the local area I represent want those upgrades now. There are people dying on the Victor Harbor road.

Mr Basham: So what were you doing for the last 16 years?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I tell you what we were doing for the last 16 years: we were fixing your stupid one-way expressway. We had to duplicate it. There were 13 bridges that went across the Southern Expressway—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —we had to take them all out—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, the best thing you can do is not respond to interjections. I will give you another 30 seconds because you were interrupted before. Interjections will cease, also. You have the call.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. We were replacing all those bridges across the Southern Expressway. Why? Because Diana Laidlaw, when she was transport minister, was told by the engineers, 'At least build the bridges across the Southern Expressway wide enough so that when a decent government, a proper, clear-thinking government, gets in they will be able to just lay down the other two or three lanes and duplicate it.' No, she said that everyone in the world was going to love this one-way expressway and was going to replicate it, so just keep the bridges narrow enough for the two or three lanes, depending where it is, and we will just keep that in place.

Guess what? We were the laughing-stock of the world. People would come down to my part of the world and do stories for international wine magazines and the first line would be: 'To get to McLaren Vale, you have to go down this stupid one-way expressway with traffic lights and a boom gate at the start and the end of it and it changes direction twice a day.' We fixed that. We put a rail line from Noarlunga down to Seaford. We electrified that rail line.

We went to the last election with money in the bank to duplicate Main South Road to the Victory Hotel and to build a new birth to year 12 school at Aldinga. That is what we did, and you are going to take four to five years to start work on the Victor Harbor road. You are a disgrace.

Time expired.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:44): My final remarks this week about the 2019-20 budget will centre on the South Australian Pathology service. I have previously stated that, as well as being very concerned about this aspect of public health, I have a family member employed within this vital service and over the years I have had a close working relationship with many health professionals across NALHN, CALHN and SALHN.

There is no doubt that South Australian pathology needs review and reform. I note that the PricewaterhouseCoopers report has identified changes to potentially save \$100 million or more over three years. It is of great concern to all South Australians that poor leadership, inappropriate staffing and wasteful structuring have led to a drift in efficiency and cost effectiveness in the past decade, although it has not been apparent to me from stories I hear, and my observed commitment of staff I know, where or how this poor state of affairs has been allowed to exist or even come about.

Having said that, I am told inadequate IT and electronic bill processing systems are part of the dilemma, and a similar set of circumstances has been uncovered at the new RAH by KordaMentha. I am not sure how this could have occurred if IT especially had been up to date. This is not the first time we have learnt about IT being in need of update, and the now abandoned EPAS

remains an issue the budget grapples with and an example of what must be done with new IT systems. To quote the minister:

...the very people who have to use the system—and the software provider—[must be consulted] the people with experience in making the system work.

Otherwise, we will see again hundreds of millions of dollars wasted. Let's hope SA Pathology will be considered as part of the SA Health digital strategy that I have heard about. Whatever else happens, we all want an efficient and effective public health service, and as we work to that end it is evident South Australian Pathology cannot be privatised. What must be retained and enhanced in the days of STEM and world-leading health research excellence in this state are the accredited training and research functions of this important healthcare organisation, important facets that cannot be replaced in the private sector.

Making efficiencies is one thing but as the Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia has warned, poor diagnoses, and in the worst cases avoidable deaths, could result if SA Pathology is privatised. Evidence taken recently by a committee tells us a partly privatised state pathology service could end up costing more because commercial providers would only be interested in the parts that make money. I note from a quote in *The Advertiser* on 7 May by college president Bruce Latham:

If you transfer the stuff they want—and that's the community pathology, which requires very little manpower and is high frequency, you can make money off of it—all you're doing is making the rest of the business...cost more because you've got nothing to subsidise against...So cherry picking makes no sense at all.

Dr Latham also warned cutting training for young pathologists was a short-sighted cost-saving measure because the ageing workforce needs to be replenished. South Australian Pathology faces a \$7.3 million efficiency target demanded in this year's budget period. Staff losses of up to 200 full-time equivalents in a workforce of 1,400 will have a big impact on those left behind. We hope among them will still be some of the best and brightest eager to continue to serve the state and its people, but it is really hard to see how a growing workload can be served by a significantly reduced workforce.

Other evidence presented to the committee, as reported in *The Advertiser* on 25 June, cited interstate Queensland consultant Selina Speer telling the committee that moves to privatise in that state in 2013 had been 'diabolical' and 'extraordinarily traumatic on a human level'. She likened removing pathology from public health services as ripping a hole in a knitted woollen jumper then trying to deal with the loose threads. Again, I quote her:

...otherwise the system starts to unravel. It can be done, but it takes a long time to tie off each cut thread. Being mindful of the value it gives to clinicians and its contribution to the sustainability of the health care system (outsourcing) doesn't make sense.

A final quote from *The Advertiser* editorial on 25 June states:

SA Pathology delivers vital services right across the state, from a wide range of complex diagnostic tests through to teaching, training and research.

Its crucial role in country health may not appeal to a private provider where profit as much as service delivery is a key motivation.

SA Pathology must continue to smarten up its act, but the looming review must ensure safety, standards and equity—not just cost—are key priorities.

There we see the importance of SA Pathology's contribution to country health being underlined. In closing, I would like to relate an anecdote from a local GP bemoaning the fact that he had to chase a simple blood test over several days, my point being that, if this is the case now, we really do have to be vigilant that things do not deteriorate in the chase for efficiencies.

A budget has to deliver services to people and the state, all over the state, with an eye to the future. Let's concentrate on doing our jobs here to the best of our ability and for the good of all. Let's tell the truth, warts and all, up-front and not bury nasty measures in budget papers that no-one can truly read or understand. Only then can we face our constituents and truly say we will look after them—the community, as well as the economy.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Piccolo.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CODE AMENDMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019*Estimates Committees*

The Legislative Council has given leave to the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway), the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink) and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

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

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 7, page 4, line 3 to page 5, line 35 [clause 7, inserted section 20AA]—Delete inserted section 20AA and substitute:

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

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

assault means an assault within the meaning of section 20(1) and includes, to avoid doubt, an act consisting of intentionally causing human biological material to come into contact with a victim, or threatening to do so;

harm has the same meaning as in Division 7A;

human biological material means—

- (a) blood, saliva, semen, faeces, urine or vomit; or
- (b) any other material prescribed by the regulations;

prescribed emergency worker means—

- (a) a police officer; or
- (b) a prison officer; or
- (c) a community corrections officer or community youth justice officer; or
- (d) an employee in a training centre (within the meaning of the *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016*); or
- (e) a person (whether a medical practitioner, nurse, security officer or otherwise) performing duties in a hospital; or
- (f) a person (whether a medical practitioner, nurse, pilot or otherwise) performing duties in the course of retrieval medicine; or
- (g) a medical practitioner or other health practitioner (both within the meaning of the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)*) attending an out of hours or unscheduled callout, or assessing, stabilising or treating a person at the scene of an accident or other emergency, in a rural area; or
- (h) a member of the SA Ambulance Service Inc; or
- (i) a member of SAMFS, SACFS or SASES; or
- (j) a law enforcement officer; or
- (k) an inspector within the meaning of the *Animal Welfare Act 1985*; or
- (l) any other person engaged in an occupation or employment prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of section 5AA(1)(ka); or
- (m) any other person prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph, whether acting in a paid or voluntary capacity, but does not include a person, or person of a class, declared by the regulations to be excluded from the ambit of this definition.

No. 2. Clause 7, page 6, line 18 and 19 [clause 7, inserted section 20AB(4), definition of *human biological material*]~~—Delete 'means blood, saliva, semen, faeces, urine or vomit' and substitute:~~

means—

- (a) blood, saliva, semen, faeces, urine or vomit; or
- (b) any other material prescribed by the regulations.

No. 3. Schedule 1, page 7, line 16 [Schedule 1, Part 1, clause 1, inserted paragraph (ab)]~~—After '1935' insert:~~

where harm is caused to a prescribed emergency worker

No. 4. Schedule 1, page 7, lines 20 to 25 [Schedule 1, Part 2, clause 2, inserted paragraph (da)]~~—Delete inserted paragraph (da) and substitute:~~

- (da) to deter the defendant and others in the community from harming or assaulting prescribed emergency workers (within the meaning of section 20AA of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*) acting in the course of official duties;

No. 5. Schedule 1, page 7, after line 25—Insert:

2A—Amendment of section 96—Suspension of imprisonment on defendant entering into bond

Section 96(9), definition of *designated offence*~~—after paragraph (g) insert:~~

- (ga) an offence against section 20AA(1), (2) or (4);

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:53 the house adjourned until Tuesday 23 July 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***NATIONAL PARK RANGERS**

852 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5 June 2019). How many rangers have been granted TVSPs in this financial year and at what cost?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

Eight rangers have been granted TVSPs in 2018-19, at a cost of approximately \$560,000. Even taking into account these TVSPs, there is a net increase of 10 ranger positions from March 2018 to now.

NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

853 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5 June 2019). How many DEW staff have transferred into ranger positions, what qualifications do they each have, and have their previous positions been filled?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

No Department for Environment and Water staff have been transferred into ranger positions.

NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

854 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5 June 2019). How many rangers have been appointed, broken down by how many new to department and how many from within department?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

There have been 18 new rangers appointed, following significant reductions in ranger numbers by the previous government. Five graduate rangers from the Department for Environment and Water have been appointed to new ranger positions and 13 rangers are new to the department.

NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

855 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5 June 2019). What was total ranger number in March 2018, what is total ranger number in May 2019?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

There are currently 103 ranger positions in the Department for Environment and Water, compared to 93 in March 2018.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

858 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). Up until 27 May 2019 when was the last time the Treasurer visited Kangaroo Island?

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

Since 22 March when my government's cabinet was sworn in, seven ministers have personally visited Kangaroo Island with an eighth minister scheduled to visit in coming weeks. The Treasurer has advised that he is not one of the seven ministers that has visited.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

859 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). How many times has the Treasurer visited Kangaroo Island?

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

I refer the member to my answer to question with notice number 858.

KANGAROO ISLAND GROUP GRANTS

860 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). Why has the \$500 administration grant for important groups like Kangaroo Island Road Safety Group been cut?

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

A decision has been made to maintain the payment of a \$500 administration grant to active community road safety groups.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

867 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). Up until 27 May 2019 when was the last time the Minister for Child Protection visited Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): Since 22 March when the Marshall Liberal government's cabinet was sworn in, seven ministers have personally visited Kangaroo Island with an eighth minister scheduled to visit in coming weeks. I am not one of the seven ministers that has visited.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

868 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). How many times has the Minister for Child Protection visited Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I refer the member to my answer to question with notice number 867.

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

873 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). Why have you failed to respond to my letter dated 17 December 2018 and subsequent letter 12 March 2019 in relation to the accommodation proposal by The Australian Walking Company in the Flinders Chase National Park?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have answered questions in parliament and in public on this matter since December 2018 and am happy to continue providing updates where necessary on The Australian Walking Company's proposal for the Flinders Chase National Park.

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

874 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). Why have you failed to respond to the numerous constituents and groups who have contacted you in relation to the accommodation proposal by The Australian Walking Company in the Flinders Chase National Park?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I often meet and correspond with Friends of Parks group representatives, volunteers and conservationists and have provided numerous public responses on this matter over the past few months.

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

875 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). Do you care about the volunteers who in an unprecedented move are on strike in objection to this proposal?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I care for all our volunteers and our environment which is why I was so disappointed when the previous Labor government constantly gutted the environment department's budget and significantly reduced the number of park rangers across South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government continues to prioritise our national parks and in our most recent budget there was a significant increase in funding for parks infrastructure. National parks in South Australia are a much-valued part of our natural environment and Friends of Parks groups are important custodians who do crucial work in parks' upkeep and preservation.

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

876 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (5 June 2019). Are you aware that hundreds of people rallied on the steps of Parliament House on 27 February 2019 in opposition to this proposal and they still await a response from you?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I am very aware of the diversity of views on this matter and the importance of developing our nature-based tourism industry and investing in our national parks. This is something that failed to occur under the previous government which significantly reduced spending in our parks, reduced the number of rangers and slashed the environment department's budget.

STATE OPERA SOUTH AUSTRALIA

877 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (5 June 2019). When was the Premier advised:

(a) two senior employees of State Opera South Australia were able to access State Opera South Australia's bank account for several months after their departure;

(b) one of those two employees of State Opera South Australia remained an active cheque signatory for several months after they departed State Opera South Australia; and

(c) the bank account credentials of one employee were used on 26 occasions by State Opera South Australia to process payments totalling \$430,000 in the three months after that employee departed in March 2018?

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

On 2 October 2018, when the State Opera of South Australia submitted its 2017-18 Annual Report for tabling in state parliament, I was informed that in his letter to the Chair of 28 September 2018, the Auditor-General noted several weaknesses and areas requiring improvement in State Opera's financial controls, including inappropriate access to bank accounts, which had been raised in an audit management letter during the year.

STATE OPERA SOUTH AUSTRALIA

883 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (5 June 2019). What reasons, if any, has State Opera South Australia provided to the Premier for former employee bank account access credentials being used to process payments?

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

The Auditor-General reported in his Update to the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018, tabled on 30 April 2019, that the reasons provided by State Opera for using the bank account credentials of one of its former employees to process payments were that this access was used for business continuity reasons, and there was a time delay in establishing access for new staff.

DESIGNATED AREA MIGRATION AGREEMENTS

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (2 May 2019).

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

This is publicly available at:

<https://www.migration.sa.gov.au/skilled-migrants/lists-of-state-nominated-occupations>

VETERANS SA

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (4 June 2019).

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

Veterans SA will retain exactly the same status in Defence SA that it has retained since moving into the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. This is exactly the same status that it held under the former Labor government when it was in the Department of Treasury and Finance.

AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (4 June 2019).

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

Costs relating to the ADC Leadership Retreat have been proactively disclosed.