

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 23 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.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019

Appropriation Grievances

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.

(Continued from 4 July 2019.)

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (11:01): I rise to make a grievance contribution on the Appropriation Bill 2019 and, in doing so, I have to say that as the member for Torrens, on behalf of my residents I am extremely disappointed with what the budget offers. It is a budget that fails to deliver to the people and particularly the people in the north-east.

The Premier appears to have a short memory when it comes to what he says and what he does. The budget puts extraordinary increases on South Australian households and businesses. This is from a Premier who said in opposition, 'We were the ones who said we would have no new levies and taxes. It was simple; it was clear: 'We were the ones who said we would have no new levies and taxes.' Now that we have a Marshall Liberal government, let's unpack that and see how it pans out in just a few areas in the 2019-20 state budget.

Those opposite promised lower costs, but we have a list of increases. Increase: motor registration up 5 per cent. Increase: driver's licence renewals up 4.5 per cent. In addition, all South Australians conducting transactions at a Service SA centre relating to the Motor Vehicles Act will be hit with higher administration fees.

This includes transactions to transfer registration or replace number plates; the issue or renewal of driver's licences and heavy vehicle certificates; applications for a learner's permit; undertaking a theory exam, a practical driving test or a perception test; and those who apply for a disability parking permit. That is before we lose the Modbury and Prospect Service SA centres that the government says it will close. These centres are so important to many in the north-east, particularly to our seniors.

While on the issue of transport, the Klemzig O-Bahn Interchange that was budgeted for by Labor, with contracts being awarded, was subsequently cut by the Marshall Liberal government. Commuters are without sufficient parking and local residents are having to deal with congested streets and nightmare traffic conditions. Let's not forget the bus routes that have already been cut.

The Marshall government's increase thrust on South Australians goes on and on. Increase: catching public transport will be more expensive, with fares up 2 per cent. Increase: the axing of the two-section card, costing some commuters \$849 more. Increase: free Metrocards now costing \$5 each. Increase: hospital car parking is up by \$725 per year for nurses, cleaners and other employees. This is an enormous increase, and employees hit by this increase will include those at The Queen Liz, Lyell McEwin, Modbury Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and Noarlunga Hospital.

Increase: hospital patients and their families will pay 20 per cent more, and the free two-hour parking at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has been axed. Increase: the fee for calling out an ambulance has gone up nearly \$50. Increase: even putting out the wheelie bin is more expensive, with the government imposing an increase in the solid waste levy of 40 per cent on councils across the state, resulting in many cases in an increase in council rates. The solid waste levy increase would

see Tea Tree Gully council suffer a \$500,000 impact in the 2019-20 budget. How are they dealing with it and who will feel the impact? Tea Tree Gully council voted to increase rates to 2.9 per cent and they cut \$300,000 from the grants line for community and sports clubs as a result of the state government's bin tax.

Port Adelaide Enfield council has seen an impact on its budget of approximately \$613,000, resulting in the 2019 rates revenue increase to 2.5 per cent from the prior 1.9 per cent before the government's bin tax. Increase: tradies are being taxed, with licences up 10 per cent, trailer registration up 10 per cent and ute registration up 10 per cent. Another increase impacts entertainment, where hikes of thousands of dollars are likely to be thrust on pubs and bars and, wait for it, major events, with the police rent tax. Where are we going with it? Will taxes be imposed on the AFL matches, the festivals, the Adelaide Festival, the Adelaide Fringe Festival, WOMADelaide, the Cabaret Festival and other arts festivals? We are yet to see the outcome of this one.

Increase: the Premier and his government have even found a way to tax a day out for the family by increasing entry fees for parks such as Cleland Wildlife Park by a massive 25 per cent. These will also be increased at Seal Bay and Kelly Hill Caves on Kangaroo Island. These increases in fees not only impact local families but they will also hurt our state's tourism.

It does not end there. We have an ageing demographic. It is no secret that people are now living longer, and that is a good thing. My office in the north-eastern suburbs is a busy office, one that receives inquiries about almost everything from people of all ages and backgrounds. One subject matter that is raised regularly is the need for assistance around the home, particularly for the more senior members of the community who may suffer from health conditions, live on their own or not be as steady on their feet anymore.

The state government's Personal Alert Systems Rebate Scheme provides approved applicants a rebate of up to \$250 per year for a personal alert button which can be used if they have a fall or experience a medical episode and which calls for emergency services straight away. This has proven to save lives and keep people safe in their homes.

Recently, I had a phone call from Bill, a 92-year-old resident, who called my office to tell me about a letter he had received telling him that, from 1 October 2019, the state Liberal government will be cutting that rebate by \$50, which will have a significant impact on those on a pension or with a low household income. The email received says, 'Changes to the personal alert rebate scheme have been introduced as a budget measure: From 1 October 2019, the annual monitoring fee rebate paid to suppliers will decrease from \$250 to \$200.' This is a negative thing. It is impacting again on our seniors. It is another increase.

Another budget measure affecting some of the most vulnerable in our community is the Marshall government's cut of \$780,000 to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service, putting vulnerable people at risk. We know that, tragically, one woman per week in Australia loses her life at the hands of a current or former partner. Thousands more are physically and mentally injured and many suffer psychological, financial and emotional abuse. It is appalling that a government can include a reduction in funding to the service as a 'savings measure'.

The Minister for Education speaks about the government's investment in education, but in this budget schools in Torrens have missed out. I have spoken in this place of the great importance to the local community of Avenues College—the amalgamation of the two schools, Windsor Gardens Secondary College and Gilles Plains Primary School—and the need for the timely infrastructure build, which includes a new children's centre/preschool, and the upgrade to the existing buildings.

The two campuses are now scheduled to come together on the McKay Avenue campus next year, more than 12 months after the original date, and further funding is required to achieve the goals the amalgamation is set to achieve. This needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency to give certainty to Avenues College's growing school community.

I could find nothing in the budget for Avenues College. If the minister is serious about providing opportunities for our students, Avenues College should be a high-priority school for needs-based funding. Why should students attending Avenues College miss out on having their learning areas upgraded and refurbished as part of the amalgamation?

Klemzig Primary School is also in my electorate of Torrens and requires a commitment based on need and the safety of students, highlighted by the fact that the school is a centre for the hearing impaired. With new housing development in the area, there is increased traffic around the school and, along with the school community, I am concerned about the safety of the children and their families, particularly those who are deaf and hard of hearing. Parents are concerned, teachers are concerned and residents are concerned.

I have raised this issue with the minister and was hoping to see a resolution to it in the 2019-20 budget, but the solution has failed to materialise. Labor committed to addressing the issue before the election and now that the new housing development has commenced, with 41 new dwellings adjoining the school, it is crucial. Literally speaking, the current situation is an accident waiting to happen. Without the minister listening and without the minister allocating funds for a solution, our hands are tied. I could go on and on: closing the Strathmont pool, used by 1,500 mostly children, many on the autism spectrum or with disabilities who used it for water therapy.

Yesterday, I received a phone call from a resident who is a real estate agent in the north-east. He wanted me to deliver a message to the Premier. He said:

Last week, I had six mum-and-dad investors contact me saying they wanted to put the properties they owned on the market, because they couldn't afford the Liberal government's land tax announced in the State Budget. This is mum-and-dad investors, not wealthy people but people putting away for their retirement. The market will be flooded with properties. There will be fewer properties available for rent and rents will be forced up. The banks are making it more and more difficult for young people to buy a home, and now rents will go up making it even more difficult for them to save.

He pointed out that this is from a Liberal government whose leader said in opposition that they would reduce land tax. Eighteen months in, we have broken promises that are characteristic of this government. Lower costs and better services are nowhere in sight.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:12): I wish to speak briefly on the grievance for the Appropriation Bill. I would like to highlight a couple of issues. I will not cover the areas that have been covered extremely well by my colleagues. The member for Torrens has covered a number of issues and I would certainly endorse her comments.

The first issue I would like to talk about, and one which is dear to my heart, is road safety and this government's record on road safety. I want to put this in the context of not only road safety but also this government's commitment to the community at the last election about lower costs, better services and no privatisation. It is very important to put that up-front because the government has broken all those three promises and has actually taken down those three pillars, which are the foundation for this government.

Firstly, in relation to road safety, we are aware that they have dismantled the Motor Accident Commission's road safety programs. Generally speaking, in my view, their road safety programs are in disarray.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The minister scoffs.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The minister scoffs about the disarray. Well, the results speak for themselves. The harsh reality of the results speaks for itself. This government has taken its eye off road safety. It spent 16 years in opposition and has blurred the message as to what road safety is about. Every time the previous government did something in relation to road safety, they would call it a revenue measure.

It is interesting that in this budget they have actually increased fines on a number of penalties. The problem with what they have done is, if your fine system and compliance system is not tailored to a road safety outcome, the message gets diluted. It disconnects the message.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It disconnects the message because what people heard from the Treasurer was essentially, 'We are raising these fines because we can and we need it for the budget,' because they have misspent money in other areas. When people hear the message that we are raising fines, etc., and doing very little in the road safety area, they do not hear 'road safety measures'. They do not hear the road safety message.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The minister again interrupts to try to cover his mismanagement of the portfolio and this government's inability to make any cut through in this area. We sadly see the results on our roads. This government has done nothing in that regard. We heard one of the current ministers say that he was going to reduce speeds. He spent a number of years talking about how he was going to reduce speeds on rural roads because that was the thing to do. Has it happened? No, it has not happened. They were going to do a whole range of things in the road safety area. They have done zilch—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —except cut funds from road safety programs. The most the minister has done is criticise one of the commercials. His whole contribution to road safety is to criticise one of the commercials that appeared on television. That is quite a pitiful contribution by this minister and this government.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Sadly, as I said before, the results speak for themselves. It is a reflection of this government's inability to do the right thing by this community. A very important measure related to road safety that we support is making sure that drivers are properly trained. We need to make sure that people understand how to use a vehicle properly, etc. We should encourage people to get the appropriate professional training so that they can use a vehicle properly, understand the road rules and also understand what is behind the road rules to make our roads safer.

Again, I remind the parliament about this government's three pillars: lower costs, better services and no privatisation. Recently, a number of driving instructors in my electorate received an email from the government. Without any consultation or notification, these driving instructors were advised that road testing in Gawler would cease. The government are just cutting that out. They are cutting the ability for learner drivers to be tested in their town. It is a bit like the Service SA cutbacks, where they are shutting down a number of offices. This is a shutdown of services for driver training and testing.

What are the repercussions? I think that it undermines road safety. We want to encourage people, young people in particular, to take up driver education. We want to make sure that young people do the right thing, get assessed and tested and do not go on the road untrained. I understand that this decision by the government will close down four sites where people can be tested. These people are mainly young learner drivers.

It has the following results. These are not my views but the views of the industry, which covers a number of small businesses. This decision by the government increases the costs for these small businesses and increases the costs of being tested for young people and their parents. It also takes young people away from their schooling because they often do their driving lessons and tests before or after school.

Not only does it increase the costs for the driving instructors in these small businesses but it reduces their capacity to earn income. It minimises the time they can have clients because people will now have to go to Elizabeth from Gawler and outlying areas, for example, Roseworthy and Kapunda. All those little townships outside Gawler that use it as a regional centre for their services are going to be hit again by this government. They were first hit with other cuts, and in this cut the government are going to discontinue a service that they provide.

The sheer arrogance of this government is that they did not even consult the industry: 'This is what we are planning to do.' They just went out there and said, 'This is what we are doing and it starts now, this day.' As of Thursday, that service will be discontinued in Gawler. I have had a barrage of parents, young people and driving instructors saying that this government is out of control. They cannot be trusted to maintain their policies. In one fell swoop, they increased the costs of small businesses, reduced their capacity to earn income and increased the cost of living for young people and their families.

Some of the things industry members have mentioned to me include extended working hours due to more time getting to other hubs, pick-up times and drop-off points, and extra resources required, etc. There will be an additional 50 minutes to get a young person tested, so there is a loss of income for driving instructors and more time for the young person, who often take time off school to get tested. There is also the cost of the additional travel on our roads for the instructors. For people who live in Gawler, it compounds the problem, with an additional cost for these young people. One of the driving instructors said:

I have been a driving instructor for eight years and have been based in Gawler. The cancellation of the Gawler hub has caused me stress as now I have to add on at least 20 to 25 minutes each way approximately, which is a lot of pressure on myself, including students, to get to and from my next appointments, which are mainly based around Gawler.

With a number of her clients coming from Kapunda, Hamley Bridge, Mallala and Riverton, this instructor will actually have additional costs. These are rural people—regional people who this government is supposedly interested in because, remember, regions matter. In this case, regions do not matter because these regional young people and instructors will have to bear the brunt of this bad policy—this decision by the Minister for Transport to cut another service in my town.

Young people, their parents and driving instructors are not impressed with this decision, particularly as there was no consultation. Not only do we increase the cost of private transport but it is interesting to note that the government has decided to reduce the level of security on public transport. This is a government that was committed to improving public transport and numbers on public transport. They are reducing security. Why would they reduce police numbers on public transport? It is because now that they have a police rent tax they really cannot afford to charge the new privatised owners of the rail to have police on the trains.

What they are doing is preparing the rail to make it as cheap as possible to sell to the private consortium and people will pay the price through lower security. They will pay the price because there will be fewer people using our trains and the government will have to make up the gap to the private contractor. This government has failed on all three pillars and cannot be trusted.

Motion carried.

Estimates Committees

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:22): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by 31 July, in accordance with the following timetables:

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019

TIMETABLE FOR ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

WEDNESDAY 24 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Premier

Legislative Council

House of Assembly

Joint Parliamentary Services

Administered Items for Joint Parliamentary Services

State Governor's Establishment

Auditor-General's Department
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Defence SA

THURSDAY 25 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Innovation and Skills
Department for Innovation and Skills
Administered Items for the Department for Innovation and Skills
Minister for Energy and Mining
Department of Energy and Mining (part)

FRIDAY 26 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services
Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
South Australia Police
Administered Items for South Australia Police
Department for Correctional Services
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

MONDAY 29 JULY AT 1.30 PM

Attorney-General
Courts Administration Authority
Attorney-General's Department
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department
Electoral Commission of South Australia
Administered Items for Electoral Commission of South Australia

TUESDAY 30 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Planning
Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

WEDNESDAY 24 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Treasurer
Department of Treasury and Finance
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

THURSDAY 25 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Education
Department for Education

Administered Items for the Department for Education

Minister for Child Protection

Department for Child Protection

FRIDAY 26 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Human Services

Department of Human Services

Administered Items for the Department of Human Services

Minister for Health and Wellbeing

Department for Health and Wellbeing

South Australian Mental Health Commission

MONDAY 29 JULY AT 1.00 PM

Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development

Department of Primary Industries and Regions

Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions

TUESDAY 30 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment

Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment

Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment

South Australian Tourism Commission

Minister for Environment and Water

Department for Environment and Water

Administered Items for the Department for Environment and Water

Department for Energy and Mining (part)

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:23): I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Mr Treloar, Mr Basham, Mr Brown, Ms Luethen, Mr Malinauskas, Mr Szakacs and Mr Teague.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:23): I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Mr Duluk, Hon. L.W.K. Bignell, Mr Ellis, Dr Harvey, Mr McBride, Ms Michaels and Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

Motion carried.

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

I think the easiest thing, potentially to assist the house, is to go through them one by one. I might offer some commentary, and I suspect the shadow minister will make some commentary as we go. Some of them are clustered, but the clusters are not necessarily in order, so I am sure we will make our way through them with good faith and goodwill.

I will open with a couple of words about the bill. It has been a long journey. I think the first seedlings of the concepts that have made their way to this bill were a result of a review that was commissioned two decades ago by then minister Buckby. Some of those ideas made their way into subsequent amendments in legislation: some of those amendments were passed; some were not.

A substantial bill was put forward by Jane Lomax-Smith in 2009, or possibly 2008. Jane Lomax-Smith continues her work in education as chair of the Teachers Registration Board, and I thank her for the role that she is playing there. I know the government and opposition are grateful for the work of that board. As the result of an election, that bill did not come to fruition. I think it was given further attention through the subsequent six years, until the current shadow minister (member for Port Adelaide) was the minister for education and put out for public consultation a bill that was the next generation of the initial bill.

There were some enhancements on what had been offered in the previous bill. From memory, this occurred at the beginning of 2017 or possibly late 2016. That bill was given significant public consultation. There were many improvements and enhancements, which were iterated in the second reading debates in 2017 and last year. Ultimately, that bill also fell just shy of passage in the Legislative Council. I think it was described as having 'run out of runway', as there were around 20 bills for the Legislative Council to deal with in its last week of 2017; education might have been seventh or eighth, and they only got through five or six, or whatever it was.

Some matters had not been resolved at that time and they have not been resolved since, but I hope that we are not far from being able to do so. The bill that was sent to the Legislative Council was supported, in most parts, by the Labor Party as well as, obviously, the government. There were a few changes from the 2017 bill, on which I focused in my second reading speech in 2018. I think those enhancements were substantial. Many of them mirrored the amendments that we had moved to the bill in 2017. I think these enhancements benefit the bill and will ensure that it is in its best form once it completes its journey to existence—hopefully, as I said, in the not too distant future.

The Legislative Council, through the Labor Party, the Greens, SA-Best and Mr Darley, all had suggested enhancements to the bill, which variously became amendments that were passed in four particular categories. One of those was in relation to corporal punishment. Amendments moved by Ms Bonaros, I believe, would enhance the status of the corporal punishment offence in this bill to include non-government schools as well as government schools.

It is, in fact, already an offence to have corporal punishment in a school, but this would be an enhanced offence. The drafting of the bill, as I recall, reflected the drafting of the original bill, which talked about corporal punishment in government schools. However, there is absolutely no reason why we would not want to extend that protection to students in non-government schools as well.

The non-government school sector, through Catholic Education South Australia and the Association of Independent Schools South Australia, confirmed that they support the measure. None of their South Australian schools would object to that measure in any way. Frankly, as a point of principle, it is a good measure. As such, the government will certainly be supporting those amendments from Ms Bonaros, which were supported by all the other parties. I think Mr Lucas indicated we would be likely to support them as well.

The three remaining categories are in relation to religion, and we can talk about that in a little bit more detail. The amendment that has come from the Legislative Council would effectively take the decision-making out of the hands of the principal, with the secondary decision-maker then being the parent, and put it into the hands of the governing councils. The government is not inclined to support that nuance in the bill. Governing councils are tremendously important. They are an avenue for parental involvement and engagement in schools and for the community to support schools.

Having a governing council as the decision-maker on religious activities in schools—whether that be through a school participating in an Easter service or visiting a synagogue or a mosque, or whatever that other religious activity is—risks having people attend a governing council meeting only based on that issue and potentially not thinking about their involvement in the broader context of what governing councils have to offer. We maintain the position that we believe that the decision-maker should be the principal and then the parents deciding in relation to their own child.

The question then comes back to the one where I believe there was a dispute in 2017 in the Legislative Council on whether it should be a situation of opt in or opt out. In effect, the form that parents are asked to sign in regard to whether they want their child to participate or not would be the same form, whether it is an opt in or an opt out. The question is what happens with those children whose parents do not return the form or do not click the box on the app. The reality is that I am sure that we can resolve this distinction.

The government will be opposing the amendments in relation to the governing council becoming the decision-maker and I am confident that in the Legislative Council or, if needed, in a subsequent conference of managers, we will be able to resolve the other one. I do not think that the tying of this amendment to questions about Christmas carols is relevant in this question because the bill already makes explicitly clear in another section, which has not been threatened in any way through the passage of this debate, that Christmas carols are an acceptable activity in schools, so I can give comfort to anyone who is concerned about that. I am sure that, as the shadow minister for education has pointed out, she is a supporter of Christmas carols and sings Christmas carols, and I have every confidence that the bill as it continues will protect Christmas carols.

I do think it would be better for it to remain, as the government's position has been stated, as an opt-out option. If children's parents wish them to opt out of being involved in one of those religious activities, it would be their right and it would be important for schools to have an alternative activity of purpose for the child to be involved in and for the child to suffer no detriment as a result of that opt out. That is the most sensible way forward and so the government will be opposing that amendment.

The next matters relate to the role of the Australian Education Union and staff representation on a couple of committees. One of them is the review committee, which is a committee established when there is a proposal to close a school or schools. The most recent example of this was in Whyalla. In order to build the new school in Whyalla, late last year as minister I commissioned a review of the three existing high schools in Whyalla, including the two 8-10 schools and the 11-12 school. That review committee comprised a range of people, such as the mayor and the principals of the schools. At the moment, in the current legislation, it includes an Australian Education Union representative. We are proposing to change that to a general staff representative, who could be an AEU rep or somebody else.

There is a secondary committee, which is in relation to promotional positions, but it is the same principle. We were proposing to change the existing AEU rep to a general staff rep. The amendments that have come back to us from the Legislative Council in their design might have been suggested to be the best of both worlds and include an AEU rep and a general staff rep. We are talking about fairly small committees in relation to the promotional panel. Having an extra representative is unnecessary, and it would be preferable to just remain with the original staff rep.

If the house rejects these amendments today, I encourage legislative councillors to return to that original bill's premise and just have a general staff rep without giving the AEU a particularly privileged position in the legislation. That said, obviously we will have a look at what the Legislative Council chooses to do and, if the Legislative Council wishes to continue having the AEU on, then we will give consideration to that in a conference of managers. I think it would be more sensible to have one position rather than two, and the government will be opposing the amendment certainly as presented.

I note in relation to the last matter, which is to do with an education ombudsman, that there has been some movement here. The education ombudsman proposal has been around for some time. It particularly gains traction when there are heightened levels of concern about complaints-handling processes in schools and in the Department for Education. The complaints-handling processes in schools are an important body of work. It is not always an easy body of work. It is tremendously important that when something goes wrong in a school, and policies are not followed in the way in which they are supposed to be, the rights of children and their parents be utterly respected.

It is also important that the management of schools be done in a way that is also in the best interests of the school. I think our principals and our teachers do an amazing job, but it is a large

system. We have 30,000 employees in our education system, 500 schools and 400 other sites, mostly preschools—900 sites across South Australia—and it is a large and diverse system. Our expectation at the moment is that, if there is a complaint, it be dealt with at the local level first, and then if it needs to be escalated to the education director, then that can be the case.

There is an education complaints line within the education department and, if people are not satisfied, they can go to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman at the moment deals with a reasonable number of education-related complaints. The education department effectively pays the Ombudsman a significant amount of money, I believe in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, to fulfil that work, but there are reasonable questions that can be asked and have been raised by Tammy Franks, by the opposition and by the Liberal Party when we were in opposition about this process.

The DeBelle inquiry made some recommendations in relation to this that the Ombudsman then explored. The Ombudsman made some recommendations, I think in 2016, and the member for Port Adelaide as minister asked her department to implement those recommendations. By the time I was briefed as an incoming minister at the beginning of last year, those recommendations had been taken up and I think were completed during the course of last year.

They were important recommendations, and I am very confident that the systems and structures in place in the education department are adequate. They are hardworking people who do a good job, but we always want things to be better, and reasonable questions continue to be asked, as is to be expected in a system so broad. I am very pleased to be able to share with the house that, through the positive and constructive good faith discussions we have had with the Greens, with the Labor Party and with Mr Darley and with the SA-Best group, but particularly I acknowledge Tammy Franks as having led this as they are her amendments in the bill—

An honourable member: The honourable.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —the Hon. Tammy Franks—that the government has come to an agreement of supporting Tammy Franks' very sensible suggestion—I appreciate the role played by the member for Adelaide, the shadow minister, in indicating that the Labor Party will support it as well, although I will let her speak for herself in a moment obviously—to ensure that this Ombudsman matter is given due consideration but that that consideration not unduly delay the bill and the benefits of the broader bill being available for our schools, our teachers, our students and our families.

The government is indicating that we are happy to have a significant inquiry into a number of the matters that have been raised by the Hon. Tammy Franks and others. Particularly, this will be a substantial inquiry that will be seeking to report during 2020, and there will no doubt be recommendations that the government will give consideration to, and the public and the people of South Australia and the parliament may give consideration to. It will look at issues including those relating to suspensions, exclusions and expulsions. It will look at some matters that were related in the Select Committee on Access to the South Australian Education System for Students with a Disability.

It will also give consideration to that complaints-handling process, including whether the current arrangements with the Ombudsman are satisfactory, whether the scope of what the Ombudsman could look at should be expanded, whether the powers should be expanded, whether there should be policy recommendations coming from the role and whether there should be a specific education ombudsman.

We are not presupposing what the inquiry will suggest. We will take it as a very substantive inquiry that we will give due consideration to in time, but it will have the opportunity and the time to really investigate what is best practice, what is going to work best for families, for students and for our education system as a whole.

It is easy to think of that education system as one large behemoth of an organisation, but it is an important one. If we can get that organisation firing on all cylinders, then it will be giving the best support to our children across South Australia. Everyone in this chamber, I am certain, has an ambition that every child, whatever their circumstance, whatever their abilities, whatever their interests and whatever their physical location, will be able to achieve whatever they can in life and live a successful life, which is, in my view, one where they look forward to what the day has to hold

when they wake up in the morning and are able to find the job they want and be given the skills and the capacities to do that job. If this inquiry will help us get there, then we value it.

I will be seeking that that inquiry be hosted by the Child Development Council, which has a suitable infrastructure to do so. It will give the inquirer or reviewer—we will work on who that will be in the coming weeks—a sounding board, if you like, through the Child Development Council, which is a group of experts in child development from a range of different practices and professional backgrounds. It will give them a sounding board as they conduct their inquiry and also give them some infrastructure and some independence. They are a statutory authority, effectively. They are at arm's length from the government and will assist that inquiry in its deliberations.

With that in mind, regarding the particulars of the education ombudsman amendments that have been put to us by the Legislative Council, my understanding is that they will not be insisted on when it gets back, because obviously we will be looking to conduct the inquiry first before consideration of those other matters, and so we will obviously be opposing those amendments.

I think that I have probably gone through in broad conceptual terms the detail of the different amendments. If it assists the house, I will indicate that the first amendment is in relation to the education ombudsman, so it is one that the government will be disagreeing to. I suspect the member opposite might have some broader comments to make as well.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Before I go to the deputy leader, I would like to welcome to the house nurse advocates attending as part of the South Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation advanced training course, who are guests of the member for Hurtle Vale. Welcome to the parliament.

Bills

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES BILL

Final Stages

Debate resumed.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: To be clear, I have moved that the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

Dr CLOSE: I will speak very briefly in generalities about these amendments and then we can go through each of them. What I would like to say initially, though, is how pleased I am that we are getting very close now to getting an education and children's services act. It has been very long in the making, and I think it will make a significant difference to the quality of education and children's services that are offered across the state. I am very pleased to have played a constructive role, both previously as minister in introducing it before the last election and then in being largely supportive of it in the terms under which it has been brought by the present minister.

I indicate that our initial position on this side of the chamber had been to maintain our position on the amendments that the government has indicated it will not be supporting. However, there has been very good progress on the question of an education ombudsman, and I am pleased to say that we support the idea of a review, of the fact that a review will occur. It has been agreed with the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place, and therefore we will support the government in opposing that amendment, which is the initial amendment that we are talking about.

I had items on my list to do that I did not get to finish, as I am sure is true of every minister when they suddenly become no longer minister as a result of an election or any other change. One of those matters was this quite vexed question of exclusions and suspensions for students in our school system, recognising that a disproportionate number of young people who experience suspension through to exclusion are also known to have a disability. When you add in that they are also known to come from families struggling with very real poverty—often multigenerational poverty and unemployment—you realise that, although punishment in an immediate sense might appear to be necessary, it does not get to the root of the challenges that these young people experience.

Punishment—if I can use that term broadly—that is about removing a child from experiencing education is probably the worst thing that you could do for that child or young person, even appreciating the difficulties that teachers, SSOs and principals are managing in classrooms and in schools.

I am very pleased to think that the Child Development Council, with its expertise and any additional expertise that is made available to it through the government making this decision, will be deeply contemplating this systemic question. I am very pleased to think that will happen and I very much hope that there will be a bipartisan view formed as a result about how this might be managed better within the school system in the future.

I would like to pay tribute to the Hon. Tammy Franks for not only continuously raising this as an issue but also being prepared to be flexible on an amendment that I know matters a lot to her—to have an education ombudsman—in order to advance this case and, at the same time, to further interrogate whether the changes that have been made within the department in complaints handling and whether the powers and interests and concentration of the ombudsman are sufficient so that we can have a better and more informed view about that in the future. On that basis, on the first amendment we will vote with the government and support their position, as I understand will occur in the Legislative Council.

I will just say briefly that, on the other two, we maintain our position here. Clearly, that does not make a difference in numbers ultimately in the lower house. On the religion question, it will be interesting to see what kind of discussions we have, should we have to invoke the deadlock provisions, assuming that the Legislative Council insists. There are many ways to manage the question of religion in our schools. I do not believe that there is any practice occurring in public schools that is problematic. I have not had any raised with me. It is not something that you hear on the radio. It does not appear to be, in practice, a problem.

However, we do need to be sensitive about the way in which we talk about, particularly in a multicultural society, the variety of religious beliefs that exist within the community and how they are expressed in what is fundamentally a secular institution, which is public education for all. I think we are all well intentioned about that and there will likely be quite a sensible resolution. We will be continuing to support the involvement of the governing council in helping to be decision-makers.

We maintain our position that the union is an important representative of the workers within the public education system—that is not the same as simply selecting a representative from an individual school—and that with the union comes more weight in negotiations that might be necessary, particularly in the context of a school closure that not everyone thinks is a good idea, that is a genuine interrogation of whether or not a school ought to be closed. Having a union with a separate voice, rather than a teacher who might be concerned about their future, on that committee remains important to the Labor Party and we will be voting that way.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 2 is also in relation to the ombudsman question, and I reflect on the words I said before.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

Amendment No. 3 is in relation to the matter of corporal punishment. The government supports this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 4 is in relation to the amalgamation and closure of schools. It is the review committee that the shadow minister was just reflecting on. For the reasons that I explained before, the government will be disagreeing with this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 5:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 5 is the amendment moved by Mr Darley that requires the approval of the governing council of a school before the principal may consider that time be set aside or the conduct of religious or cultural activities. We see this as a matter that is best dealt with by the principal and the parent. Therefore, as I explained earlier, the government will be seeking to disagree with this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 6:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be agreed to.

Amendment No. 6 is also in relation to corporal punishment, ensuring that the matter relates to non-government schools as well as government schools. The government supports this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 7:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 7 is the other amendment in relation to the position of the Australian Education Union being singled out within the bill as opposed to a staff representative, this time in relation to the panels for promotional level positions. For the reasons outlined earlier, the government disagrees with this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 8:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 8 is in relation to the education ombudsman, as earlier described.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 9:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 9 be disagreed to.

Amendment No. 9 is a further consequential amendment in relation to the education ombudsman concept. In the context that we have just described, the government disagrees with this amendment.

Motion carried.

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

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that the government will be supporting the amendments made in the Legislative Council in respect of this bill, which will ensure its passage through the parliament today. I thank the Legislative Council for its consideration of the matter, including both government and other party amendments that have been incorporated. The passage of this legislation and the advance of special provision for emergency service worker assaults certainly make some history. I remain puzzled as to why there had not been an advance of this during the course of the previous administration.

I wish to commend, firstly, the Police Association of South Australia for their first advocacy of the matter, bringing it to the attention of the new government. Secondly, I commend the support of a number of other bodies, including the police commissioner himself, who took an active interest in this matter, which consequently enabled us to see a new provision for bodily fluid offences that incorporates some groundbreaking legislation. I thank the police commissioner for his active interest in this matter.

The South Australian chapter of the Australian Medical Association, the nurses union and the representatives of our emergency service workers also made a very significant contribution to the development of this new law and to the culmination of what is groundbreaking legislation. We are very pleased that that has advanced.

Certainly, there are aspects of the bill that have been incorporated from other parts of our criminal law, and they are consolidated in a new format. Whilst that may not add to some of the benefits of the bill, it does consolidate it within the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. There is a new element in the hinder police provisions, which, I am pleased to say, have not been abandoned; that is, hinder police has been salvaged and introduced into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, so it will be retained.

The chief feature in the success of this legislation, and the message that it sends to our superior courts in regard to the community's high level of intolerance for this, is whether the prosecuting authorities and the investigative authorities—which principally lay with SAPOL in the first instance—do prosecute these matters and maintain a diligence in their prosecution of the matter to ensure that there is every opportunity for successful convictions to be obtained and that submissions are made to treat the seriousness of such offending and that it is reflected in that.

The new shell has added a new dedicated offence, a specific offence in relation to the transfer of bodily fluids that potentially affect, in a very dangerous way, the vulnerability of our emergency workers to contamination and disease transfer, which we all know is completely unacceptable. With that, I thank all those who made a contribution, and I thank the Legislative Council for its consideration of the matter.

Mr ODENWALDER: I want to thank the government and the Attorney-General for the interesting experience of, together, guiding these matters through the parliament. I also acknowledge the Legislative Council and the crossbenchers in the Legislative Council—the Greens, SA-Best and the Hon. John Darley—and particularly the Hon. Frank Pangallo, who made some last-minute contributions to the definitions of prescribed workers to include those law enforcement officers who enforce the law around animal protection.

In short, this is a win, of course, for our police, for our ambos, for our emergency services workers, and it is something that the Police Association has been calling for since October. I do want to thank the government, but I wonder why it took so long to get to this point. But I do not want to dwell on that; I want to dwell on the fact that it is in fact a win for our emergency services workers.

The measures in this bill, as the Attorney said, send a very clear message to the courts, and the superior courts particularly, that assaults and particularly harm to police officers, ambos,

emergency workers and nurses will no longer be tolerated. There has been a perception and indeed a reality that many perpetrators have been lightly dealt with by the courts. This has to end. As of when this bill is assented to, those days hopefully will be over and those messages will get through not only to the courts but also to the police themselves and to the prosecutors and, one would hope, to the offenders. That is a hope we all have—that the laws that we pass in this place finally trickle down to the people who commit the offences.

As the Attorney says, the final bill clarifies that the exchange of human biological material can constitute an assault and can constitute harm in certain contexts. I thought it was always a given that that was the case, but I am happy to support any amendments which clarify that. I understand the police commissioner wanted that, and I think sections of the ambos and the nurses wanted that too. I see no reason not to make that absolutely clear in this legislation.

Importantly, the bill creates dedicated offences within the Criminal Law Consolidation Act above and beyond the aggravated offences of assault and cause harm and those types of things. It creates specific offences which deal specifically with police, ambulance officers, nurses, medical practitioners within hospitals, corrections officers who work in the community and a suite of other people who, by definition, go into harm's way to protect life and property and to treat people in emergencies.

It does that, but the most important part of all, I think, is the changes to the Sentencing Act. The government and the opposition agreed early on that there should be a change to the secondary sentencing principles which go towards the courts making decisions based on the fact that it will deter people from committing these offences. Also, there is the amendment the opposition brought in, which was supported by the Legislative Council and is now supported by the government, which makes any of these offences with harm designated offences. This means that the courts cannot impose a second suspended sentence within a five-year period for an offence like this which causes harm to an emergency services worker.

I do want to thank the government for supporting the amendments and for providing, finally, the passage of this bill. I want to thank particularly those members of the Legislative Council who got behind the amendments and got behind our police, our ambos and our emergency services workers. Finally, I commend this bill to the house.

Motion carried.

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 June 2019.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:04): It is my pleasure to be the lead speaker for the opposition on the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) (No 2) Bill 2019. I assure the house that I will not need the full unlimited time available to me to talk about this. However, something that is common practice is for attorneys-general on both sides to have portfolio miscellaneous bills to bring to the house, bundling up a whole range of minor matters, but it is important to scrutinise them very thoroughly. I am sure that is something the government, when they were in opposition, were careful to do, and we certainly are doing that because you would not want an attorney-general to slip something in here and for parliament not to notice. I certainly would never accuse the current Attorney-General of doing such a thing.

I indicate that it is, sadly, very disappointing that the opposition is in a position where the Attorney-General has brought on this bill to debate in the house today—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: She's on the phone.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): Order!

Mr PICTON: She is not listening; she is on the phone. It is very—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Not even listening; she's on the phone—disrespectful.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Highly disrespectful.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): You are showing a high level of disrespect, member for Mawson. Carry on, member for Kaurna.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: I'm not on my mobile phone. I'm not on my mobile phone like the Attorney-General.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): Order!

Mr PICTON: Thank you, Acting Deputy Speaker. As the member for Mawson points out, the Attorney-General is on the phone, but I am sure she is getting a late-minute briefing on this very bill. It is very disappointing that she has brought on this bill to discuss here in the house today without actually providing all the answers to the questions that the opposition has raised about this bill. Labor is yet to receive answers to the questions that were put on notice during the briefing we had with the Attorney-General's Department and her office staff.

Those questions included the provision of examples of why a judge would need to have immunity in both civil and criminal trials. As it was explained in the briefing (and the Attorney-General might be interested in listening to this if she wasn't on the phone), the immunity provisions are to prevent a judge from being prosecuted for something contempt of court or corruption. We requested examples of where this immunity might have been used in the past or how it might be used in the future, and that question was taken on notice.

In fact, it would be very useful to have an example for each jurisdiction in which a judge is granted additional immunities. The jurisdictions include those found in:

- the Coroners Act 2003;
- the District Court Act 1991;
- the Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993;
- the Liquor Licensing Act 1997;
- the Magistrates Court Act 1991;
- the Supreme Court Act 1935; and
- the Youth Court Act.

Another question that we did not yet have an answer to was how the proposed change of definition of 'premises of a participating body' in the Sheriff's Act 1978 will function. In particular, what is the 'precinct or immediate environs,' how is a laneway 'between' or 'abutting' a premises different and how far do those geographic definitions extend? I hope that the Attorney-General can answer these questions. I am very certain that she did not hear any of them because she has been on the phone the entire time, but we will try to address these when we get to the committee stage of the debate.

Once again, I indicate that Labor reserves its position on this bill, and it is on behalf of the shadow attorney-general in the other place that I indicate that. We will try to get some of these answers here, but certainly between the houses we will continue to try to get answers, and then we will reserve our position to see what it is in the other place, where the numbers are a little less definite than they are in this place.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:08): I rise to commend the bill to the house. As the member for Kaurna has indicated, there is nothing terribly extraordinary about the structure of the bill that is brought in this way, by way of an omnibus bill, within the Attorney-General's portfolio. I am grateful to note that the member for Kaurna observes what is true—that the Attorney would not be bringing along in this format, in compendium legislation, anything that is going to take the parliament unduly by surprise. Indeed, that is not the case here. We have a bill that will, in 18 parts, create amendments to a number of acts in ways that are largely uncontroversial.

The only extent to which I express any surprise in relation to the contribution of the member for Kaurna is that it should be necessary, at the second reading stage, to be reserving a position. I

did not hear any indication, other than in relation to the extent of immunity that ought appropriately be enjoyed by judges, that is particularised in the member for Kaurna's contribution. However, I will be interested to hear, as he has obviously decided that he will take the opportunity to interrogate that at the committee stage, where else there may be specific issues the opposition might take with this otherwise uncontroversial legislation.

For my part, I propose to make some specific remarks in relation to that part of the bill that amends the Spent Convictions Act. Part 13 of the bill amends the Spent Convictions Act 2009 in clauses 16 and 17, and I propose to take this opportunity to spend a few moments to consider what is occurring there.

The amendments that are the subject of clause 16 of the bill, which would repeal amendments to the act moved in 2017 by a former member of the other place, have some history that would be familiar to those who were members of this house in the Fifty-Third Parliament. In 2017, the parliament, by a similar compendium act—in that case the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio No 3) Act 2017—passed amendments to the Spent Convictions Act that had the effect of clarifying rules relating to the disclosure and use of a conviction that is taken to be immediately spent under the Spent Convictions Act. Those amendments have not yet commenced.

The amendments would have the effect of remedying what is an anomaly in the Spent Convictions Act that had, I understand, in some cases prevented employers from taking appropriate disciplinary action against employees following criminal offending, including where the offence was committed in the course of employment or where an employee posed a serious risk to other staff and/or to the public. The way that the spent convictions legislation works, it might be noted at this point, is that conviction, once spent, does not, as one might describe in the vernacular, have the effect of wiping the slate clean; it does not cease to exist once spent.

The spent convictions legislation works in such a way that, for example, in court proceedings, if someone is charged with an offence, it is not brought to the attention of the court for purposes of prosecution from an evidential point of view and, in other ways, is not available for consideration in a number of circumstances in which convictions are relevantly considered. It has the effect of preventing the disclosure of the relevant conviction and, relevantly, in relation to these amendments, operates so as to prevent there being any proper basis for refusing or revoking an appointment in circumstances where the conviction is spent.

In relation to a case where a conviction is determined immediately to be spent, the perhaps unintended consequence is that an employer would find themselves relevantly, practically, effectively barred from taking action in relation to the conviction because its status would be such as to not provide a basis for disciplinary action or for the refusal or revocation of the relevant appointment. In that sense, the employer is prevented from using relevant knowledge of offending in order to, for example, commence an investigation or other relevant conduct in the workplace.

By contrast, if circumstances were sufficiently different that no criminal charge was laid or if, following the laying of charges and the prosecution, there was an ultimate not guilty determination then the employer would be able to go ahead and carry out the kinds of investigations or other procedures in the workplace that might be deemed necessary or appropriate in relation to disciplinary action. One can see the unintended consequence that follows. If a conviction resulted, one might conclude that the relevant conduct—therefore the subject of some ultimate disciplinary action having been proved—if deemed immediately spent, might have that unintended consequence.

To remedy that anomaly, the 2017 portfolio act I referred to earlier facilitated the creation of a new exclusion that would find its way into the spent convictions regulations. It would only apply to immediately spent convictions and would allow employers to take into account those immediately spent convictions for employment-related purposes for a limited and defined period of time and purpose. To date, those regulations have not been enacted either. The amendments in 2017 effected a necessary restructure of the Spent Convictions Act in order to facilitate that.

There were then a number of amendments moved by the Hon. Kelly Vincent in the other place in the course of that debate. Those amendments were to have the effect of allowing younger persons—people under the age of 25, the subject of the amendment—who were covered by this immediately spent conviction to make application to a qualified magistrate for an order that that

particular prescribed exclusion would not apply in relation to that conviction. The idea was to recognise certain exceptional circumstances that might apply in which that immediately spent conviction ought not be disclosed, even in that particular employment circumstance for which the regime was designed to operate.

Those particular amendments were supported by both government and opposition at the time. It was also foreshadowed that a review would need to occur in relation to that before the new legislation came into operation to ensure that that might be appropriate in all the circumstances. It is for that reason in particular that I set out to focus on part 13 of the compendium bill, because the government has had the opportunity in bringing this legislation before the house to do the work that was foreshadowed in 2017 in the previous parliament.

I am glad the member for Kaurna has rejoined us to participate in the debate. I am glad there is a level of interest on the opposition side, having made the remarks that I did at the outset, because there is apparently a limited appreciation of the contents of the bill. It has been foreshadowed that there might be some investigation in the course of the committee process. I am doing what I can to enlighten those on the other side about just this particular aspect of the bill and I am endeavouring to walk through it in as clear and straightforward a way as I am able.

What has become clear is that, in light of the opportunity to conduct the work that was foreshadowed back in 2017, the government has determined that it would be and is inappropriate to enact those amendments. That is for a number of reasons but boils down to the fact that they do not contemplate or appreciate the relevant question, and that is whether or not that special category of spent convictions, the immediately spent convictions, ought be disclosed for an employment-related purpose as opposed to the context in which the offence has occurred which relates to the workplace in which that person may be currently employed or seeks to be employed.

While the endeavour may be meritorious—that is, to provide a process for younger persons to be provided with a broader exemption—the effect, perhaps unintended, would be undesirable in that the immediately spent conviction might find its way to be hidden from disclosure simply by virtue of the relatively young age of the offender, and that ought not, as a matter of principle, be a circumstance that persists within the regime and within the nature of that special exclusion.

It is convenient in that the time has now transpired so that that work foreshadowed in 2017 could have been done and is done, the result being that the undesirability of pressing on with that machinery means that those amendments will be repealed, and they are the subject of part 13. With those remarks, particularly in relation to those clauses of the bill that deal with the Spent Convictions Act 2009, I commend the bill to the house and wish its speedy passage.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:29): I rise to firstly thank the shadow minister and the member for Heysen for their contributions. I thank the member for Heysen for his interest in this law reform in relation to a number of areas but particularly spent convictions. I note the indication by the opposition that they will support the bill but have some questions.

I am not just the Attorney-General; I am also a woman and I can do two things at once. It came to my attention that the Leader of the Opposition was interested in a number of matters. A number of issues have been raised on the bill by the opposition in the briefings provided to them. I am going to outline to the parliament a number of aspects on which the opposition have already been briefed, so they may not be interested anymore in these matters, but I expect they will cover the matters that the leader wants to repeat again in the parliament, as is consistent with his modus operandi on these matters.

For the benefit of the parliament, I am going to outline some aspects of some of the reforms in the bill, in particular the judicial immunities, unexplained wealth, court premises and spent convictions aspects. I think the other matters speak for themselves. As I have indicated, we are happy to answer any further questions.

One of the issues that was raised on the judicial immunities, which of course provide protection to our judiciary, was whether examples could be given of the types of acts that are exercised in the performance of a judicial function, which would fall within the scope of the common law civil and criminal immunity for judicial officers. The position at common law is that the judicial

officer enjoys immunity from civil and criminal liability for acts performed in the course of judicial functions.

The immunity of a judicial officer from civil and criminal liability, under the common law, exists despite any express statutory reference in legislation to the contrary and there is no distinction between judicial officers of a superior and inferior court, so this applies to Supreme Court judges and to the Magistrates Court alike. The purpose of the immunity is to preserve the integrity, independence and resolve of the judiciary to ensure that justice may be administered by judicial officers independently on the basis of their unbiased opinion.

An example of an act that may fall within the sphere of judicial immunity from civil liability is the tort of negligence, whereby a defendant may allege that a judicial officer failed to apply or indeed misapplied the law in the course of a hearing or deciding a relevant matter. At common law, judicial officers also enjoy immunity from criminal liability for acts performed in the course of judicial functions. However, the immunity does not attach to acts that are outside the performance of judicial functions, i.e. theft, assault, murder, fraud, etc. Most criminal acts committed by a judicial officer are likely to fall outside the scope of a judicial officer's official functions and that, therefore, would not attract immunity from criminal liability.

An example, however, of an act performed in the exercise of a judicial function, where the immunity from criminal liability may theoretically arise, is criminal defamation, whereby a defendant may seek to argue that they have been criminally defamed by a judicial officer as the result of a wrongful conviction or finding of guilt. In this example, the judicial immunity would extend to protect the judicial officer from any criminal liability arising out of the exercise of the judicial authority to determine the defendant's guilt and the publication of any material to that effect, i.e. their reasons for judgement.

Further clarification was also sought about which judicial officers currently enjoy statutory immunity from (a) both civil and criminal liability and (b) only civil liability. In respect of the former, legislation that currently confers statutory immunity from civil and criminal liability on judicial officers for acts performed in the course of judicial functions includes:

- South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013, section 79(1);
- South Australian Employment Tribunal Act 2014, section 76(1);
- Police Complaints and Discipline Act 2016, section 37(1);
- Protective Security Act 2007, Part 5A—Protective Security Officers Disciplinary Tribunal, section 31E(1); and
- Legal Practitioners Act 1981, section 81(2).

In respect of the latter—that is, in respect of only civil liability—legislation that currently confers statutory immunity in respect of that area on judicial officers for acts performed in the course of judicial functions includes:

- Coroners Act 2003, section 33;
- District Court Act 1991, section 36;
- Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993, section 36;
- Magistrates Court Act 1991, section 44;
- Supreme Court Act 1935, section 110C; and
- Youth Court Act 1993, section 26.

In respect of unexplained wealth as it relates to serious and organised crime in this bill, a query was made as to whether any other jurisdiction has an expiration clause built into its respective unexplained wealth legislation. I advise the parliament that South Australia is the only jurisdiction to have a sunset clause prescribed in its unexplained wealth legislation. The bill was introduced into parliament by the former Labor government with the expiry clause included.

In respect of the definition of 'premises of a participating body', which relates to court premises and the precinct being extended, clarification was sought on the meaning of 'precincts and immediate environs' in reference to the definition of a 'premises of a participating body', i.e. court premises, in relation to clause 15 of the bill. It is interesting that this was asked. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and I recently had a discussion, and I indicated that this matter was in the parliament for its current consideration. He was pleased that this was advancing, as it was a matter that had come at the express request of the Chief Justice.

The terminology that has been used was at his express request so, as advised during the briefing, the inclusion of the words 'precincts and immediate environs' has been adopted from the definition of 'court premises' as provided in section 2 of the Court Security Act 1980 (Victoria). The phrase 'precincts and immediate environs' is not expressly defined in our Sheriff's Act 1978. The phrase is therefore likely to be given its ordinary meaning by a court. The *Macquarie Dictionary* defines 'precinct' as including 'an enclosing boundary or limit' or 'a walled or otherwise bounded or limited space within which a building or place is situated' and 'environs' as the 'immediate neighbourhood; surrounding parts or districts'.

Members probably will not get much further assistance with the definition and interpretation of this clause from our liquor licensing laws, but members who have been here for a while will recall that we have quite a number of laws that relate to a precinct around a liquor licensed premises, which persons cannot enter if they are carrying weapons and the like. There are opportunities, for example, for SAPOL to search persons in those precincts.

However, this is a definition that has been provided by the Chief Justice, who requests that the terminology be expanded in this legislation. It has been mirrored from legislation that operates interstate, and we are confident not only that it is appropriate that the Chief Justice seek this for the protection of the staff and judiciary themselves working within the precinct but that he is eminently competent to be able to properly define that for the purposes of this legislation.

As to the Spent Convictions Act and the repeal of the Hon. Kelly Vincent's amendments, firstly I thank the member for Heysen for making a contribution in this regard because it is important that we understand exactly what is happening here and put this in the context that this is an issue that not only needs to be remedied but could have been remedied by the previous government, and they did not do so.

In respect of the information provided already on the amendments in clause 16 of the bill, which seek to repeal the amendments to the Spent Convictions Act 2009, that is, the SC Act moved by former member the Hon. Kelly Vincent MP, in 2017 parliament passed the Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio No 3) Act 2017, that is the 2017 portfolio act, which included amendments to the SC Act to clarify the rules relating to the disclosure and use of a conviction that is taken to be immediately spent under the SC Act.

The amendments to the SC Act have not yet commenced. The amendments remedy an anomaly within the SC Act, which had, in some cases, prevented employers from taking appropriate disciplinary action against employees following criminal offending, including where the offence was committed in the course of employment or where the employee poses a serious risk to other staff or the public.

Generally speaking, a spent conviction cannot be disclosed and is not a proper basis for refusing or revoking an appointment. In the case of a conviction that is immediately spent, the employer is effectively barred from taking disciplinary action and prevented from using their own knowledge of the offending to commence an investigation. By contrast, if no criminal charge is laid, or if the person prosecuted is ultimately found not guilty, the employer is able to carry out their own investigations and consider the need for disciplinary action.

To remedy the anomaly, the 2017 portfolio act facilitates the creation of a new exclusion that will be found in the Spent Convictions Regulations 2011, hereafter referred to as the regulations, that would only apply to immediately spent convictions and allow employers to take immediately spent convictions into account for employment-related purposes for a limited period of time. To date, these regulations have not yet been enacted.

The amendments in the 2017 portfolio act also affected a necessary restructure of the SC Act to facilitate this. During debate on the 2017 portfolio bill, the Hon. Kelly Vincent MP moved a number of amendments to the SC Act. The Vincent amendments sought to allow for a young person, (i.e. a 25 year old or under) with an immediately spent conviction to apply to a qualified magistrate for an order that a prescribed exclusion found in the draft regulations does not apply in relation to that conviction.

The purpose of the amendments was to recognise that there may be exceptional circumstances in which the immediately spent conviction of a young person should not be disclosed to an employer or potential employer. The amendments were supported by the former government and the opposition at the time, but it was foreshadowed that the amendments may need to be reviewed before coming into operation to ensure that they were appropriate in the circumstances.

From reading *Hansard*, it seems that, notably, neither party had considered this proposal yet supported it to enable the bill to pass before the parliament was prorogued. The current government has now had the opportunity to review the Vincent amendments and determined that it would be inappropriate to enact the Vincent amendments. The Vincent amendments fail to recognise that the question of whether it is appropriate for an immediately spent conviction to be disclosed for employment-related purposes is not specific to the particular offence committed by the relevant person but rather the context in which the offence relates to the workplace in which they are currently employed or seek to be employed.

In addition, it is noted that the Vincent amendments allow for any person aged 25 years or under to apply to a qualified magistrate for an exemption for any exclusion that is, or may be in future, prescribed by the regulations, not only the employment-related exclusion detailed above. In other words, this would allow for any person aged 25 years or under to apply to have their immediately spent convictions hidden from disclosure as a matter of course simply by virtue of their age and merely because of the fact that the exclusion is prescribed in the regulations.

This is clearly inconsistent with the original policy issues that the parliament agreed to with the passage of the 2017 portfolio act. Accordingly, we are seeking that the Vincent amendments be repealed as part of this bill. I will now provide two examples that compare the effect of the former government's amendments with the Vincent amendments.

Example 1: person A is a 23-year-old healthcare worker employed in a hospital. The person is charged with numerous offences in connection with the theft of fentanyl, a drug of dependence, from the hospital where they work. The person is found to have taken fentanyl on 31 occasions for their own use. The offences are found proved, but the person was ultimately found not guilty by reason of mental incompetence. As a result, the person receives an immediately spent conviction.

Under the current act, the employer is unable to act, despite the obvious risk that the person posed to patients at the hospital. Furthermore, the employer is prevented from notifying the Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency about the person's substance abuse or incapacity. Under the amendments made by the former government, including the regulations proposed at the time, person A's immediately spent conviction is liable to be disclosed to an employer or prospective employer for a prescribed period.

Under the Vincent amendments, because person A is under the age of 25, they would be eligible to make an application to a qualified magistrate for an order that a prescribed exclusion under clause 14 of schedule 1 of the SC Act does not apply in relation to their immediately spent conviction. In the event that the magistrate has determined to make the order, this would mean that the anomaly would continue to exist and person A's employer would be barred from taking any disciplinary action in relation to person A's offending.

Let's consider a second example. Person B is a 42-year-old worker in a children's residential care facility. The worker is charged with stealing surplus medication that was prescribed to one of the children at the facility and falsifying documents to cover the theft. The worker subsequently pleads guilty and the court declines to record a conviction. Consequently, under the current act, the worker's employer is unable to take any action against the worker.

Under the amendments made by the former government, including the regulations proposed at the time, person B's immediately spent conviction is liable to be disclosed to an employer or prospective employer for a prescribed period. But, under the Vincent amendments, person B is over the age of 25 and will therefore not be able to make an application to a qualified magistrate for an order that a prescribed exclusion under clause 14 of schedule 1 does not apply in relation to their offending.

I bring those matters to the attention of the parliament because they are important matters raised during the course of briefings and I hope illustrate the significance of why these particular aspects are being pursued in the government's Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) (No 2) Bill. They are worthy of the support of the parliament to advance. I would hope, upon reflection by the shadow minister on matters he has previously raised, that he, too, will see the merit of supporting the bill and be satisfied that it is important that we give these matters favourable consideration. I otherwise thank members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: I thank the Attorney-General for her very lengthy answer in the summing-up stage of the second reading. I would like to ask the Attorney-General, as I do not think it was mentioned in her summing-up, who she has consulted with in terms of the consultation she has done in regard to this bill and if she can provide a list of that and a summary of what their representation and position on this legislation were.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will identify the consultation list of those who were consulted. As has been previously reported to the parliament, it is the policy of the government to alert the parliament where there have been published submissions put by various stakeholders. It is not the policy of the government to provide details from parties that are parts of the government or, indeed, the judiciary in this case.

The government undertook consultation with the heads of jurisdiction, including the State Courts Administrator, the State Coroner, the senior judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court, the judge of the Youth Court, the judge of the Licensing Court, president of the Health Practitioners Tribunal, the Law Society of South Australia, the SA Bar Association, the Legal Services Commission, the Crown Solicitor's Office, the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Commissioner of Police, the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Public Trustee and the Department for Child Protection.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

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

Amendment No 1 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 5, line 5 [clause 8, inserted section 36B(2)]—Delete ', subject to subsection (3),'

This is an amendment to the commencement clause. It will enable the amendment to the Summary Offences Act 1953 in the bill to commence immediately after section 4 of the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Act 2018 comes into operation or on the day on which the bill is assented to by the Governor, whichever is the later. This will ensure that the amendments to the Summary Offences Act 1953 and the bill will not come into operation until after section 4 of the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Act 2018 has commenced.

Amendment carried.

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

Amendment No 2 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 5, lines 9 and 10 [clause 8, inserted section 36B(3)]—Delete subsection (3) and substitute:

- (3) The Supreme Court may only consider 1 application in relation to each of the questions referred to in subsection (1)(b)(i) and (ii) (as those questions relate to a particular investigation) but the Court may, if an application has been made under this section, join such other parties to the application as the Court thinks fit.

I indicate that this amendment is also to the commencement clause. It will enable the amendment to the Surveillance Devices Act 2016 in the bill to commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation other than on assent. This is to provide greater certainty to relevant parties about when the amendment will commence.

Mr PICTON: I have a question for the Attorney-General in relation to this amendment: is this because the Attorney-General wants this to be sooner or wants this to be later? If it is later, which I presume it would be, how much later is the Attorney-General anticipating that part 16 would be proclaimed and would start operation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Later. It is an offence provision, so it is important that we ensure that that occurs.

Mr PICTON: The second part of my question was: how much later does the Attorney-General believe that this section will be proclaimed as opposed to the rest of the act?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that there is no reason for it to be delayed for any length of time. It just has to be post that date. It may only be a week or so.

Mr PICTON: Lastly to the Attorney-General on this: what additional steps need to happen in terms of bringing this in? The Attorney-General mentioned that people need to be talked to. Is that consultation going to happen after the passage of this act? Is it discussions with the police? Who is the concern that discussions need to happen with that would delay the starting of this section?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that really the only stakeholders who would receive any advice on this prior to the process for proclamation would be the courts, because it relates to an offence and they would be the ones handling that matter, and possibly SAPOL.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 to 11 passed.

Clause 12.

Mr PICTON: In relation to clause 12, I understand that this has come about because of representations from the ICAC, OPI or the ICAC commissioner himself requesting these amendments. Can the Attorney-General outline whether her agency fully considered the nature and effect of the amendments, or were they introduced simply on the basis of the recommendation of the ICAC without further consideration from the department?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Firstly, yes, the amendments here came as a result of a recommendation from the commissioner, Mr Bruce Lander. I am further advised that in the original Public Interest Disclosure Act it was intended that councils be included, so this is fulfilling what was expected to be in the previous legislation.

For the benefit of the member and other members, you might recall that this legislation was presented by the previous government and then pursued by this government after it fell into deadlock, from recollection. As to the question of whether our agency considers any recommendation or just does it, I make this very clear: we welcome the representations and recommendations of any agency that has an interest in these matters.

Obviously, if it is at the level and status of the commissioner, that is worthy of respectful consideration, perhaps even more than others. I make this point: our agency carefully considers the recommendations and requests of all stakeholders because it is our responsibility, and I think our duty to this parliament, that we make sure that, even if the recommendations are with the best intentions in the world, they are not going to offend other important areas of our law or inadvertently have some negative impact on the application of other laws.

We take that responsibility very seriously. I know that the officers and advisers I have, some of whom are here today, do diligently consider these matters, and there is no exception in respect of this one.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD EXPLOITATION AND ENCRYPTED MATERIAL) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

VICTIMS OF CRIME (OFFENDER SERVICE AND JOINDER) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (PETITIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale): Presented a petition signed by 293 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 papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Motor Accident Commission—Charter July 2019

Public Sector Act 2009—Section 71 Report

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights—Mamungari Conservation Park Co-management Board—General

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Associations Incorporation—Forms
 Evidence—Domestic Violence Proceedings
 Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse)—Recorded Evidence
 Rules made under the following Acts—
 Magistrates Court—Criminal—Amendment No. 75

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—

Flinders University—Annual Report 2018
 Torrens University Australia—Annual Report 2018
 University of South Australia—Annual Report 2018
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Teachers Registration and Standards—Miscellaneous

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Advanced Care Directives—Exemption

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll) on behalf of the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 National Parks and Wildlife—Mamungari Conservation Park Co-management Board—General

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

Completed Autonomous Vehicle Trials, Parliamentary Report on—Report
 Local Council By-Laws—
 Town of Gawler—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Moveable Signs
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Local Government Land

Question Time

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier—welcome back. Can the Premier explain the benefits of his land tax aggregation measure announced in last month's state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for this opportunity to clarify our position with regard to land tax. The specific question that he asked is in regard to aggregation and what the benefits of aggregation are. Let's be quite clear: what we are after is a reform to land tax here in South Australia. There are situations where people have the same—exactly the same, for example—land value. Some might hold it in a single entity or in a single property; some might hold it in multiple properties and have a completely different levied tax rate. We want to eliminate that anomaly that currently exists.

We ultimately want to drive towards lower land tax in South Australia. We made a commitment in the lead-up to the election to have lower taxes in South Australia. We demonstrated this to the people of South Australia while we were in opposition. We have demonstrated successively, in our first and second budgets, to lower tax in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and that's exactly and precisely what we want to do. We want to take that burden from households, from families—

Mr Malinauskas: Tradies tax, bin tax.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and from the productive component—

Mr Malinauskas: Outback tax.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of our economy here in South Australia. We do that because we genuinely want to continue to drive our economy in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call the following members to order: the member for Mawson, the member for West Torrens, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Waite. Leader.

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. What is the sort that the Premier's land tax aggregation measure is seeking to stop?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): Well, I think I might have just explained it in my previous answer, but I am happy to again. You have the situation under the current legislation where somebody who might have exactly the same land value held in a single entity, or a single property, having a completely different levied land tax liability from somebody who might have exactly the same value but held over a number of entities.

We think this is inequitable. We want to drive lower land tax overall in South Australia. The previous government were happy to kick this issue down the road. They weren't prepared to deal with this necessary reform. Well, we are going to be dealing with this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —issue, and our commitment to the people of South Australia is that we want land tax reform, and ultimately what we need is lower land tax in South Australia. That's what we took to the election and that's what we will be implementing.

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier announce a new policy of land tax aggregation and publish revenue estimates in last month's state budget without first having done modelling on the impact of the policy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): Thank you very much. I am not exactly sure what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. Modelling was done. It was done by Treasury and was contained within the state budget.

FLINDERS LINK

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:11): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister please update the house on the Flinders Link project and how the Marshall government is building South Australia?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:11): I certainly can—

Ms Cook interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and I do note the member for Elder's commitment to this project—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —as I do the commitment from the member for Davenport. This is a fantastic project, a fantastic project that we have been able to make sure continues to go ahead. Certainly, this is something that has been on the books for some time, and certainly there was some amount of money that was provided to get this project off the ground, but the missing ingredient—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Was your blowout!

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —was an actual cost estimate that was realistic and all the money to complete the project. It is not good enough to have half the money or two-thirds of the money: you actually need the full amount of money to deliver this project.

What you also need is engineering advice that details how this project needs to be built. So, when the engineers provide a solution to government that says that we need to upgrade the viaduct structure to make sure that it has high degrees of structural integrity so that there aren't any issues with the project, do you know what we do as a government? We listen to that advice, and we say to the department—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that it is our job to make sure that we get all the money, all \$125 million worth of the money, on the table. So we sit down and use the fantastic relationship that we have with the Morrison government to get on and deliver this project, and for those people in the southern suburbs, especially those on the southern side of South Road who have been looking forward to this for such a long time, the 650-metre extension—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hurtle Vale is asked to cease vociferating across the chamber, and she is warned. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Settle, settle, settle. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Maybe we need a compass, Mr Speaker. Can I say that this project is also going to unlock another project that this government had to fix and unclutter from the previous government, that is, unlocking \$1.5 billion worth of private sector investment at Flinders University.

We as a government have an ambition to grow the number of international students in our state, and to do that we need to build some accommodation to house these international students. Flinders University has put itself on the line to help the government to deliver on this commitment, and we have managed not only to deliver the Flinders Link project, which is going to improve access to the Tonsley line for commuters around the Flinders precinct, especially those people in the

member for Davenport's electorate who will now have a connection on that side of South Road to be able to catch the train—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for West Torrens, be quiet!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but we are also going to see \$1½ billion worth of housing development and associated mixed-use development that is going to unlock that area and is going to drive international student visitation to our state. We know that for every international student who comes to South Australia there are tens of thousands of dollars per head of investment in our state.

So the opportunity here was for us to be able to do a deal with Flinders Uni that actually helps to get that project off the ground, to actually get enough money to deliver the Flinders Link extension to get that project off the ground, and actually be there last Friday with the member for Davenport as well as the member for Boothby to turn the first sod on what is going to provide a glimpse into what we can look forward to in the future, and that is a Flinders University hub that includes a train station, that is going to have public transport links to other parts of our network, that is going to be able to deliver for people a quicker and better way—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to get on a train and get to Adelaide.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We could not be more proud of the work that we have done in the short 16 or 17 months since we have come to government to deliver for the people of the southern suburbs.

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier release the modelling of the land tax aggregation he referred to in his previous answer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): I think I made that very clear: it's contained within the state budget.

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have the full support of his backbench for the land tax aggregation policy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): Absolutely.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Liberal party room works through all the issues associated with our legislative agenda, and we are working through the issues with regard to—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —this land tax issue. And, yes, people have made representations to me on behalf of members of their electorates, and I'm very happy to receive that information from individual members. We work through each and every one of them.

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

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just make the point that we are sitting down with the industry; we are consulting with the industry. They have some numbers that they want to put forward to us. We are happy to receive those numbers. We will ultimately—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —land on a piece of legislation which we will introduce to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the parliament before the end of the year, and we do this because we want to get this legislation through. We want to get the rate reductions through for 1 July next year because what we are promising the people of South Australia is an overall land tax reduction in South Australia. We know this will be an economic stimulus. We know this will create jobs. It will move us forward—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —towards our agenda of growing our economy, creating jobs and keeping more young people here in South Australia.

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier seek to dissuade any members of his party room from crossing the floor regarding land tax aggregation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): Obviously we will be advocating for the government's legislation, but ultimately the people in the Liberal Party have the ability to exercise their conscience on any issue. This is quite a difficult situation for those opposite. They don't like to have anybody with any freethinking thought on anything. They basically—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left and right!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They need to determine party room policy, or caucus I think they call it, pick up the phone and, ring, ring, 'Oh, hello; it's the STA. What should we be doing about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —shop trading hours today? What should we be doing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —about government policy today?' We don't have that interference in our party room.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Everybody is an individual in the party room and we make our decisions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think this gives us a better position—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to arrive at the policy—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on behalf of every single person in the state, and long may it continue.

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Who is in charge of South Australia: you or the Treasurer?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: that is a frivolous question and doesn't comply with standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: Under what standing order?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: It doesn't comply with the requirements of standing order 97 for the framing of a question. It's frivolous and should be ruled out of order.

The SPEAKER: I'm going to allow the question. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19): We have made quite a virtue of the way that we are running government in South Australia. It's a big difference from the way it has been run previously. We call it cabinet government, where all of cabinet takes responsibility for the performance. We make collective—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —decisions. In fact, I have pointed out on many occasions that cabinet in South Australia meets twice per week. We are trying to do everything we can to make sure that we develop policy and implement that policy in a logical, ordered and considered way. We have eliminated some of the knee-jerk decision-making that may have existed under previous regimes, with government policy rushed in without consideration of other government departments, for instance.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What we do as a government is take collective responsibility.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Ultimately, of course, by virtue—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of the fact that I am the leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party, I'm the Premier of South Australia and the buck stops with me. But I make the point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, this is a new concept for those opposite—that the buck might stop with somebody.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We don't know who the buck stops with over there. We see the Leader of the Opposition's lips moving, but often the messages coming down the line—from the member for West Torrens or the person who wants the job, the member for Lee—are of course up from the dream factory on the second floor, where Kevin Naughton is probably busily now tapping out a question coming down to the front bench. No, sir, in the Liberal Party I take responsibility. The buck stops here. We are focused on delivering a better economy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —more jobs, lower costs for the people of our state.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is building South Australia's workforce?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:21): I certainly can—and a great segue from the Premier about building jobs here in South Australia. I am pleased to report the ABS figures released just last week: 14½ thousand new jobs over the last 12 months and 60 per cent of them are full-time, full-time jobs delivered over the last 12 months. There are now a record 857,600 South Australians working in South Australia—an all-time record. Never before have there been so many South Australians in jobs than we have at the moment, with 8½ thousand working full-time over the last 12 months. That's 552,600 full-time jobs here in South Australia.

There is another very interesting and encouraging statistic from the ABS job figures. If you look at the numbers more broadly throughout the ABS figures, you see 2.7 million additional hours worked in June by South Australian workers in 2019 compared with June 2018. Put on top of that the average hourly rate, it is \$95 million extra paid in wages in South Australia under this government in June 2019 compared with June last year. That's \$95 million extra being spent in the economy because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —more South Australians are working longer hours, more South Australians are doing jobs—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —and more South Australians are earning money. The labour force participation rate is up 0.7 per cent over the last 12 months—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order members on my left!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the highest rate in eight years. It is encouraging to see the trend participation rate increasing to the highest level in those eight years. The portion of employed people who were underemployed was 0.9 per cent lower, the equal lowest level in five years, as existing workers are working more hours and more workers are working full-time.

The ABS data relating to job vacancies shows that there was a whopping 46.3 per cent increase in the number of jobs advertised than there were five years ago and a 9 per cent increase

this year so far. Of course, on business confidence, according to the census South Australia has recorded the highest level of small and medium business confidence over the decade in the March quarter and recorded the highest level of confidence in the nation.

We remain committed to doing more to make the South Australian economy grow. That is why we are delivering the Skilling South Australia program, making sure that South Australians have the skills that industry needs to grow: 20,800 new trainees and apprenticeships over a four-year period. Furthermore, the recent NCVER figures show that the government-funded vocational education and training activity for non-government providers has risen by 5.4 per cent compared with a decline nationally.

This is a stand-out figure and testament to the partnership between the Morrison government and the Marshall government in the Skilling South Australia program. Employers are investing in their staff, investing in their workforce and investing in skills in South Australia to deliver more jobs for South Australians. The positive impact of the government's relationship with industry and Skilling South Australia is paying off.

The SPEAKER: I remind the member for Mawson that he is on two warnings.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Is the only modelling done by Treasury on the land tax aggregation measure contained in the budget papers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): That's a detailed question that I am sure the member for Lee should feel extraordinarily—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —open to asking tomorrow in estimates. I think he has the Treasurer for six, eight or 10 hours—who knows. I'm sure the Treasurer will be able to answer that question tomorrow.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:25): My question is again to the Premier. Why did the Minister for Primary Industries make a public statement yesterday that the government doesn't know what the impact will be of the land tax measure?

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Say that again, sorry.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Why did the Minister for Primary Industries make a public statement yesterday that the government doesn't know what the impact will be of the land tax aggregation measure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): I'm not going to take the member for Lee's interpretation of what was said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —by the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Of course, nobody can know accurately exactly the dollar revenue that will come from these measures. This is why an estimate is provided by Treasury. There is always some movement, as there would be with every single set of books that is created. This is the best estimate the Treasury can provide but, as I have said repeatedly, we are not so arrogant as to not listen to people who have an alternative view.

That's why we are sitting down now with people who are doing separate modelling. If there is a wide variation, we are very happy to listen to that information and the assumptions upon which those forecasts are provided. I make this commitment: if more money is likely to come in from this revenue measure, then we will accelerate the rate reduction because it is in our interest to lower the rates in South Australia to stimulate further economic activity. That is precisely what we will be doing.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe and the Minister for Primary Industries are called to order.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Did the minister think to ask what the impact of the aggregation of land tax would be before supporting it in cabinet?

Members interjecting:

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

The honourable member for Mawson having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27): I have provided a detailed response to the previous question regarding this matter.

The SPEAKER: I remind the house that cabinet operates as a collective and any minister can answer a question.

OYSTER INDUSTRY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is building the aquaculture sector by strengthening biosecurity?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:27): Yes, I can. I thank the member for Flinders for his very important question. He knows probably better than most just how important biosecurity is, particularly within the aquaculture sector. What I can say is that, while I was over in Flinders just recently, we were hosted by Colleen and Jeff Holmes from SA Premium Oysters. We were over there celebrating.

An announcement had just been made on behalf of the oyster industry that \$750,000 had been put to ongoing research funding to develop and further develop POMS-resistant oysters. Sadly, in 2016 we saw a decimation of spat production over in Tasmania that almost wiped out 100 per cent. There was 100 per cent mortality of the spat production in Tasmania that South Australia was so reliant on for our needs here in South Australia. We are now looking at three more years to develop Pacific oysters that are up to 90 per cent resistant to the POMS disease, Pacific oyster mortality syndrome.

That project was jointly funded between the state government and Flinders Ports, Australian Seafood Industries, the South Australian Oyster Growers Association and the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation. The delivery of this project will be a game changer for oysters here in South Australia. It will show the industry that the government has stood behind them to make sure that we develop a POMS-resistant oyster. That has had a significant impact right up and down the eastern seaboard but more recently, as I have said, in Tasmania.

We also need to bring a high level of protection, and that will be done through the SARDI program. It's about generating three more generations of oysters that slowly become more and more resistant. Currently, we have oyster populations that are somewhere in the vicinity of 60 per cent POMS resistant and we aim to bring that, as I said, right up to the 90 per cent number. The industry has been working with government over these issues, particularly spat production. We have also removed the need for two years of the levies and licence fees. That was something that we, as a responsible government, put into our budget.

We have also seen another threat to the industry, and that was the detection of POMS in feral oysters in the Port River only just last year. What we did as a government was we got out the hammers, jackhammers and blowtorches and we dealt with those feral oysters. It showed that the industry and government can work together. We can actually remove the threat of that virus spreading out of the Port River and into our production areas and putting the oyster industry at threat.

What I can say is that the government has recognised the issue with POMS in oysters. We have supported the industry through a very, very lean and tough period. I have been over and met

with a number of oyster producers on the West Coast and Yorke Peninsula. They have done it tough, but they appreciate the work that the government is doing to support them to move forward so that we can have an industry that currently is around \$28 million. We are looking to build that and grow the industry so that we can again have oysters on our dinner plates and we can again be regarded as one of the world's great oyster producers.

PREMIER MARSHALL

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:31): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Minister for Primary Industries make a public statement yesterday that there is pressure on the Premier every day?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:31): I think it goes without saying that there is a lot of pressure in this job. Let me tell you, being the Premier of this state is not a walk in the park.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is we have a lot of work to do to fix up the mess that we inherited from those opposite. As you would appreciate, we are applying ourselves diligently to that task. We have made a start. When we look at the statistics that we now see before us, we are very pleased. There are some very good green shoots. My friend the Minister for Innovation and Skills just a few moments ago talked about some of the very, very good green shoots in terms of employment in South Australia and in terms of skills in South Australia.

The Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure earlier today spoke about the massive build program that is underway in South Australia. These are all complex programs and complex projects, but they are projects that we have the mettle for, that we are up for and that we are going to be delivering for the people of our state.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:32): My question is again to the Premier. Is it true that the land tax aggregation measure was not flagged with your own party room prior to it being announced?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:32): This is a matter which is determined by cabinet. My understanding is that prior to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned. The member for Elizabeth is called to order and warned.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I'm 100 per cent sure that members of the joint party room were informed before the state budget was handed down in this parliament on the Tuesday.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:33): My question is to the Premier. Did your government show arrogance in dropping this on the backbench?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: standing order 97 doesn't allow for argument in questions and that question doesn't measure up.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This is a direct quotation from a media article quoting a Liberal member of the party room. It's not argument: it's a statement of fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If it is a direct quote, arguably—point of order on the point of order—I would have ruled that, if you are quoting something, you should seek leave to introduce facts into the house. It's on the edge. I'm prepared to uphold that point of order. I will give the member for Lee an opportunity to rephrase the question and then I will move to the member for Davenport after that. Member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Has the Premier and his cabinet treated his party room arrogantly?

The SPEAKER: That question is in order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34): No.

SOUTH ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall government is building South Australia and delivering its commitment to fix the Candy Road, Lander Road and Main South Road intersection?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:34): Mr Speaker, if you head a little bit—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: If you head south—a little bit further south than the Darlington interchange and Flinders Link projects—you will head down to an intersection: South Road, Lander Road and Candy Road. It's an intersection that was shut off from through traffic decades ago, as South Road at that time was the major thoroughfare for traffic heading up and down South Road.

Since the advent of the Southern Expressway, this section of South Road has seen a significant reduction in traffic; in fact, we have seen the halving of traffic on that section of road, down to somewhere just north of 20,000 vehicles a day. What we know is there's a significant issue in and around some of the backstreets, especially on the Candy Road side, with, essentially, rat running occurring through backstreets in that area as people, not being able to use this intersection, attempt to get around South Road.

At the election, we took a commitment to the people of South Australia, on behalf of the member for Davenport (then candidate for Davenport) but also the member for Black, to fix this intersection to essentially open this part of the southern suburbs to people getting both sides of South Road. We are delivering on that commitment: \$5.2 million that was there in the 2018-19 budget to get on and deliver this project.

I had the good fortune last Friday to go with the member for Davenport and inspect the intersection and essentially see firsthand what's going to be undertaken there. Essentially, we are returning this intersection to what it would have been decades ago. Now that the traffic has moved over to the Southern Expressway, we can bring it back to what its original intention was: the opportunity to give relief to local residents who see undue amounts of traffic go through their backstreets. People who are seeking to otherwise find alternative ways to get around this intersection will now be able to use this intersection and leave those poor residents alone.

Later this year, we will see the first service relocation work start. There's one electricity pole on the southern side of the intersection that will need to be relocated, and then the works will begin in earnest next year and be completed over the course of next year. This project is being completed internally by field services. We had the good fortune to meet the people on site who are actually going to be project managing and looking after this intersection.

Certainly, I think the opportunity for those people who live on both sides of that road to actually be reconnected with each other after decades of being separated by this closed intersection is extremely important, as is the opportunity to be able to connect residents with local services.

Essentially, if you happen to be on one side of South Road and want to get to services on the other side, it is an extremely difficult task.

This is just another example of us investing in reducing traffic congestion in the southern suburbs. Whether that be the Flinders Link project, whether that be getting on and completing the Darlington interchange, or whether that be upgrading the Candy Road and Lander Road intersection, we have committed to delivering for the people of the southern suburbs, especially in the member for Davenport's electorate. This forms part of a \$12 billion plan that we have to upgrade infrastructure right across our state.

Can I say that this is delivering on a commitment as a result of great advocacy by the member for Davenport. He has been a staunch proponent of this project, and I am very excited that we are now getting on and delivering on yet another election commitment that we made to the people of South Australia.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house how many landowners living in the electorate of Hartley will be impacted by the changes to land tax aggregation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:39): Sir, it would not surprise you to know that I do not have that information with me. If that information is available, then I'm happy to come back to the house with an answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is called to order. Member for Lee, and then I will switch to the member for Mount Gambier.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:39): A supplementary: has Treasury included that analysis in the modelling that it has done?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:39): I refer the honourable member to my previous answer. Estimates is tomorrow; that's a perfect opportunity for the member for Lee—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to ask detailed questions, of which I'm sure he wouldn't expect that we have that detail in this house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —at our disposal during question time, but it is something which could be directed to the Treasurer; he may have that information to provide for you.

Dr Close interjecting:

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

ROAD NETWORK

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister confirm to the house that his department is actively considering

combining or aggregating the Joy Baluch Bridge, the duplication of Port Wakefield Road and the overpass of the Copper Coast and Augusta highways into one contract?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:40): I will have to take the detail of that question on notice, except to say that we have looked at various options for how we procure that project. It is fair to say that the principles we want to abide by are ones that, first, deliver good value for taxpayers. We want to make sure that we stretch this dollar further, and with the \$200 million we have on the table for Joy Baluch and the \$90 million we have on the table for the Port Wakefield duplication and overpass we want to make sure we get the most bang for buck out of those two projects.

The second thing I will say is that we are very keen to get these projects out into the marketplace as soon as possible. We know there are a number of projects coming up for completion towards the end of this year, the Northern Connector being chief amongst those, and we saw the Torrens to Torrens project complete, and we are really keen to make sure we deliver a smooth pipeline of work for industry to be able to deliver.

We have awarded to MMA, essentially McConnell Dowell together with Bardavcol and a number of other professional services, a contract under an alliance tendering model—one, if you talk to McConnell Dowell and Bardavcol, they would say is a fantastic way to be able to deliver a project. We awarded that a couple of weeks ago. The land acquisition and demolition have been underway for some time, and we will see that project kick off in earnest at the end of the year. We really want to make sure that in the first few months of next year both these projects are getting into that early works package stage because we know it is important to maintain that consistent pipeline of work.

The other thing I will say is that there is an opportunity here to make sure we are delivering as much local content as possible. We have an existing industry participation policy that we abide by; in fact, it is something the department is extremely enthusiastic about. It is something that, since we have come to government, we have amended to put greater focus on traineeships and apprenticeships, which we know is extremely important. The opportunity to grow our skills base using government work is also extremely important, and is why we made the decision for projects over, I think, \$50 million, off the top of my head, to include greater opportunities for trainees and apprenticeships.

The other part of this that has been in our thinking is very much about how we deliver a procurement model that is as open and transparent as possible and that delivers best value overall. For instance, the former government used an alliance model to deliver the Oaklands crossing, and we are using an alliance model here to deliver the Regency Road to Pym Street section of the north-south corridor.

In relation to Joy Baluch and Port Wakefield, we are very keen to make sure that we deliver on good outcomes and make sure that all of that is balanced, whether that be skills development, whether that be value for taxpayers, whether that be getting this work out into the industry in a quick time frame so that we can deliver that consistent pipeline. Those are all factors that weigh on our decision.

ROAD NETWORK

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:43): A supplementary: does the minister agree that aggregation or bundling of large contracts has a negative impact and effect on small and medium-sized businesses in South Australia?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:43): No; in fact, there is a range of different—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —procurement models that we undertake for a range of different projects. In relation to the opportunity, for instance, to be able to mandate lower tier work, I will talk about the road maintenance reform we are currently undergoing. Having discussed that with a number of contractors in your electorate, the opportunity to use different contracting models to make

sure that tier 2 and tier 3 companies have the opportunity to bid in and get work is very much at the heart of what we want to achieve. Certainly, we are able to achieve that through a variety of different procurement models.

What I can say is that in making sure that there are opportunities through the capital projects that we have on the go to the road maintenance work that we have on the go, we are very much alive to making sure that there is work for companies all up and down that size chain. I suppose the other difficulty we have is that, especially for a number of these tier 2 contractors, they currently have degrees of restrictions about the size of projects they can deliver and also the complexity and types of projects they are able to deliver, so it is important for us to try to skill up local industry to be able to deliver projects. Again, that is something that also factors into our thinking.

I know that something we did talk about previously, before the election, was the fact that at times we felt work was being pushed together to the detriment of local contractors. Can I say that, since coming to government, we have worked assiduously to break that down and to make sure that there is opportunity through the entire chain. I am comfortable that we are heading in the right direction on that, and we will continue to make further progress as we roll out projects into the future.

EMERGENCY SERVICES EQUIPMENT

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house of how the Marshall government is equipping and supporting our front-line emergency services workers in the MFS and the SES?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:46): I thank the member for the question and note his interest in our emergency services and the great work that they do. It was with great pleasure that recently I joined the Premier; the SAFECOM chief executive, Dom Lane; the MFS chief officer, Michael Morgan; and the chief of the SES, Mr Chris Beattie to announce some of our budget commitments from the most recent budget, where we of course have supported the Metropolitan Fire Service, the SES and continued our support to the CFS as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What we know is that our MFS firefighters will, into the future, have some of the best kit, the most technologically advanced kit that the MFS have ever seen. We have put in \$4.3 million over four years to purchase 1,100 state-of-the-art helmets and 500 new breathing apparatus units. I was staggered to learn that the MFS helmets were a 20-year-old design. That is what they were carrying out. They were going out there doing incredibly dangerous work and the designs of the helmets are some 20 years old. Now they will have the latest high-tech protective equipment and that is absolutely fantastic.

Having these helmets, too, will give them advances in options into the future. They now carry around on their helmets radio gear that is actually attached to their collars. They will be able to, in the future, look at options of having earpieces through the helmets. This is wonderful new technology. Along with that are four new turnkey trucks: \$3.15 million worth of investment is there for four new turnkey trucks as part of the MFS capital works, so that is very exciting.

The SES also received a big boost in the state budget, with \$1 million going towards revitalising their facilities and upgrading their vital equipment as well. That takes their yearly capital funding program to \$4.5 million over the next few years, which is great to allow that renewal of our SES services across our state. It is a great way to thank our volunteers. They do an absolutely outstanding job out in our community. Whatever time of day or whatever time of night, rain or hail or sunshine, they are out there supporting our local communities. Increasing the facilities and equipment around where they do their volunteering—their work is so greatly appreciated—is one way to thank them for that.

This of course comes on the back of a \$670,000 commitment in last year's budget for the Humanihuts, another great capability of the SES. The Humanihuts are a 128-person accommodation, with shower facilities, that provides shelter and meets the SES operational requirements during an

emergency. They can be set up anywhere they are needed around the state to provide accommodation for people who are perhaps working on fires or working on any disaster areas, with air conditioning and all that they need. The Humanihuts are, again, another great commitment to follow through, with \$670,000 for that.

With the CFS as well, we know how successful Project Renew has been. The \$5 million project has delivered 129 projects throughout South Australia, so that is fantastic. Whether it be removing old asbestos from some of these buildings, it really is wonderful. When we look back over the 2018-19 fire danger season, more than 500,000 hours are from CFS volunteers who have donated into our community to help their communities at a time of need. That is a phenomenal figure, 500,000 hours, so we thank each and every one of those volunteers who did that fantastic work.

It is a pleasure to be part of the Marshall Liberal government that is keen and focused on building our state—not only building it from an infrastructure point of view and a security point of view but also from an emergency services point of view. We thank all the volunteers for the great work they do and we look forward to supporting them into the future.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier rule out scrapping his land tax aggregation measure, announced in last month's state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): Yes, absolutely. We are 100 per cent up for reform in this area. What this will deliver is a lower rate of land tax receipts for the government. That means a lower impost upon businesses and individuals in South Australia. We are committed to lower land tax, as we have been committed to lower payroll tax and other taxes in South Australia. That's what we are pursuing in the reforms that we will bring to the parliament later this year so that they can be put through the parliament and in place to offer lower land tax as of 1 July next year.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:50): Which industry groups, other than the Property Council, has the Premier met with regarding land tax aggregation since he has been back from leave?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): I have only been back yesterday and today, but yesterday I met with the Property Council and also Business SA, and today I am meeting with the UDIA. My door is open to speak to people about this issue. It's a very important reform.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's not one that we are rushing. I note that what was done under the previous regime was to announce one day and implement the next day. What we are doing is implementing this reform on 1 July next year so there is actually plenty of time to sit down in a respectful way to listen to what people have to say, to take those things on board and to—

Mr Malinauskas: You've got 12 months to change his mind.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. As I was saying, we are committed to this reform. It's a reform that will actually deliver lower land tax in South Australia. It's an important reform. It will be introduced into the parliament before the end of this year so that it can be in place to deliver lower land tax for this state as of 1 July next year.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:52): My question is again to the Premier. Has the government received any advice from Treasury that the land tax aggregation measures could raise more than the \$40 million per year set out in the budget papers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:52): I am not aware of that. Again, this could be something that you could ask the Treasurer tomorrow. But I make this point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —because several people have made comments, via the media and directly to us, that they think that this will actually bring in a much larger revenue to state coffers than what is contained within the state budget. If this is the case, we commit here, in this parliament today, that we will accelerate the rate reduction.

The top rate in South Australia is way too high: 3.7 is completely uncompetitive. That's a fact. That was a situation that was presided over by the previous government, and I note that they didn't have the wherewithal to actually tackle this issue; they wanted to sweep it under the carpet. We do not want to do that. We want to deal with these two issues simultaneously—the aggregation issue, but also bringing down that top marginal rate. We have already included two separate rate reduction measures in the budget—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that was handed down just a few weeks ago. For those landowners who have a value of up to \$5 million, on 1 July next year they will see that top marginal rate component go from 3.7 down to 2.9. There is a graduating reduction for those with a land value above \$5 million, which starts on 1 July and takes place over a seven-year period. I would like to accelerate that. I have made no qualms about that issue; I would like to see that happen faster. If we can provide some assurance that there is going to be an increase over and above the \$40 million that is envisaged and forecast within the state budget, then that's exactly and precisely what we will do.

The budget contains two key measures as of 1 July next year—one is a revenue increase of \$40 million, and that is offset with a reduction in land tax receipts of \$49.7 million. I don't know whether those opposite can do the arithmetic, but that shows, even in its first year, almost a \$10 million reduction in the total land tax take, and that increases every year thereafter. All this information is provided within the budget. I am happy to point people towards the pages if they need some help.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE PLAINS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister please update the house on the recent launch of the Northern Adelaide Plains website?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:55): Yes, I can, and I thank the member for King for her important question. I know that she is a very, very strong advocate for the Northern Adelaide Plains food bowl, but just as importantly her advocacy out at the Virginia Hort Centre has not gone unnoticed. The times that I have been out there, she has been out there as a strong advocate looking for ways that she can further advance what the Northern Adelaide Plains food bowl presents.

We know that the Northern Adelaide Plains Irrigation Scheme is almost up and running, and it presents itself a huge opportunity. Recently, I was joined by the member for King out there to make a fantastic announcement, and it was the launch of a new website for the Northern Adelaide Plains food producers. What it does is give them the opportunity to express and display what their businesses mean not only to the markets domestically but also as aspirational exporters.

I know that the member for King has been out there, and she is looking after her constituency, the food producers within King. What I can say is that she is now working with them to implement a drumMUSTER program—I think it is an outstanding exercise—working with CropLife Australia and working with my department. It is about looking at ways that we can implement the Clean Your Farm program.

It is a program that was implemented with the concern that, if those growers want to be part of export markets, they have to treat biosecurity with an absolute priority, and that is about cleaning up around their glasshouses, their polyhouses and on their farms. I commend her for the work that she is doing there. Really, we wanted to talk about the website that was launched out at the Virginia Hort Centre late last month, which showed that the food region is producing almost 200,000 tonnes of food at a value of about \$300 million farmgate value.

In the last 15 months, this Marshall Liberal government has been working with the industry sectors and organisations on the Northern Adelaide Plains with the Food Cluster to understand how we can generate a more transparent model and give them the ability to put their story out there on a website, and they have done that.

The website is outstanding. It has been developed with those food producers. It has been developed with the Northern Adelaide Plains hort group. It has been, I guess, widely consulted on not only with AUSVEG and the Horticulture Coalition but also in collaboration with the Stretton Centre. I know that the member for King has worked extremely closely with that Stretton Centre to develop this website. I know that Barry Lloyd, a local greenhouse vegetable producer, is the inaugural chair, and the Stretton Centre's Tom Madigan is the acting cluster manager.

What I might say is that this is an opportunity that South Australia can hang its credentials on—biosecurity, food production and safe, clean, green food into an opening up export market, and those opportunities are aplenty. The Northern Adelaide Plains is now, as I said, looking at opening up the opportunities to double the value of their food and double the production of what they are growing out there with the opening up of the Northern Adelaide Plains Irrigation Scheme.

The funding that was provided to the Clean Your Farm campaign will be delivered with AUSVEG, as well as making sure that all the participants are engaged, making sure that we have a presentable food-producing farming sector, making sure that the Clean Your Farm overlays with the Northern Adelaide Plains website and making sure that we as food producers here in South Australia are proud and demonstrate that biosecurity is a priority.

BAKEWELL, JONATHAN

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Why hasn't the Premier responded to correspondence from Eileen Culleton, whose sister Anne-Marie Culleton was raped and murdered by Jonathan Bakewell?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:59): I thank the member for his question. I will take a look into that issue and come back to the house with a response.

BAKEWELL, JONATHAN

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that Eileen Culleton, whose sister Anne-Marie Culleton was raped and murdered by Jonathan Bakewell, opposes the release on parole of Jonathan Bakewell?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): As I said, before I answer questions on this I would just like to apprise myself of the details of the letter. I am happy to come back and answer those questions.

BAKEWELL, JONATHAN

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that rapist and murderer Jonathan Bakewell breached his parole as a result of drug use and that Jonathan Bakewell was taking drugs when he raped and murdered Anne-Marie Culleton?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): I just refer the honourable member to my previous answer.

PERIODS, PAIN AND ENDOMETRIOSIS PROGRAM

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the endometriosis education program that's being run in schools?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:00): I am really pleased to get this important question from the member for Heysen and to have the opportunity to talk about the condition of endometriosis and the opportunity that we are providing the foundation, the Pelvic Pain Foundation of Australia, to work with our schools and particularly to work with young women and girls, giving them information that is going to be, hopefully, transformative in many of their lives.

Endometriosis, as many members but not necessarily all members would be aware, is a chronic menstrual health disorder that affects around 700,000 Australian women and girls. It often causes debilitating pain and organ damage. It can lead to mental health issues. It can lead to social and economic stress. It can lead to infertility.

I think for many people in the house and throughout South Australia who know women who suffer from endometriosis one of the common things that we hear is a wish that if only they had understood their condition earlier, if only they had received an earlier diagnosis, some treatment earlier in their lives, then untold pain and potential loss and potential grief from many lost pregnancies and other difficulties they have experienced in life might have been abated. But, unfortunately, there are many people in our community who suffer from this condition without knowing it or only having being diagnosed quite further on in life.

To that end, to ensure that there are opportunities for more young women and girls to learn about their bodies and understand what is happening, the state and federal governments have provided funding to the Pelvic Pain Foundation of Australia to run their Periods, Pain and Endometriosis Program, or PPEP talks, in high schools across South Australia. So far, since the program started, the educators have spoken with 800 students across 10 weeks.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: So far, since the program—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned for a second and final time. The member for Reynell is also warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: So far, since the program began, 800 students in 10 weeks have been spoken to by the trainers. In 100 per cent of the schools that they have been at the schools have invited the group back, have asked them to come back and speak to them again in the future. It's available to run in all the schooling sectors. It's being delivered to 80 schools as part of this program in Adelaide and the regional centres of Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta and Port Pirie. There was a pilot in 2017 in 10 schools. This is a substantial expansion, with support from the education department—\$70,000 that I signed off on not that long ago—support from the health department and support from the federal government as well.

The program is supported by medical specialists to make sure that students receive accurate and relevant information and that qualified educators have the support they need. Qualified teachers deliver the program, which is linked to the South Australian high school curriculum, educating teens in years 9 and 10 regarding normal menstrual symptoms, how to recognise when symptoms are abnormal, which symptoms are suggestive of endometriosis and where to obtain assistance should their menstrual symptoms be distressing.

I am very pleased to advise that this week educators from our South Australian program are in Queensland to do a pilot in some schools there, as they are interested in the program as well. It's attracting attention around South Australia and Australia. I was pleased to speak with David Knuckey from SAASSO a couple of weeks ago, who was absolutely thrilled to hear about this program and the impact it will have and the support it will give families across our schools. Through this early

diagnosis and intervention, we are working to help women and girls live lives to their full potential. I thank all involved in the program for the work that they are doing.

FOSTER CARERS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How many foster carers were recruited in 2018-19, above attrition, who are available to care for a child?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:05): I welcome the question. As this house would be well aware, recruiting foster carers has been one of my main goals that I have been working on for the past year. We know that for several years under the Labor government they made announcements of even up to \$9 million to recruit foster carers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —and in fact they lost more foster carers—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As I was saying, the former Labor government announced up to \$9 million in funding to recruit more foster carers yet actually lost more foster carers for many years, so it's a wonderful turnaround over the last couple of years to actually have more coming in than going out. I am very pleased to announce that we did make—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —my goal of 50 net increase in foster carers. I thank all the foster carers and all the kinship carers for their wonderful work that they do in caring for our most vulnerable children. I have recently, during the school holidays, been to Mount Gambier and to Whyalla to meet with foster carers and hear their stories face to face and get their ideas of how we can improve the system.

As I said earlier, more foster carers were leaving the system under Labor than were coming in, so it was important to identify what were the reasons. We know that many of those reasons were lack of information, no blue books and no immunisation records. There were lots of issues: a lack of respect, a lack of information. A lot of issues have been able to be resolved through the new legislation enacted in October last year, which made a great deal of help.

Any removals that foster carers object to can be taken to SACAT now after an internal review. There's more information. The information-sharing guidelines have been updated. There is a lot more that is being done and there is certainly a lot more that will be done. I meet with foster carers for that reason: to hear what more we can do and what we can do better.

Recently, Connecting Foster and Kinship Carers actually did an exit survey for any foster or kinship carers leaving the system to find out their reasons why. We got some valuable feedback from them where we were able to see that some of them left for natural reasons, like a child ageing out of care and moving on or a change of circumstances in their own family life that meant that they could no longer foster, but many of them would consider coming back later on. My goal is to meet with previous foster carers who left under Labor to see if there are any circumstances under which they might come back now that we are changing and improving our system.

Even if it's as an emergency carer or respite carer, we really need people to think about foster caring. Our new website launched (<https://fostercare.sa.gov.au/>) only a couple of weeks ago and 13002FOSTER is the direct line where you will find out more information about fostering. I would call on anyone who is interested to call that number because we need more loving families for our children.

*Grievance Debate***ARTS SECTOR**

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:08): The arts sector in South Australia still hangs in a state of limbo 14 months after Steven Marshall came to power promising the world to arts.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the member for Badcoe should be aware that it is disorderly to refer to a member of this house by their name. It is, in fact, appropriate to refer to their electorate to prevent quarrels.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and prevent quarrels I will. The member for Badcoe has the call.

Ms STINSON: As I said, the arts sector in South Australia still hangs in a state of limbo 14 months after the Premier and arts minister came to power, promising the world to arts. Little more has been seen from him than a velvet smoking jacket and a glass of champagne while he peers over clear-rimmed glasses. It is great to see the Premier when he comes to the occasional festival opening or exhibition launch, but his speeches—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: I think it is utterly disorderly to refer to someone's clear-rimmed glasses in a negative sense, especially when talking about the arts sector.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education can leave for half an hour for a bogus point of order.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite can leave for half an hour.

The honourable member for Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:

Ms STINSON: He is jealous that no-one is talking about his lovely glasses, but I am sure that we are all very happy with his lovely glasses as well. They are lovely. It is great to see the Premier when he comes to the occasional festival opening or exhibition launch, but his speeches are starting to sound fairly hollow and much the same as the last one. That is because there is precious little being done in the arts.

There was a fairly detailed plan for the arts among the Liberals' election promises—about as detailed as it gets. Chief among the promises was an arts plan. It was billed as the state's first strategy in 20 years, but it might just take 20 years before we see it. For 14 months now, the sector has been told to hold on and wait for the arts plan and that all will be harmonious once there is an arts plan. The consultants' report was delivered a month ago. Most people in the sector were led to believe that it would be released publicly straightaway.

There are high hopes that there will be funding associated with the plan, particularly to make up for the severe cuts that have been imposed by this government on the arts sector in not one but now two budgets. When the Premier took the arts portfolio, there were expectations that the arts would receive special attention, and they have, but not the kind of attention that anyone wants. Last year, cuts of almost \$32 million were announced, sweeping across the sector. In this year's budget, those cuts go even deeper.

This time, children's arts organisations are among those in the firing line, with \$1.9 million being stripped from the Windmill Theatre Co., Carclew youth arts and the History Trust of South Australia, which operates the Maritime Museum, the Migration Museum and the National Motor Museum. Last year, when these organisations had it sprung on them that they were being ripped out of Arts SA and shipped over to Education, they were assured that this move would protect them from the broader cuts to the arts sector. Clearly, that was not true.

We do not know yet how those cuts will be reflected, but job cuts, cutting shows, limiting touring and cutting back on education and community engagement are on the table for the three organisations. Once again, you just cannot trust the Premier. The targeting of these cuts really defies belief and the Liberals' own stated objectives. We hear from them that they want to push international

trade to take South Australia to the world and bring the world to us, yet arguably one of our most successful arts exports, the Windmill Theatre Co., is among those to have its funding cut back.

Right now, the Windmill team are getting ready to open their incredibly successful show *Baba Yaga* in mainland China. Next, it heads to Taiwan. After that, it will head to Kristiansand and coincide with a major children's arts summit in Norway, and then it is off to Ireland and the UK. They are also launching their show *Beep* in Perth later this year. If that is not taking it to the world, I do not know what is. Windmill is a shining light in the arts sector, and it does not deserve to have its light dimmed by these budget cuts.

It is little wonder that this theatre company is prized in our national arts scene. It was a joy to see the company's name in lights at the recent Helpmann Awards in Melbourne, nominated for Best Presentation for Children and Young People. Windmill was there along with scores of other South Australia-based creatives who were acclaimed for their innovative and electrifying work this year. South Australia really does punch above its weight.

But even interstate at the Helpmann Awards, people were asking, 'Where is this arts plan?' I was asked by expat South Aussies and east coast arts leaders, 'Where is this plan? Is this all a bit of spin and PR? Will it actually achieve anything?' and the big one, 'Will there be any money with it?' Of course, it is very strange to slash an arts budget not once but twice before you have even come up with a strategy for the arts. Please, Mr Premier, instead of just rocking up to the occasional opening night, come with something to say.

Time expired.

GALLERY 1855

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:14): In late June, I had the pleasure of attending the launch of the *Iriti munu Kuwari. Now and Then. Artworks from the Kaltjiti Arts, SA* exhibition held by the City of Tea Tree Gully at the beautiful Gallery 1855. This was a wonderful display, curated by John Ferguson, that showcased contemporary Pitjantjatjara paintings, alongside traditional and adapted crafts that were created by the Kaltjiti artists during the mid 1980s. Many of the pieces in the exhibition were from John's own private collection that had been put together from travelling thousands of kilometres up through the APY Lands in Central Australia.

It was certainly a beautiful exhibition that showcased wonderful works unique to a special part of our state and indeed our nation. The launch itself was a fantastic event, with visual artist Damien Shen as guest speaker and with Jack Buckskin's always thought-provoking, informative and thoroughly entertaining Welcome to Country. It was also great to see the Mayor of the City of Tea Tree Gully, Kevin Knight, there in support of this wonderful exhibition and indeed Gallery 1855 more broadly. I would also like to commend Niki, who works for the Tea Tree Gully council, for all her work in facilitating this important exhibition.

This important exhibition, as I mentioned earlier, was held in the beautiful Gallery 1855, which is at 2 Haines Road in Tea Tree Gully. This building was, in fact, originally built to house the district council of Highercombe council chambers, the first purpose-built council chambers in South Australia. In 2010, the state heritage-listed building was converted into Gallery 1855, an arts and culture centre, including a studio workshop area and also some gallery space.

I want to commend the Tea Tree Gully council for what they have achieved. Gallery 1855 hosts numerous exhibitions and workshops that are often connected with the displays in the gallery. These have included, for example, a ceramics display with a workshop run at the same time for people interested in learning more about ceramics. These low-cost workshops are targeted at people of all ages and recently have included a workshop for children on drawing animal people, run by Adelaide Hills illustrator Zinia King, which was highly successful.

From speaking to many of the artists and volunteers involved with the gallery, it is clear that Gallery 1855 is highly valued by the arts community and the community more broadly. Artists come from across the state to display their work and likewise people come from across the state and beyond to enjoy the gallery, not to mention school groups and other community groups that visit the gallery.

Aside from it being a beautiful building, the gallery is also unique in terms of the size of the exhibition space and the layout, making it ideal for many exhibitions that in some cases, I have been informed, really do not have an equivalent elsewhere in Adelaide. Artists and volunteers involved with Gallery 1855 have also shared with me their stories about the important social benefits of the gallery in providing people with the opportunity to connect with others through shared interests. In a time when social isolation is increasingly problematic, any opportunities within our community to connect people with others should be treasured.

Given the significance and importance of the gallery to the local community, it is somewhat concerning that a number of local councillors seem to want to convert the gallery into a coffee shop. A number of ideas have been circulating about how this might happen, for example, by relocating the entire gallery (workshops and the gallery), which appeared to be an initial thought bubble and now appears to be more of a push to simply put a business into the studio portion of the gallery and relocate the workshops.

There is quite understandably a great deal of concern from the local community about this proposal. There is concern about what this would mean for the workshops by separating them from the exhibitions, the flow-on effect that would have on the community, and the impact that altering the gallery would have on whether artists would continue to show their work in this place.

Gallery 1855 is certainly a very important part of the broader Tea Tree Gully township precinct, which includes facilities like the heritage museum, local restaurants, Pine Park, the hotels, Anstey Hill and a number of other heritage sites. While it is important to support well considered plans to facilitate economic activity within a local community, it is concerning that what might be traded away would be far greater than what may be gained.

I urge Tea Tree Gully councillors to consider carefully what is being proposed and ensure they understand how unique the offering is at the gallery, which the council should actually be very proud of, before making any decision to split up or relocate the current activities at that site.

RAMSAY ELECTORATE

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:19): I rise today as the member for the Ramsay electorate, spanning the suburbs of Salisbury, Salisbury Downs, Salisbury North, Salisbury Plain and Paralowie. I have been very honoured to represent this area since 2012 and, while there is much to celebrate in this great community, there are also challenges that face my constituents.

A key concern that is regularly raised is the rising cost of living. The budget that was presented just a month ago is no exception. The Marshall Liberal government is hitting South Australians in the hip pocket, with massive tax hikes way above the inflation rate. They were promised lower costs, and now that promise is broken. These tax grabs are particularly painful for those in our community who are struggling with unemployment or surviving on low incomes.

Almost 30 per cent of the households in Ramsay live on less than \$650 per week before tax. The reason I am raising these figures is that I want this government to understand that their tax increases hit the Ramsay electorate hard. Every time they drive their car, catch public transport, go to hospital or even put out their wheelie bin, the government is taxing them more and more money. Every time costs rise for the people of Ramsay, they have to make choices—choices that members of this government just cannot comprehend.

The sacrifice is not turning down another investment property or not having an overseas trip; it means not having the occasional day out with the family, such as going to Cleland Wildlife Park, which, as we know, also had a 25 per cent hike in entry fees. The budget is narrow minded and does not support the people in my electorate. We have heard conflicting messages from this government: they are promising lower costs, yet that is not what is being delivered, and it is not what is being seen by the constituents of Ramsay.

Driving a car is more expensive, with hikes to motor registration (up 5 per cent) and driver's licence renewals (up 4½ per cent). The conflicting messages continue with these huge increases. It seems that they want fewer cars on our roads; however, they are making it harder for people to catch public transport. They are cutting bus routes, privatising our network and yet again increasing fees. Catching public transport is more expensive, with hikes to fares up 2 per cent and the axing of the

two-section card costing some commuters \$849 more a year. Gone are free Metrocards: they now cost \$5 each.

The real kicker of this budget came in the final hour. The Ramsay electorate is situated in the City of Salisbury council area. The council had been preparing their 2019-20 budget for several months, working hard to keep all existing services, reduce debt and introduce new projects to help the community. They sent their draft annual budget out for public consultation based on a 2½ per cent average increase. These plans have hit an unfortunate hurdle, as it was announced in the state budget that councils and ratepayers will be hit with a significant and surprising increase to the solid waste levy.

While they were out consulting with the people of the City of Salisbury, there was this surprise. On 1 July, the levy rose from \$100 to \$110 a tonne in metropolitan areas and is set to rise to \$140 on 1 January 2020. This is a whopping 40 per cent increase. The result is a \$770,000 increase in costs for the City of Salisbury. That will mean more than \$5 million over the next four years. That was announced less than a week prior to the council approving their budget. They had no choice but to adopt an increase of 2.9 per cent, absorbing half that levy increase and imposing the other half on ratepayers.

You keep punishing the people. You promise lower costs but every which way it goes—public transport, council rates—you are punishing the people of South Australia.

AUSTRALIAN CALISTHENICS FEDERATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24): As national patron, I was honoured to attend several days of the Australian Calisthenics Federation competitions, this year held in Perth at an amazing venue, the Kingsway Christian College auditorium. This theatre is way beyond anything I have seen in this state and, as the owners of the Royalty Theatre, the Calisthenic Association of South Australia can only wonder why there is so little support for the infrastructure of the home of our wonderful sport in this state, especially when you consider the Royalty Theatre's importance in the arts community as a medium-sized theatre—but that, of course, is another story.

Congratulations and thanks go to the amazing ACF president, Liz Kratzel, the amazing director of competitions, Anita Roser, the equally amazing ACF committee of management and council delegates for all their work on behalf of our sport. Also, congratulations must go to the Calisthenics Association of Western Australia, their president, Sandra Gosling, national conveners Lisa Ruecroft and Faye Walmsley, the national committee and stage manager, Christine Polglaze, and a huge number of organisers and volunteers—too many to mention—who made the smooth-running event so special and memorable for all.

These were our first nationals without Joy Smith, a national icon of calisthenics. Joy suddenly passed away on 14 February this year surrounded by her loving family, and we thank them for sharing her with us for all the years they did. Whilst her home state was Victoria and it was her first love in calisthenics, Joy was definitely committed to supporting all states and gave freely of her time to help them in areas of need. She truly loved the ACF national competitions and was a strong support at each and every Pan Pacific Masters games. Her physical presence at these events will be strongly missed, but she will always be in our hearts and there in spirit.

This year's adjudicators—Karen Hicks from South Australia, Gaye Parker from Western Australia, Michelle Urquhart from Victoria, and Kerryn Waddell, also from Victoria—had an enjoyable but unenviable task, ably assisted by their writers, over the subjunior, junior, intermediate and senior competitions, with reps from the following states and territories.

The ACT sent 20 competitors in one team, South Australia sent 90 competitors in four teams, Victoria sent 94 competitors in four teams and Western Australia sent 102 competitors in four teams. All states—except Tasmania, where calisthenics is yet to gain a toehold—including New South Wales, were represented in individual, duo and graceful competitions. Queensland and the Northern Territory will be attending the Northern Territory nationals, which will be next year.

The teams that competed are supported by coaches, team managers and chaperones, not to mention family and friends who travel to support their talented and creative competitors throughout the country. We must acknowledge the costume creators and wardrobe managers—the major task

in calisthenics—and we also have a large contingent of calisthenics men, who take responsibility for the props that so enhance each item. These props travel from home states by truck and appear on stage magically as required. Calisthenics is a well-regulated and managed sport, and its organisational skills are without peer and on a par with the Olympics, if you sit back and have a look. They are an amazing group of people.

I am proud to report that the standard of competition was very high, and the artistry and skill of coaches and competitors in choreography was truly amazing, and excels year after year. Time today will only allow me a summary of results, and I refer those interested to the ACF website for a full breakdown of results. Teams from South Australia placed second in subbies, first in juniors and inters and third in seniors. Victoria was first in subbies, second in inters and seniors and third in juniors. Western Australia was third in subbies and inters, second in juniors and won seniors. The ACT was placed fourth in the intermediate section.

Many service awards were made to individuals, many from families with a lifetime commitment to calisthenics. Many of the 24 life members travelled from around Australia to witness the competitions, and I particularly want to mention SA expats—now ACT residents and representatives—Rex and Merryl Packer, and thank them for their many kindnesses over the years.

I would also like to mention the newest life member, South Australia's Carolyn Fortune, whose citation it was my pleasure to read to the audience present in the auditorium and watching via live streaming. Carolyn began at the age of four and competed in calisthenics until she was 36. She has coached for 40 years and is now a respected administrator of our sport.

Calisthenics here in South Australia remains one of the largest mass participation sports for girls. I am sad to say, men and boys do not compete in calisthenics anymore, but calisthenics originally came into being to keep men's wrists supple, which might be something they want to think about later on.

It is also a great sadness to me that not many Indigenous girls compete in calisthenics and that is something we will look at. I understand that cost is a barrier, but I really look forward to reporting to the house great steps forward in that capacity. I recommend that all of you take an interest in your local calisthenics clubs. Each of those girls has large family groups supporting them.

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

A quorum having been formed:

YOUTH PARLIAMENT

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:31): Today, I will speak about Youth Parliament, which was held in this place last week. The South Australian Youth Parliament is coordinated by the YMCA and held annually in every state and territory across Australia. The South Australian Youth Parliament is a non-partisan program which enables young South Australians aged 15 to 25 to have their say on important issues, and build their skills and parliamentary understanding.

Some of the program's alumni—and there would be many I am not aware of—include the Playford mayor, Glenn Docherty, and former federal member for Adelaide Kate Ellis, who both participated in Youth Parliament. Who knows which of our future leaders will come through this great program. It was a privilege to be in the Legislative Council chamber for the opening of Youth Parliament and in this chamber for the closing. As well as this, I paid attention to many of the debates that were going on during the week, particularly attending the debate in the House of Assembly on the youth parliamentary drug safety management bill 2019.

I was more than impressed with the level of knowledge, insight and compassion that young people had when debating this bill in particular. No matter which side of the debate these young people took, the arguments were second to none; perhaps many of us in this place could learn a thing or two about evidence-based arguments in this space, particularly when addressing health and social impact harm minimisation strategies. I am pleased to report to this house that that bill passed by quite a large majority.

The young people meet over a number of months to develop their ideas and their arguments, which they would like to predicate within the process of Youth Parliament. They form committees not

dissimilar to what we have here, and also develop their bills that will be debated during their sitting week. This year, in addition to the drug management bill, the young people debated a free data bill, sexual health education bills and national parks bills, as well as several motions including an Office for Women motion calling for equal pay for all South Australians. It was quite a progressive agenda.

The young people are led by a team of frontbenchers and the Youth Governor. This past year, the Youth Governor was Her Excellency Rebecca Lightowler, who is an engaging and inspiring young woman who leaves big shoes to fill, which I am sure her successor, Her Excellency Chloe Thomson, will be able to fill more than adequately with determination and drive. She has a very powerful story and I look forward to meeting with her in the coming months to see how I can support her in her new role.

This important program focuses on personal development, empowerment and connecting politicians and decision-makers with youth voices and opinions. Something I think we can all agree on is that we need to hear more from our young people. They are, after all, our future voters, our future leaders, our future politicians, and they deserve their voices to be heard just as much as those of us here who are probably a little more over the hill.

As I said previously, the program is designed to give these young people, aged between 15 and 25 years, a chance to be heard at the highest level of state government on a wide range of issues relevant to young people's lives. The participants in this year's program received training in public speaking and leadership at residential camps as they researched the issues they were passionate about.

I noticed several members of Youth Parliament speaking at the beginning of the week and then speaking towards the end of the week, and I could see the increased confidence that they had in their capacity to address their peers, often around subjects which are quite personal and which evoke some reactions that are difficult to deal with, even for adults. I saw young people trying to deal with powerful emotions and saw them being able to get through and complete their speeches, and I was very proud of what they were able to achieve.

The bills that were developed will be handed to the minister for youth as well as other ministers and shadow ministers to provide the government and opposition with insights about issues that are important to our young South Australians. The program, apart from it being overseen by the wonderful people of the YMCA, is supported by the Department of Human Services, the Law Foundation of South Australia, the Electoral Commission of South Australia and of course Parliament House and many members of parliament here who attended during the week.

I congratulate all youth parliamentarians from this year. I look forward to seeing the new intake as soon as they convene for next year and hearing about the exciting and informative legislation they will be debating. I have great hope for the future, particularly given the subject matter they are prepared to tackle.

ROTARY CLUB OF MOUNT BARKER

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:36): I mention in the house the efforts of the Rotary Club in Mount Barker to assist my community. I had the very real pleasure of attending the club's changeover dinner, and I wish to record in this place my gratitude to the club for its work. The dinner was an opportunity for me to speak with club leaders and members and to reflect on the scope of the club's work over the past year.

Shiralee Judge has led the club with distinction and brought fresh energy and a willingness to examine complex social issues. I was impressed with her leadership and commitment to the club. I was also impressed by and grateful for the efforts of her executive and members, including past president Peter Baur; vice-president, Ian Rose; secretary, Florence Yeardley; treasurer, Helen Marshall; director of community service, Rod Cooper; director of membership and club service, Mary Roebuck; and director of youth and international, Helen Marshall.

Throughout the year, the club was able to raise over \$80,000. That is a significant sum. I understand funds have been invested in 17 community grants and awards through 11 Rotary Youth projects, including the Mount Barker High School student award and the Rob Burford Award at Littlehampton Primary School and assisting the Mount Barker Scout Group 2019 jamboree. The club

also subsidised comps for students to participate in local and international developments and exchange programs. In addition, the club has been a significant supporter of Operation Flinders and the End Polio campaign and has funded tent and shelter kits for future disaster relief.

I understand that the club applied for and was successful in receiving a district grant to help fund the Bhutan 2020 SkyHydrant project. This project aims to supply safe drinking water to every school in Bhutan by the end of 2020. The club also donated to the End Trachoma by 2020 project to assist remote Indigenous communities. I was delighted to learn that the club's very significant work has also been recognised in other ways by Rotary International.

At the District 9520 conference, the club was the joint recipient of the international project award for supporting a vital program to provide safe drinking water in Timor-Leste. I understand that club members Carola Sanders and Peter Baur travelled to Timor-Leste in November 2018 to assist in the project. I was also pleased to learn that the club will qualify for the Rotary Citation from Rotary International.

I take this opportunity to wish the new president, Rod Cooper, and his committee well for 2019-20. I am confident the club will continue to make an extraordinary contribution in my community and to other communities through Rotary International. You will know that Paul Harris formed Rotary in 1905 so that professionals with diverse backgrounds could exchange ideas, form meaningful lifelong friendships and serve their communities. The Rotary Club in Mount Barker continues to closely observe those objectives.

In the time now remaining on the floor it is not possible to individually recognise other club members whose extraordinary service was appropriately memorialised by the club and by Rotary International at the dinner, but I will place these remarks in correspondence to members as soon as I am able. In that way, I will also extend and make plain the real appreciation of my whole community for their work and the work of the club.

Bills

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

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 12.

The CHAIR: We are still on clause 12. The member for Kaurna has asked one question. I believe that he has another one. The member for Kaurna has the call.

Mr PICTON: Your record keeping is immaculate, Mr Chairman; it has to be. As I recall, the previous question I asked the Attorney-General was in relation to whether she and the department had considered the nature and effect of the amendments, or whether they just acted on the advice of ICAC, and she said that they had considered this. In light of that, will the Attorney-General outline what she believes is the nature and effect of this particular amendment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Firstly, can I just clarify that. The original question was whether the department had considered it, not me personally.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, in any event, that was the question but, in relation to the effect of it, it is to incorporate the applicability of the law in respect of councils. That is the applicability, adding in the words 'or council' after 'agency' as identified.

Mr PICTON: Did the Attorney-General or her department consult with the Local Government Association, and what is their position on the amendments?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that they were informed but that we have not received any submission in relation to it. I will refer the member also to my previous answer, and that was that, at the time this bill was being presented by the former government, by the former member for Enfield, the then attorney-general, which ended up in deadlock, perhaps, he could recall his own

cabinet deliberations in relation to the bill at that time; but in relation to this particular bill, they were advised of it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 15 passed.

Clause 16.

Mr PICTON: In relation to this there has been some discussion on amendments and positions of a former member of the other place, the Hon. Kelly Vincent. I am wondering whether the Attorney-General, or her department, or her office consulted with the former member of parliament the Hon. Kelly Vincent, before introducing this bill, and, if so, what was her position on the amendments?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the question is whether the Hon. Kelly Vincent, now retired from the parliament, was consulted on this proposal, the answer is no.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

Mr PICTON: In relation to these amendments under clause 21, can the Attorney-General outline who requested these amendments be made?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This amendment proposal was initiated by a request from the Public Trustee.

Mr PICTON: Can the Attorney-General outline whether any of her cabinet colleagues recused themselves from the cabinet discussion about this clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not know that I am even at liberty to advise the parliament in respect of any cabinet deliberations, including occasions when a member withdraws from consideration of any items in cabinet having identified any potential conflict of interest, so I will not be answering that question.

Mr PICTON: Can the Attorney-General answer whether any of her cabinet colleagues are involved with, are on the board of, or run any charities that might benefit from these arrangements as outlined in the amendments?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is a very general question. I imagine this deals with a number of charitable trusts; there may be hundreds or thousands of them in South Australia. I would need to have some specific information, but not that I am aware of.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (22 and 23) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOBBYISTS (RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 May 2019.)

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:47): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker on the Lobbyists (Restrictions on Lobbying) Amendment Bill 2019. I also indicate that, as per the previous bill, for

reasons I will outline, the opposition will be reserving our position at this stage, as we go between the houses. Unfortunately, we believe there have been some difficulties encountered by the Attorney-General in relation to this bill. Perhaps she has outsmarted herself. The Liberal Party took a commitment to the last election, and I quote:

...amend the Lobbyists Act to prevent any office bearer of the state governing body of a registered political party or an associated entity such as a union from becoming a registered lobbyist in [South Australia].

The reference for that is on the Strong Plan website. In May last year, it was reported that this legislation was only weeks away. That was published in InDaily: 'Marshall's lobbyist crackdown'. Around 12 months later, the legislation finally arrived in parliament, so it was not quite weeks away—maybe 52 weeks away.

I think that gives members a sense of just how slowly this Liberal government is moving. On 16 May 2019, a whole year later, InDaily published an article entitled, 'Crackdown backdown: unions escape net in lobbyist reforms'. I think it is useful to refer members to that article, which contains some very carefully crafted quotes from the Attorney-General. I would like to read out some very key passages for members. The article states:

However, she conceded today the Bill would take a different form after extensive legal advice and consultation.

'We had to look at questions of constitutional rights of communication,'

she told InDaily. The article then goes on to say:

She said the legislation would carry the same definition of associated entities as under the Electoral Act, which—while it identifies organisations that are 'financial members of a registered political party' or having voting rights within them—does not stipulate trade unions.

'We've had to look really clearly at constitutional questions [and] we've come back within the parameters of that advice...we have to ensure we're producing legislation that is enforceable,' Chapman said.

Towards the end of the article are the following paragraphs:

But Chapman insists the Bill still represents a 'strengthening of SA lobbying laws', saying: 'Our prohibition will make it clear that a person can be an official of a political party or a lobbyist, but not both.'

'Our election commitment was to prevent any office bearer of a political party, and of associated entities of parties, to lobby government officials—and that's exactly what these amendments do.'

I would now like to draw the house's attention to clause 7(2) of the bill, which inserts a new subsection (4) that appears to ban associated entities from lobbying unless they are registered. I would have thought that would capture many unions.

What is going on here? Has the Attorney-General been misleading in terms of her comments to the InDaily journalist? Has she allowed them to make a mistake and not corrected it? I am not sure what it is, but clearly there is an issue here that we seek the Attorney-General's correction on. It seems that it was always the Attorney-General's intention to capture unions, despite her false change of heart. The Attorney-General's own second reading explanation proves it. The first paragraph of her second reading explanation says, and I quote:

Today, I introduce a bill that relates to the government's election commitment to ban any office bearer of the state governing body of a registered political party, or an associated entity such as a union, from becoming a registered lobbyist in South Australia.

Let me just highlight a particular part of that paragraph: 'or an associated entity such as a union'. I am not sure whether it was a poor staffer who forgot to update the speech or the Attorney-General did not read it properly, but clearly there is a difference between her public statements in this regard, what the bill is saying and what her second reading explanation is saying. In summary, we have a bill that is 12 months late, a sloppy, at best, second reading explanation and an article where incorrect statements seem to have been made.

It is an absolute mess. Who knows how many other errors are littered through the bill? I would like to return to the briefing that the opposition received on the bill, which is obviously being led again by the shadow attorney-general in the other place, the Hon. Kyam Maher. It was abundantly

clear that the government had not done their work properly and that they had not fully understood how their own bill worked.

Let me be very clear: we support a comprehensive lobbyist licencing regime—in fact, of course, we led the work on this during our time in government—but we cannot form a position on the bill without the additional information and follow-up briefing that we were promised. The things that we are after are a full list of the current associated entities, whether or not union shop stewards are captured, exactly how the bill applies to volunteers and what the government's working definition is of valuable consideration.

In that briefing, we also heard revelations that the Attorney-General is in possession of advice that indicates that in-house lobbyists in private firms, such as mining companies, banks or other large organisations and corporations, are required to be registered under the current lobbyist legislation. Given that the Treasurer, Rob Lucas in the other place, who we all know is running the government, has said that the law is the law and legislation should be enforced, private companies should be concerned that this means that the government might be coming after them.

The fine in section 5 of the act for engaging in lobbying without registration is \$150,000 for a body corporate, \$30,000 for a natural person or imprisonment for two years. Clearly, we have some advice that the Attorney-General is in possession of on this front that would mean that a whole range of different employees and a whole range of different corporations would be captured by the current act, and we need some clarification on what the government's approach to that is going to be.

I conclude by once again indicating that Labor will reserve our position on the bill until we receive the information and the follow-up briefing from the Attorney-General that we have been promised. It is disappointing that this has come here. It is another bill that we were promised more information on but that has been brought before the house without that information being provided, information that could lead the opposition to form an opinion properly on this matter, particularly when there are so many glaring contradictions between the statements of the government and what appears in the bill.

I hope that we get some clarity on these issues through the debate in this chamber or, if not, between the houses. We will certainly wait on that information before we form a detailed opinion on this bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:55): I thank the member for Kaurna for his contribution on behalf of the opposition, notwithstanding that it appears that, even with briefings, he is reserving the opposition's determination on whether they support this bill or not. The briefings have been provided. I note that the member raises what he claims are apparent inconsistencies between the contribution to the parliament and the recordings of Mr Tom Richardson in InDaily articles on 31 May 2018 to 16 May 2019. We do not accept those claims of inconsistency.

What I think the member answered in his own contribution is that advice had been taken on the implementation of the reform of the Lobbyists Act since coming to government. Accordingly, in the bill presented here for consideration there is a very specific and deliberate inclusion of the associated entities for which there is application of this legislative registration process to be consistent with that which is defined in the Electoral Act. Clearly, that enables there to be consistency for the purposes of interpretation.

The indication by the member for Kaurna that his party is contributing and is supportive of a comprehensive lobbyist register procedure is based on the fact that his side of the parliament, when in government, had initiated the process. I would like to remind the member for Kaurna that, whilst the former premier in this parliament had announced a lobbyist register protocol in relation to a registration arrangement, it took years for that to be converted to a statutory-based obligation.

That was very disappointing because, in light of the lobbyist laws around the country and the progression of statutory-based obligations in this regard, it seemed that the previous Labor administration in this state was not too happy to make provision on a statutory basis. Ultimately, that came to pass, but under considerable pressure. It was a little bit like the torturous development, approval and implementation of an Independent Commission Against Corruption.

Nevertheless, there is no question that, on our side of the house, prior to the election we made it absolutely clear, and we maintain our position, that you cannot hold office in a political party and be a lobbyist. We acted on coming into government to implement that obligation. The confusion or otherwise of the member for Kaurua or other members of his party is a matter for him. I do not know how much clearer we could have been in the briefings; nevertheless, we promote for the consideration and approval of this house this bill consistent with that promise to the people of South Australia. We are proud to present the bill to the parliament for its approval.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: I have a question on clause 1 for the Attorney-General. Why was there such a delay between the Attorney-General's previous statements last year in May that this bill was weeks away and the eventual production of this some 12 months later? What was going on over those 12 months between the promise of this bill and the eventual production of this bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised, and I am personally familiar with the fact, that there had been a presentation for the drafting of legislation. There was a period in which there was advice, as I have indicated, in relation to constitutional validity that you referred to that has been reported in media publications and that went back and forth. Essentially, that is what occurred. Shortly after coming into government, this was a matter that was presented for development, along with our long list of legislative reforms consistent with our election promises.

Mr PICTON: In relation to this bill, who did the Attorney-General consult with and what was the summary of their different positions, understanding her usual provisos about internal stakeholders, etc.?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Starting in the first round of consultation in 2018, each political party registered in South Australia, which I assume includes the Australian Labor Party—

Mr Picton: I would hope so.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —you are a registered party—was invited to contribute to the bill. This includes all current lobbyists registered in South Australia as at that time: the Australian Industry Group, the Australian Professional Government Relations Association, Business SA, Crown Solicitor, Director of Public Prosecutions, Department of the Premier and Cabinet Lobbyist Register, Law Society of South Australia, SA Bar Association and SA Unions. I note that I did not have any response from him, but now that he is a member of the parliament, I suppose you can ask him.

I also sought contributions from SAPOL, and more recently on this last bill, the Australian Professional Government Relations Association, the Law Society of South Australia, all current lobbyists registered in South Australia (some of whom provided a response) and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's SA Lobbyist Register, for reasons which I have previously explained. Obviously, you can follow those up if you want to get some information from somewhere other than the government agencies.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr PICTON: In relation to the definition of 'office bearer', it is currently drafted as 'by whatever name called and whether or not validly appointed to occupy'. I am wondering why the Attorney-General has drafted it to capture people who have not been validly elected or appointed to a position, and what is the rationale behind invalid appointments and elections being captured?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The definition of 'office bearer', which relates to whether someone is validly or not validly appointed to occupy the position, is important because it ensures that someone cannot escape liability by later claiming that there had been no valid appointment or

election—i.e. there was not a quorum at the meeting—and make some argument as a defence to being excluded from any obligation in respect of this legislation.

As I think the Hon. Kyam Maher was advised at the briefing—I am not sure whether the member for Kaurna was also present—a list of other legislation with a similar provision to stop people from avoiding responsibility in relation to this matter, or being captured, is as follows:

- the definition of 'officer' in section 3 of the Associations Incorporation Act 1985;
- the Building Work Contractors Act 1995;
- the Construction Industry Long Service Leave Act 1987;
- the Conveyancers Act 1994;
- the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005;
- the Environment Protection Act 1993;
- the Explosives (Fireworks) Regulations 2016;
- the Farm Debt Mediation Act 2018;
- the Firearms Act 2015;
- the Fisheries Management Act 2007;
- the Hydroponics Industry Control Act 2009;
- the Land Agents Act 1994;
- the Land Valuers Act 1994;
- the Lottery and Gaming Act 1936;
- the Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995;
- the Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 1996;
- the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995;
- the Security and Investigation Industry Act 1995; and
- the Tattooing Industry Control Act 2015.

Except for the first item, these all relate to sections identifying the definition of 'director'. For the reasons we have pointed out, these are items that serve to protect against the avoidance of the application of the act.

A good number of these were passed at a time when the member for Kaurna was a member of this place, a minister or an adviser to a minister. I know I was here in the parliament at a time when a number of these pieces of legislation were passed. Personally, I did not ever challenge the need for or the validity of this type of legislation because obviously it is important that we do not let people wriggle out of responsibility or application, as is consistent with all the other legislation replicated in this bill, for good reason.

Mr PICTON: Can the Attorney-General outline whether a union shop steward is captured in the definitions under clause 4 of the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think this is perhaps where the confusion is in the member for Kaurna's mind. Just because someone is employed as a shop steward in a union does not of itself attract application. If the shop steward is a member of an associated entity in relation to the application of this act, or the union is a member of the associated entity, then we would expect that would occur.

The reason we cannot say such and such a union or every employee or people who are shop stewards in a particular union is that we do not know the particulars of that. It would have to be identified by them whether that applies to them or not. I expect there would be some people in the

community who may be employed as shop stewards in one or another union who may have some association with one of the affiliated entities under the Electoral Act that would be brought into application. However, I am not here to make that judgement. That is a matter for the law to be applied and then for someone, if it applies to them, to register.

Mr PICTON: With respect, the Attorney-General says this is a matter for the law: we are drafting the law here, so I think it is quite important that we think through how this will apply to different groups of people and whether or not it is the parliament's intention to apply this to particular groups of people. As we have outlined, the government seems a bit confused on this front as to whether it will.

Can the Attorney-General outline an example of where she thinks a shop steward would have application under this, what the situations and prerequisites would be for it to apply to such a person and whether she thinks there is a situation where they would not? I think it is quite important—I am sure this may well even be reflected on in statutory interpretation, if it ever got to that point—that we know what the intent of the parliament is in regard to who this bill should apply to.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The clue in relation to this is 'office holder'. That means if the particular person—and the member is using as an example a person who is a shop steward—is an office bearer or an employee of the organisation, or a volunteer who is authorised to act on behalf of the organisation, that is the first aspect that needs to be considered. If we assume that the same shop steward, who you have used as the example, then seeks to undertake work as a lobbyist, he or she clearly needs to then self identify whether they are required, according to those provisions, to register.

This is not a law which is prescribed where we can provide a list of all those who are in and all those who are out: it is a law that applies for anyone who wants to be a lobbyist. They have to register. If they are excluded from the opportunity to be a lobbyist by virtue of the status of other positions that they may hold, then they need to identify that; otherwise, they break the law.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council insisted on amendments Nos 4, 5 and 7 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed and does not insist on its amendments Nos 1, 2, 8 and 9.

Mr PICTON: Chair, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Consideration in committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 4, 5 and 7.

I indicate my gratitude to the Legislative Council for its speedy consideration of the matter that was considered earlier today. I also further thank members of the opposition, the Greens and the crossbench for their support of what I think the Hon. Kyam Maher described as a very sensible outcome in relation to the review, and the education ombudsman echoing the words of the member for Port Adelaide this morning and the Treasurer as well. Everyone is happy with that. That has been dealt with, in relation to the bill. We still have these two issues outstanding. I am consistent with the positions put this morning.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:20): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that a conference be granted to this house in respect of certain amendments from the Legislative Council in the bill and that the Legislative Council be informed that, in the event of a conference being agreed to, this house will be represented at such conference by five managers

and that Mr Boyer, Dr Close, Mr Cregan, Mr Murray and the mover be the managers of the conference on the part of the House of Assembly.

Motion carried.

LOBBYISTS (RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 5.

Mr PICTON: Before we were rudely interrupted by the education people, I was about to ask: will the Attorney-General confirm whether she is in possession of advice that indicates that in-house lobbyists in private firms, such as mining companies, banks or consultancy companies, are required to be registered under the current unamended lobbyists legislation? If so, what is the date of that advice and when do you intend to start enforcing that advice in relation to the current legislation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that the advice was received in relation to the parties that you have identified. That was remedied. They do not apply in relation to this bill, so I think that has resolved the matter.

Mr PICTON: I think we might take that up further in the upper house. I am wondering if the Attorney-General can take us through the elements of what constitutes lobbying—for instance, communication with a member of parliament or communication on behalf of a third party for valuable consideration. Also, does the Attorney-General consider that such practices would apply to the Liberal Party's organisation, FutureSA?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: To the second matter, for obvious reasons my adviser does not have a clue what FutureSA is, but if the member is referring to the entity that I would expect, within the definition of the Electoral Act, to be an associated entity of the Liberal Party, I expect that it would apply. The first question has now escaped me. You wanted me to redefine for you what the meaning of 'lobbying' is other than what is there in new section 4(3)?

Mr Picton: What are the elements?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The adviser has just pointed out that, in relation to the act rather than the amendment at this point, current section 4 provides:

...a person will be taken to engage in lobbying if the person, for money or other valuable consideration—
that is one—

communicates with a public official—

and there is detail there about whether it is in writing, on the phone or other electronic means—

on behalf of a third party for the purpose of influencing the outcome of—

I think that is the third critical area, and it relates to legislation, approvals, awarding of contracts or other exercise by the official of his or her functions or powers. That is currently in the act, and the member might want to have a look at that. For the purposes of the amendment under the clause that we are considering, clause 5, the amendment does two things: delete subsection (3) and substitute explanatory subsections, as illustrated there for the avoidance of any doubt. So it is adding to the specific in or out of application.

Mr PICTON: Can the Attorney-General outline what the difference is between a client and a third party, and does the Attorney-General consider that a member of a union is either a third party or a client?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure that I actually understand fully the question of whom, I suppose is the logical further extension of that, because again I think that the member is under the misapprehension that I am somehow or other able to identify to whom you might be referring as the third party or client. I am not sure I can answer that, but perhaps if you could just make it a little bit clearer we will see how we go.

The CHAIR: Member for Kurna, we have had three questions.

Mr PICTON: I was invited by the Attorney-General to clarify—

The CHAIR: The Attorney is happy, so you have the call.

Mr PICTON: The Attorney is happy; we are all happy. What I am really trying to get at is that you have definitions of a client and you have definitions of a third party. How do you define those? I know that the Attorney-General is trying to say, 'Well, I can't say who is who. They've got to work themselves out.' I think it is actually quite important that the parliament has a clear idea in its head of what it is defining these terms as because, if we cannot work it out, then there is no way anybody else can work it out.

I do not think we should just be handballing this all to the courts and say, 'Well, the courts should have to define this,' because I think that proves that we do not really have a clear definition of what we are legislating for here, particularly given that we know that the confusion in this legislation is about unions and union membership. Could you be a client if you are a member of a union, or could you be a third party if you are a member of a union? We seek some clarification on that.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Perhaps the member for Kurna can have a look at the original act again. Under section 4(4), there is already a definition of a designated organisation, and I will refer back to that in a minute. The provision that we are making in this bill is to add in a definition of 'client'. Let me first go to what a designated organisation is. Subsection (4) provides:

- (a) an employer organisation, employee organisation, professional organisation or some other organisation established to represent the industrial or professional interests of its members; or
- (b) an organisation established for a charitable, educational, benevolent, humanitarian, religious, recreational, sporting or philanthropic purpose; or
- (c) or an organisation, or an organisation of a kind, prescribed by regulation.

The insertion under this bill, if passed, will add a definition of 'client', which the member will realise I have just read out—it is already in the bill—which is proposed to be 'of a designated organisation, means a person who is being assisted or represented by the designated organisation'. That is the connection that I think is relevant for the purposes of understanding that. I think 'client' is very clearly defined. The applicability of the new 4(3) states:

For the purposes of subsection (1), a person will not be taken to communicate with a public official on behalf of a third party if the third party is a client of a designated organisation and the person, being an office holder within the organisation, communicates with the public official in the ordinary course of holding that office.

I am not sure whether that makes it clearer or not; I hope it does. It may not be crystal clear. Obviously the member had the opportunity to ask at the briefing and perhaps he did not understand at that stage, but when the member is looking at this legislation I urge him to follow through that and it will identify that within the 'Meaning of lobbying' there is a provision under subsection (3) which deals with this question of client and/or third party as to when a person will not be taken to have communicated.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Mr PICTON: In regard to clause 7(2) of the bill, which inserts a new subsection (4), does the Attorney-General consider that a union is an 'associated entity'?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I hope this helps the member to understand this and one of the important reasons why there is consistency proposed in the definitions in this bill with the Electoral Act. The list of associated entities that are already identified on the Electoral Commission website is very interesting, but some unions are named on it. Some associated parties of the Liberal Party of Australia, SA Division, are also named on it.

The items that the Electoral Commissioner has identified as an associated entity, if this helps, listed up to 2017, are the Australian Rail Tram and Bus Industry Union SA/NT Branch, the Australian Services Union SA/NT Branch, the Australian Workers' Union SA Branch, the Australasian Meat

Industry Employees' Union SA and WA Branch, the Automotive Food Metals Engineering Printing and Kindred Industries Union SA Branch, the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union—Forestry and Furnishing Products Division SA District, the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union—Construction and General Division SA Branch—

Mr PICTON: I get the gist. You do not have to read it all.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There are only a few more that I think are all in your category for your party. They include the Communications Electrical Plumbing Union—Communications SA Division, the Communications Electrical Plumbing Union—Electrical Division SA Branch, the Community and Public Sector Union—PSU Group, the Finance Sector Union SA/NT Branch, and the Health Services Union SA/NT Branch. Then there are a number of other entities which relate to other parties, I would expect.

I notice SA Progressive Business Inc. is there. I think that is one of yours. The list also includes the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association SA Branch—now we are getting to the powerful lot—the Textile, Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia, New South Wales/South Australia/Tasmania Branch, the Transport Workers' Union of Australia SA/NT Branch the United Fire Fighters Union of SA and the United Voice SA Branch. The top people are at the bottom. Anyway, as at 2017, they were published by the Electoral Commission on their website as to what they had identified as associated entities.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, because we are applying the same definition. I hope that helps. I do not know whether the Australian Labor Party have any other unions that since 2017 have voting rights or positions of influence in relation to the South Australian division of the Australian Labor Party. I do not know that I can help anymore in that regard. I suggest the member keeps an eye on the list from time to time. One would hope, though, that in relation to setting laws that are consistent with the same definitional pathways, that will assist those to be able to identify if, of course, they want to be a lobbyist.

Mr PICTON: In relation to clause 7 and with the benefit of the Attorney-General's confirmation in regard to associated entities, say if I were the chair of one of those associated entities, whether it be FutureSA, as the Attorney-General has outlined, or one of the other ones, if you are in that position of an associated entity and you make representations to the government, does that constitute lobbying?

What if you happen to feel strongly about something entirely removed from the ordinary interests of that body, for instance, a conscience issue—and the Attorney-General is bringing into the house a bill in relation to sex work—if you are making representations in relation to that issue that you feel strongly about, that has no relation to the associated entity, say FutureSA, that you are involved in, and you made representations to your local MP or another representative or public official, would that constitute lobbying? In that case, who would be the third party and what would be the valuable consideration that applied there?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I refer the member again to section 4 of the current act, which sets out the meaning of lobbying. What the member is referring to is a member who is the chair of an organisation, an associated entity, and would therefore be captured and need to be registered for the purpose of lobbying, which is where, for money or other valuable consideration, they do certain things to influence contracts, legislation, etc.

If the chairman in that example wants to present a view on something for which they are not receiving money or valuable consideration—they might be a consumer of services of sex workers and want to be able to put their view to me in relation to the decriminalisation of that industry—then it would be my view that I do not think that would apply. They would not be doing it for money or other valuable consideration unless, of course, they own a brothel.

All these things have to be taken into account as to what they are actually doing. We do not expect that any act of any communication at any time necessarily fits into the meaning of lobbying. That is what has to qualify. People have to want to do that job for that benefit in those circumstances

to have an obligation to be registered, and then are disqualified from being able to be registered if they hold other office. That is the process.

The member seems to be a bit confused about that, but I have tried to make it crystal clear. I might say for the purpose of the record that I do not have any knowledge whatsoever of whether the chairman of FutureSA, assuming we even have one, is a user of sex work services. I make the point that, if he or she had the desire to convey to me their view on the sex work decriminalisation bill, I would be happy to hear from them.

Mr PICTON: That was an unexpected turn. I would like to extrapolate that point to another particular scenario. A more realistic proposition might be that somebody from an associated entity, let's say the chair of FutureSA, might go to the government and say, 'Person X would be a great person to be on the board of Infrastructure SA,' for instance. They try to lobby the government to appoint that person to be on a board. Does that lobbying fall within the definition of lobbying in terms of the act? Is there a third party? Is there valuable consideration that would apply to such an action?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I hope I have this clear. As you have indicated, if that person proposing the nomination is acting on behalf of a third party, they would be prohibited from doing that if that was outside their role as the chairman of FutureSA.

Mr PICTON: What is the valuable consideration about that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For the benefit of this example, I do not think that it is part of the usual operations of FutureSA to give advice in relation to boards.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Also in relation to clause 7, could the Deputy Premier advise what union activities are captured by the bill and why they would be captured by the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure whether the member missed the list of different unions. He probably knows more about what they do in their normal course of business than I do. If they are purporting to act outside the business of the union to lobby government, they would not be able to do so. I do not know the particulars of the charter or current usual work of the Australian Transport Workers Union; the member might.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Protesting against privatisation.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: All sorts of things, no doubt. I am saying that they are obviously in a position to present on behalf of the union, just as the member for Cheltenham, who was formerly the head of SA Unions, used to put submissions to me as the advocate on behalf of that body's member unions in relation to proposals that we were presenting. That is an important role to have. That is not barred. What is barred is to lobby outside the charter of the organisation.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Just to clarify the Deputy Premier's rationale for my benefit, was that because those regular activities of a trade union are protected by what I understand to be section 5—the ordinary activities captured by the charter of the unions—so it would require a union to be communicating with a decision-maker of government where there is a third party and there is some valuable consideration involved or at stake potentially as a result of those communications?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes and yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Could I ask what organisations the Attorney-General is considering capturing via regulation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not have any proposed at this point.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Does that mean the capacity to do so is superfluous?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, it does not mean that it is superfluous because there is no identified base for granting a regulation to prescribe a particular entity. I know that the member has been concerned about this in the past and suggested that there should not be some catch-all legislation to cover other entities by prescription. Previously, the member has presented that on the basis that we need to know exactly what is covered and that there should not be any opportunity for the extension of that.

As the member well knows, the purpose of such an addition is to ensure that there is the capacity to capture and be flexible for the development of other bodies if we were to introduce a new definition of organisation or a new entity. Obviously, we have trust companies and bodies and we might invent another one, in which case we need to add to the definition the entity to be captured for what is an organisation. It allows for the flexibility of that. I do not believe there is any other reason for it. I will just check with my adviser. She is shaking her head, so I do not think I can add anything further.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am just going to avail myself of a brief personal explanation to clarify the unfortunately ill-put—

The CHAIR: Are you seeking clarification?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —comments of the Deputy Premier. I think she refers to a previous committee stage of a previous bill that we discussed regarding the establishment of and access to a database for child protection purposes. In that context, indeed I did raise those concerns, but that is not the same context in which we are raising this. I think this is more just the capacity. In case we have failed to think of something up-front and think of something later on, we do not have to come back to the parliament; would that be correct, Deputy Premier?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2019.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:49): I rise to speak to the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures) Bill, which is a relatively brief bill. Members would be familiar with how I like to curb the amount of comment on brief bills, such as the Supply Bill, for example. We will see if I can—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: My apologies, member for Lee, because you may have indicated this, but are you the lead speaker?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, sir. This bill is, in the context of the 2019-20 state budget delivered last month, a relatively brief bill. It really only canvasses two revenue measures: a series of changes to the Mining Act, to enable the significant increases to fees levied under the powers of the Mining Act and, similarly, to enable an increase to maximum expiation levels levied under the Road Traffic Act.

Its brevity is surprising because it finds its context in a state budget that contains \$513 million in higher taxes, fees and charges over the budget and forward estimates period, in addition to the popular land tax aggregation measure, which has been receiving some attention inside this chamber and outside this chamber but in the parliament complex over the past 24 hours or so.

Those taxes, fees and charges and the land tax aggregation do not find their voice in this bill. I see the member for Morialta ready to spring like a leopard to raise a point of order to say that I am debating, and that this is not the substance of the bill, but I will tease him no longer.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It is fascinating. It is contexted. It is germane.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He is alone in that view—including from me. I do—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: You are the one who was raising it. Don't hide your light under a bushel.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do, however, have to raise a number of issues with this bill. It is remarkable that after the extraordinary progress our state has made in providing for a more approachable, transparent and low-cost jurisdiction for the mining industry and its participants, we would be seeking to significantly increase fees. Indeed, I believe the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy has publicly complained about what they see as fee increases of up to 70 per cent in some areas on members of their industry.

Members need only cast their minds back to just before the global financial crisis, when there had been significant investment by the then state Labor government and also the mining industry in unlocking new mineral resources. There was the PACE program, which provided geographical, geological and sometimes even hydrological data to the industry free of charge, so that people could come in and explore core samples in what became a new mineral core library. That led to, amongst other things, the \$800 million expansion of Carrapateena, which is currently underway and delivering significant economic activity.

That is not the sort of effort that we see in this bill. Unfortunately, this year's budget measures bill imposes extraordinary increases for members of the mining and extractive industries. It is very regrettable that this message can be sent by a state like South Australia which, leading up to the global financial crisis, was the third most prospective jurisdiction for mining in the world. That was not just as a result of what was invested from the PACE initiative but also from the significant red tape that had been cut from those people looking to come and explore and, hopefully, come and develop in that area.

Maybe it is part of a cunning plan by the minister, given the hoo-ha about his mining bill—a term not used often, and understandably so—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It's like the days of Albert Bensimon.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There's a name we have not heard for a while—

An honourable member: No hoo-ha.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, when you get it from there 'you know it's for real', if I remember correctly.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Simply irresistible.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is probably a bridge too far these days. The member for Morialta has succeeded in shaking me from my train of thought, and I congratulate him on that. It is regrettable that, given the hoo-ha over the mining bill, perhaps this is a cunning plan by the Minister for Energy and Mining to thwart further development in regional and rural South Australia. What a nefarious plan that would be, given the unfettered support the opposition has offered him in trying to prosecute more mineral prospectivity in our great state of South Australia.

Then we move on to the remarkable increase in expiation fees. Of course no-one condones speeding, least of all me, and it is perhaps understandable that some people who give some cursory thought—no deeper—to road safety might think that jacking up speeding fines would lead to significant improvements in road safety outcomes on South Australian roads.

It was in that guise, or indeed that spin, that the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas of the other place, decided to frame his \$513 million of higher fees and charges on South Australians, dressing it all up as just an increase in some speeding fines, a voluntary tax on South Australians who will not have to pay it as long as they do not speed.

Unfortunately, even with these measures that is not actually true. If you take the number of speeding offences at each of the levels to which these fines are being increased and you multiply

them by the increases in the fines, it is but a tiny proportion of the amount of revenue to be raised by this. Indeed, the great bulk of the revenue to be raised from the attack on speeding drivers, as the government would like to hear it, is actually from the increase in the corporate fee.

This is a fee paid by business owners and fleet managers who are unable to identify the drivers of their fleet vehicles at the time an offence occurs; hence, that individual driver, not being able to be held personally responsible or liable for their speeding, can have the expiation paid by the company owning the vehicle. In addition to that, a corporate fee is payable. Such is the increase in the corporate fee, that this amounts to I think, off the top of my head, an \$18 million increase in revenue from those fleet managers of South Australia who are unable to identify the drivers.

This has been characterised as a rort by the Treasurer and the Premier. Of course, they say that about people who own land and who may not be subject to the full effects of proposed changes to land tax aggregation. However, how does this rort affect small businesses, for example, or that tradesperson who started out on their own, perhaps as a plumber or electrician or carpenter—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Believe me—and you should know this by now, member for Morialta—the anecdote is but just starting and not finished. After just starting out with their own van, through hard toil they have managed to grow their business, employ more staff and buy more vans and so on. It is these people who are likely to be paying the tens of millions of dollars more in this corporate fee. I think that is regrettable.

I say that as somebody who perhaps could be accused at face value of speaking with a little forked tongue on this matter because I did, in fact, as a former transport minister, move to increase the corporate fee, but that was in a very specific circumstance. That was for companies that owned trucks that were being used by truck drivers to speed recklessly down the last stretch of the South Eastern Freeway towards the tollgate in Adelaide.

In that context, in the early days of my unfortunately brief tenure as transport minister, we had seen catastrophic accidents, including multiple fatalities from trucks running out of control there. All South Australians, including, I think it would be safe to say, everyone in this place, were horrified to see that at least one of those accidents was caused by unroadworthy vehicles being placed on the road, and inexperienced drivers being placed in vehicles as well, having to descend that tricky stretch of the South Eastern Freeway.

In that context, that was an appropriate use of an increase in the corporate fee, but not just everyone, not just because it is a revenue raiser. That is not about road safety: that is about punishing South Australian fleet managers and small businesses who legitimately do not often know who is driving which fleet vehicle—which van, in the example I gave—on any particular day.

I would assume (this is the feedback we get from the small business community) that if they see one of these speeding offences conducted in one of their vehicles and when they are presented with expiation, if they are unable to identify the driver, as the member for Morialta would know, if the miscreant in the classroom cannot be identified, then all the students should suffer. That is the approach often taken by a small business.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: That is not best practice in education.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is not best practice in education anymore, I think the member for Morialta was going to say. I sat up the front. I did my homework on time. I was quiet and I was always led astray. Even to this day, I still suffer from the misbehaviour of the member opposite.

It is extraordinary now that we see these speeding fines increasing in this way. We know that if the government were really serious about road safety, it would not just be about increasing fines; it would also be looking at demerit points. More to the point, it would not be about winding up the Motor Accident Commission so that South Australia can be the only state in the nation without a dedicated independent transport authority committed to road safety.

I think the seriousness behind this bill is that it gives rise to the lie that just increasing speeding fines will enhance road safety. It is no coincidence that we have had a dramatic 50 per cent escalation in the number of people who have died on South Australian roads so far this calendar

year, and it almost exactly corresponds with the period of time when the Motor Accident Commission completely halted from being present in the media and making any proactive media comment about road safety—not in the lead-up to the Australia Day holiday, not in the lead-up to the March long weekend, not in the lead-up to the Easter long weekend, not in the lead-up to the June long weekend.

Not only that, there has been no new research, no new advertising commissioned and no new advertising campaigns publicised across media here in South Australia. That is terrible, and it is not going too far to say that people are dying as a result of winding back the messaging on road safety in the community at the moment.

I think that dressing up an enormous increase in speeding fines and claiming that that is doing something about the carnage out on our roads is really unfortunate. We know that even the current Minister for Police is able to quote the Fatal Five, and speeding is but one of them.

While we are not getting messages out into the community about combating all the Fatal Five—not just speeding but also dealing with inattention, distractions such as mobile phones and so on and drink and drug driving—we are worse off as a community. So I have turned over a new leaf. I have kept my remarks reasonable and I will leave them there.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:05): As to length, I might tend to agree with the member for Lee. As to reasonableness, well, reasonable minds might differ. I have listened carefully to his contribution and, in rising to commend the bill to the house, I will perhaps commence by making some observation by way of comparison to the relevant corporate levy and fines to which the member for Lee referred just now, namely, that they were increased in no small way.

They affect vehicles that are travelling down the South Eastern Freeway, commencing in my electorate at Crafers. Indeed, that is a particular part of our state's road network that is potentially very dangerous if navigated without care and without great skill. I very much commend the drivers of large freight trucks who have to navigate that stretch of road, in particular on a regular basis, because it certainly takes a high degree of skill and concentration to do it safely.

The member for Lee referred to the increased fees that he was responsible for implementing during his term as minister. I note that those penalties that are specified by the department, and were noted at the time as being very substantial increases, are indeed hefty. They are fines in the amount of \$25,000 and \$50,000, respectively, in relation to business vehicles that are detected speeding and where those vehicles are held by a body corporate who fails to nominate the driver responsible for a camera-detected speeding offence. It ought to be made very clear that there are very significant penalties already in place in relation to the driving of corporate registered vehicles when the driver of the vehicle is not nominated.

When it comes to questions of safety, it is important to be aware that it is, and has been for some time, regarded as importantly linked to responsibility and individual accountability. To the extent that the regulations provide for an increase in the penalty to be applied to bodies corporate failing to nominate a driver. Those penalties in relation to these regulations provide for an increase from \$300 to \$1,800 in respect of a single offence and from \$600 to \$3,600 for two offences that occur at the same time.

That might, perhaps in light of the member for Lee's remarks just now, be seen in the context of the body corporate levy that applies to business vehicles on the South Eastern Freeway that are, in the circumstances that the member for Lee described, in the tens of thousands and reflect the desire of government to ensure that steps are taken to identify a driver responsible in circumstances where the vehicle is registered in the name of a body corporate.

I refer to that matter in particular in opening my remarks. I do propose to confine my contribution in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures) Bill 2019 to those aspects of the bill that provide for amendments to the Road Traffic Act 1961, and I have already referred specifically to those that would affect the penalties to apply in those circumstances of a vehicle registered to a body corporate where the driver is not identified.

It perhaps has ceased to be a matter of real debate that speed is a significant if not the chief contributing factor to serious injuries and fatalities caused by vehicle collisions on the road, and that is at a variety of speeds. Considerable data indicates that as speed increases so, too, does the risk

of fatality and, moreover in relation to speed in excess of a relevant speed limit, there is a considerable increase in the risk of serious injury or fatality.

So it is for that reason that inquiries over a long period of time have found that those responsible for taking measures to keep our roads as safe as they can be ought have particular focus on speed management measures and on enforcement. I would refer specifically in this regard to the Inquiry into the National Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020, published in September last year, and the 12 key recommendations of that report, which highlight both of those aspects in particular—speed management and enforcement—and those aspects will have come as no surprise to those considering the report.

It is important as well to note that the authors of that report highlight that this is not a simple matter, and that measures to control speed alone will not be sufficient to solve safety issues on our roads. That is a matter that might also be regarded as uncontroversial. There are a variety of safety measures, including those which have been referred to by previous speakers in this debate.

Suffice to say that speed, especially excessive speed, is clearly a major contributor to serious injury and fatality on the road. It is important in the context of these measures, the subject of the bill, that, in increasing the fines applicable for driving at speeds that are significantly in excess of relevant speed limits, we bear in mind the road safety imperatives at the core of the government's responsibility to make our roads as safe as possible.

The changes to the Road Traffic Act 1961—which have the effect of updating court-imposed penalties set out in the act for excessive speed so as to be greater than the new expiation fine—which remove the existing corporate fee from the act and replace it with the provision that enables the corporate fee to be made by regulations and change the provision in the act that limits the maximum amount of the expiation fee from the current amount of \$1,250 to \$2,500, are accompanied by the changes to the regulations that are the subject of the Road Traffic (Miscellaneous) Regulations 2014. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES BILL

Conference

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 5pm on Wednesday 31 July 2019 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (17:17): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council agreeing to the time and place appointed by the council.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:18): I was referring to consequential changes to the regulations to provide for the expiation fee increases that relate to speeding substantially in excess of relevant speed limits, which I will specify in a moment. It is important to bear in mind that, with regard to driving-related offences that are the subject of the Road Traffic Act 1961 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, it ought to be appreciated in this context that it is a circumstance of aggravation that a driver is driving at more than 45 km/h over the speed limit, one of a variety of circumstances of aggravation of that offence.

It is understood not just in the context of research, reports and inquiry, but it finds voice in terms of that particular offence as an accepted circumstance of aggravation, that to drive in excess of 45 km/h above a relevant speed limit is a circumstance of aggravation in relation to the offence of careless driving. Others in that category include similarly serious matters, such as driving above the

prescribed blood alcohol level—.08 in this case—or driving so as to avoid police. It is in a group of aggravating circumstances that are very serious misconduct indeed in relation to a careless driving offence.

The increases that are the subject of these regulations reflect that level of seriousness in relation to excessive speeding. The regulations will provide for an increase in respect of speeding over 45 km/h in excess of the relevant speed limit, from \$622 to \$1,658. An increase will also apply for speeding in excess of a speed limit in the range of 30 km/h to 44 km/h, increasing from \$552 to \$1,472.

In the context of the circumstance of aggravation to the offence of careless driving and in the context of the research, some of which I have made specific reference to, it ought to be very clear indeed that speeding, and speeding considerably in excess of relevant speed limits, is a matter that must be addressed and addressed with the utmost seriousness and, in this case, addressed by way of enforcement. It is clear that in terms of a deterrent, a significant increase to the pecuniary penalty that applies in relation to such driving may be seen as a significant deterrent to such driving.

The intent is that the implementation of the regulations will be expedited so as to avoid delay in their implementation, and so it is anticipated that the regulations will be implemented immediately and all relevant steps be taken so as to achieve that outcome. The question of driving safely, driving in accord with speed limits and being conscious of relevant applicable speed controls is one that I am particularly focused on as the member for Heysen, having the South Eastern Freeway running through the northern part of my electorate.

This freeway sees in excess of 50,000 motorists traverse it each day, including a substantial number of heavy vehicles (in the order of 4,000) also travelling it. It is one of the state's major roads. I am also fortunate that, in the more than 1,000 square kilometres of Heysen, driving and living among the community in the regional parts of Heysen, people use regional roads daily with a variety of speed limits reflecting the condition and circumstances of those roads relevantly.

In my view, it is imperative that we do all we can to invest in our state's major road infrastructure, including the freeway. I am delighted that yesterday we announced the investment of more than \$14 million in a key safety improvement that will see the construction of an additional lane, a third lane, on both sides of the South Eastern Freeway between Crafers and Stirling to increase safety through that choke point.

Similarly, I am proud that the Marshall Liberal government has from day one, throughout the campaign and now in its first two budgets, committed to serious, long-term sustained investment in road safety for our regions in infrastructure investment. It could not be more important. It has been neglected over the last 16 years of Labor government in this state, and I am very proud to see that commitment be made. Importantly, road safety involves responsibility and accountability by road users, including with respect to compliance with speed limits.

It also importantly involves a proper, responsible, thorough-going investment by government in decent, safe roads, whether they be major arterial statewide roads or important regional roads. I am always a keen advocate not just for arbitrary speed limits but speed limits that accord with the capacity of the road to keep people safe on the road. Speed limits should always reflect the capacity of the road. I commend safe driving by all those who are resident within my electorate driving in accord with the condition of the road and the applicable speed limit. I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (17:27): I thank the members who have made a contribution on this bill. My recollection is that they comprise the member for Lee and the member for Heysen. I thought that they were both interesting speeches. I have nothing but applause and praise for the points put forward by the member for Heysen; I thought they were some very wise words.

The member for Lee made a broader ranging speech. It began whimsically and was amusing in part. I think he made reflections on historical allegations of fact in relation to activities at school that I am not sure would bear the detailed scrutiny of a privileges committee. Fortunately for the member for Lee, the passage of time has diminished the detail of my memory to such a point that I could not possibly go into too much disagreement with him that I would want to put on the record.

I thank him for the trip down memory lane. I thought that his comments relating to budget measures bills were germane to the topic. I think that the context can be important in these speeches. In commenting on some of the matters that have been traversed in the media this week, I think that the member for Lee obviously took a political approach, as an opposition shadow minister is wont to do. I just make the point that, as in so much of the rest of his speech, he was in many ways inaccurate.

The member for Lee then went on to the substance of the bill and talked about the Mining Act and the Road Traffic Act. I think the hyperventilation in relation to the alleged damage that this bill is going to do to the mining industry was overblown.

I think that the contribution mining makes to this state is significant, and this government is utterly committed to ensuring that we benefit even more greatly from the riches underneath the soil. The mining industry is an important part of our state's economy.

The measures in this bill do improve cost recovery for work undertaken by the Department for Energy and Mining in the assessment of environmental protections, rehabilitation approvals and mine operation plans, and they remove discounts on mining lease rental payments to the state, which are currently provided to freehold landowners who are also tenement holders. The revised fee arrangements under the Mining Act are intended to start from 1 January 2020.

The dramatic suggestions of the member for Lee in relation to these matters were overblown, and I encourage all members to support these sensible measures as part of this bill. The debate then got quite focused on matters relating to the Road Traffic Act.

The member for Lee made some fairly significant comments, which I think started out as a traditional opposition member's speech criticising the government, alleging that the government is responsible for all these dreadful things.

He then reached a crescendo that was probably, I would submit, a bridge too far when he said in his speech that people are dying as a result of the winding back of road safety messaging, or words to that effect. He criticised the government for winding up the MAC, which I thought was a fairly remarkable approach from somebody who was a minister in the government that effectively sold off the MAC. The shadow minister said that it left South Australia without a focus on road safety. I think that those comments were ill advised.

The fact is the government is experiencing the obvious secondary effects of the former government's decision to privatise the MAC. The critical point to make is that there has been no reduction in funding for road safety functions such as advertising campaigns. The MAC was in place until 30 June this year. The police and the transport department as well obviously have a significant role to play. The police have an incredibly important role in road safety.

Of course, when we are talking about independence from government, the police, who contribute so much of this work, have a unique place in amongst government departments with a level of autonomy in their action, a level of independence in their action, that is quite different from the relationship between other government departments and the ministers whom they are responsible to.

I encourage opposition members to reflect on the important work done by the police in this area. I thank them for their work. I thank the police commissioner for his work. In that vein, I will move on to some of the other comments that the member for Lee made in relation to this matter. I forget the exact words he used, but he suggested that the measures to increase fines for speeding offences above 30 km/h an hour and especially above 45 km/h, and indeed the increase in the corporate fee, were superficial.

I will summarise, and I apologise to him if he believes that I have unfairly characterised the way that he described them. He suggested that, on face value, they were attractive measures but did not bear deeper thought as road safety measures. He suggested that it was just the Treasurer, the Hon. Mr Lucas, who suggested that these were road safety measures. I make the point that, to my recollection, the police commissioner, Grant Stevens, also suggested that these were important road safety measures.

I think that the benefits to South Australia are not, as characterised by the member for Lee, only to be found in budget enhancements as a result of these changes but are also significant in relation to road safety. I do not think I detected in the member for Lee's speech opposition to the substantial increases in fines for people who speed between 30 and 44 km/h above the speed limit, which is an increase of \$552 to \$1,472, or from 45 km/h and over, which is an increase of \$622 to \$1,658. I stand to be corrected when I check *Hansard*.

Let us just take as read that we understand that speeding at and above 30 km/h over the speed limit is not something we want our community to do. It is, in fact, a bad thing, and increasing the penalty and punishment will increase the disincentive for people to do so, which is a good thing. We can come back to it if the opposition choose to disagree.

As far as I could tell, the member for Lee was mostly arguing against the increase of the corporate fee. He described it as something that is accumulated by companies or fleet managers who are unable to identify the name of the driver, and suggested it was not a serious road safety measure. The member for Lee also said the government had faltered in focusing only on fines when the real gains are to be made in looking at demerit points.

I would put to the member for Lee and other members of the house that the increase in the corporate fee is not just a revenue measure; it is extremely likely to drive better road behaviour, not just from the perspective of improving the way businesses organise their fleets but also improving the behaviour of drivers on our roads who think that, if they are caught speeding in a company car, they might potentially be in luck and not lose demerit points because the corporate rate might be applied.

I am not saying that I know a person who has ever been in that situation. It is possible that other members of parliament do know somebody who has thought that they might be able to get away without losing demerit points because they have a reasonable expectation, possible expectation or hope that they will get off because the corporate fee will be paid by the company that employs them, or by whomever owns the car they are driving. Therefore, they will not have to face up to any demerit points in addition to the fine itself.

It has certainly been suggested to me that there would be people out there who do behave in that manner. If we can stop them from driving on our road, with the expectation that they can drive poorly and above the speed limit and not personally be pinged for it—not be held liable to the full extent of the law in relation to demerit points and a fine—and that this extra corporate fee might be paid, then I am confident that it will save lives and improve driver behaviour.

It is also reasonable to expect that fleet managers would have sound administrative processes in place so that they know who is driving their vehicles at any given time. Increasing the corporate fee will provide a strong incentive to fleet managers and businesses to ensure those processes are in place prior to allowing employees to drive their cars. It will assist in identifying the driver if an offence is committed in a company vehicle.

We are talking about some fairly serious offences that can be committed. Driving at high speed is a serious matter and we have to ensure that people do not do so. Again, if we can improve driver behaviour by ensuring that drivers know they will be held accountable to their company, and that it is extremely likely they will be held accountable to law enforcement in South Australia, it will drive better behaviour quite apart from any budget enhancements that may be in practice.

I think the member for Lee had some good parts to his speech, and there were some parts to his speech that were not as good. I encourage him to include more of the good parts in his next speech—I enjoyed those—and reflect on the parts I have identified as worthy of reflection.

I think this is a good bill and I commend the Treasurer for bringing it forward. I think this will assist the house and the people in South Australia in the tasks that we are seeking to do, including improving safety outcomes on South Australian roads. I therefore commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 17:41 the house adjourned until Wednesday 31 July 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***STATE OPERA SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

878 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (5 June 2019). When was the Premier advised of the Auditor-General's adverse findings on State Opera South Australia and the risks identified by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

The Premier was made aware on 2 October 2018, when State Opera South Australia submitted its 2017-18 Annual Report for tabling in state parliament. That report contained the Auditor-General's letter to the chair of 28 September 2018, which noted several weaknesses and areas requiring improvement in State Opera's financial controls, which had been raised in an audit management letter during the year.

STATE OPERA SOUTH AUSTRALIA

879 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (5 June 2019). Have any changes been implemented at State Opera South Australia since the Auditor-General's findings in Report 4 of 2019, Update to the Annual Report to address the concerns raised? If so, please detail what these changes are, how they address the three instances raised by the Auditor-General, and when each change will be (or was) implemented.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

As the Auditor-General reported, these bank account access and cheque signatory issues were corrected following the audit, and prior to the publication of Report 4 of 2019.

State Opera South Australia has updated its financial delegations and introduced procedures, including:

- assigning specific account user names and passwords to nominated delegates, and
- incorporating the de-activation of staff members' account access at the time of their departure into the organisation's exit processes.

STATE OPERA SOUTH AUSTRALIA

880 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (5 June 2019). What action has the Premier taken to ensure State Opera South Australia has implemented changes in response to the issues raised by the Auditor-General in Report 4 of 2019, Update to the Annual Report?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

The Auditor-General reported that changes were implemented to correct these issues following the audit, and prior to the publication of Report 4 of 2019.

It is the Auditor-General's practice to follow up agency responses in the next audit year.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet, through Arts South Australia, is also monitoring State Opera South Australia to ensure continuing compliance.

STATE OPERA SOUTH AUSTRALIA

881 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (5 June 2019). What reasons, if any, has State Opera South Australia provided to the Premier for former employees retaining access to State Opera South Australia bank accounts after their departure?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

State Opera South Australia reported to the Auditor-General that the former employees' bank account access was not cancelled for business continuity reasons, as there was a time delay in establishing access for new staff.

There was no evidence that this access was used by the former employees after they left.

STATE OPERA SOUTH AUSTRALIA

882 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (5 June 2019). What reasons, if any, has State Opera South Australia provided to the Premier for a former employee retaining cheque signatory authorisation for State Opera South Australia after their departure?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

State Opera South Australia has advised that the board did not update its cheque signatory authorisation in error. This error was corrected following the audit and prior to the publication of Report 4 of 2019—Update to the Annual Report.

There was no evidence that this authorisation was used by the former employee after they left.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

894 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many children or young people in residential or commercial care have been diagnosed with the flu in 2019?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

Health information, including an influenza diagnosis, is captured on a client's case record, but is not part of an aggregated reporting system.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

895 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many children or young people in residential or commercial care have received a flu vaccination for the current flu season as of 18 June 2019?

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

It is the expectation of the department that all children and young people under the guardianship of the chief executive receive all immunisations as recommended by the National Immunisation Program (South Australia Schedule) within the recommended timeframes.

It is not appropriate for me, or the department, to disclose medical details about individual children in care.

This is as much about the need for government and the public to respect a child and their family's right to privacy and to treat their personal information with utmost sensitivity, as it is to ensure compliance with relevant legislation.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

896 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many children aged over six months and younger than five years in residential or commercial care have:

- (a) received a flu vaccination for the current flu season in 2019?
- (b) been diagnosed with the flu in 2019?

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

It is the expectation of the department that all children and young people under the guardianship of the chief executive receive all immunisations as recommended by the National Immunisation Program (South Australia Schedule) within the recommended timeframes.

It is not appropriate for me, or the department, to disclose medical details about individual children in care, including figures on the number of children suffering specific illness.

This is as much about the need for government and the public to respect a child and their family's right to privacy and to treat their personal information with utmost sensitivity, as it is to ensure compliance with relevant legislation.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

897 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many children and young people, over five years and less than 18 years, in residential and commercial care have:

- (a) received a flu vaccination for the current flu season in 2019?
- (b) been diagnosed with the flu in 2019?

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

It is the expectation of the department that all children and young people under the guardianship of the chief executive receive all immunisations as recommended by the National Immunisation Program (South Australia Schedule) within the recommended timeframes.

It is not appropriate for me, or the department, to disclose medical details about individual children in care, including figures on the number of children suffering specific illness.

This is as much about the need for government and the public to respect a child and their family's right to privacy and to treat their personal information with utmost sensitivity, as it is to ensure compliance with relevant legislation.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

898 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). What practices, if any, are in place to ensure eligible children aged over 6 months and under five years of age in residential or commercial care receive a flu vaccination under the State Funded Childhood Influenza Program?

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

Immunisation against influenza is funded under the National Immunisation Program for medically at risk persons six months of age and over. SA Health recommends vaccination for children between six months and five years.

DCP staff also work to SA Health's Health Standards for Children and Young People under the Guardianship of the Minister policy directive.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

899 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Does the Department for Child Protection assist carers in making flu vaccination arrangements for children or young people in residential or commercial care?

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

DCP staff work to SA Health's Health Standards for Children and Young People under the Guardianship of the Minister policy directive. Additionally, departmental practice guidance advises DCP case workers to liaise with residential and commercial care facilities to ensure that children in these care arrangements receive immunisations in accordance with the National Immunisation Program (South Australia Schedule), noting that this may include arranging a child's participation in school-based vaccination programs.

CHILDREN IN CARE, IMMUNISATION

900 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). What Department for Child Protection practices, if any, are in place to ensure a child or young person's continued and maintained schedule of immunisations are followed upon first entering residential or commercial care?

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

DCP staff work to SA Health's Health Standards for Children and Young People under the Guardianship of the Minister policy directive. In line with this policy, departmental practice guidance advises DCP case workers to arrange for a primary care practitioner to conduct a health check as soon as possible after a child is placed in care, ideally within 30 days. DCP practice guidance also recommends case workers keep records of immunisations and that this information is made available, as appropriate, to those responsible for the day-to-day care of the child.

DCP staff work in accordance with SA Health's recommended vaccination schedule.

CHILDREN IN CARE, IMMUNISATION

901 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Can the responsible foster or kinship carer access a child or young person's immunisation history upon entering residential or commercial care?

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

Children in residential or commercial care do not, as a matter of course, have a responsible foster or kinship carer.

CHILDREN IN CARE, IMMUNISATION

903 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Are foster or kinship carers responsible for making immunisation arrangements for a child in their care?

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

DCP policy and practice guidance, including the publicly available document, 'Who can say ok? Making decisions about children in care', state that a carer can provide consent for immunisations, including through a child's participation in school vaccination programs. DCP case workers are available to provide advice and assistance based on medical information contained in a child's case file.

CHILDREN IN CARE, IMMUNISATION

904 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Are foster or kinship carers required to notify the Department for Child Protection when a child or young person in their care receives a vaccination?

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

DCP case workers record immunisation details in case files where this information is known. Caseworkers, through their working relationships with carers and children and young people, endeavour to keep detailed case records, particularly on important medical matters such as immunisation schedules.

CHILDREN IN CARE, IMMUNISATION

905 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). What support, if any, does the Department for Child Protection provide to foster or kinship carers in making vaccination arrangements for a child or young person in their care?

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

DCP policy and practice guidance encourage case workers and other frontline DCP staff to provide advice to carers on immunisation schedules and, where possible, relevant medical information relating to the child or young person, including allergies or allergic reactions experienced during previous immunisations. Carers can provide consent for immunisations of children and young people in their care.

CHILDREN IN CARE, IMMUNISATION

906 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). What policies, if any, does the Department for Child Protection have in relation to ensuring that children and young people in residential or commercial care are up to date with their vaccinations as per the:

- (a) National Immunisation Childhood Schedule?
- (b) National Immunisation Adolescent and Adult Schedule?

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

DCP practice guidance recommends departmental staff, where possible, provide carers and residential and commercial care facilities with all relevant details of a child's or young person's medical history, including any information about allergies and allergic reactions to previous vaccinations, prior to an immunisation. DCP's Lead Practitioner reinforced this guidance in an all-staff email on 3 June 2019.

DCP policies and procedures comply with both the National Immunisation Childhood Schedule and the National Immunisation Adolescent and Adult Schedule, as well as the SA Health's Health Standards for Children and Young People under the Guardianship of the Minister policy directive.

CHILDREN IN CARE

907 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Since 20 March 2018 how many children or young people in residential or commercial care have been diagnosed with:

- (a) pertussis (whooping cough)?
- (b) hepatitis B?
- (c) hepatitis A?
- (d) measles?
- (e) meningococcal?
- (f) pneumococcal?

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

While DCP records medical information, including the details of any significant illnesses, on the case files of children and young people in care, the department does not release information of this type, except to carers where this is appropriate and necessary. This is as much about the need for government and the public to respect a child and their family's right to privacy and to treat their personal information with utmost sensitivity, as it is to ensure compliance with relevant legislation.

YOUNG PEOPLE IN CARE, SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES

908 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Since 20 March 2018 how many young people, aged 18 or under, have been diagnosed with sexually transmitted diseases upon entering residential or commercial care?

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

While DCP records medical information, including the details of any significant illnesses, on the case files of children and young people in care, the department does not release information of this type, except to carers where this is appropriate and necessary. This is as much about the need for government and the public to respect a child and their family's right to privacy and to treat their personal information with utmost sensitivity, as it is to ensure compliance with relevant legislation.

CHILDREN IN CARE, IMMUNISATION

909 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Have any foster carers or kinship carers declined to have children or young people in their care vaccinated, as per the National Immunisation Program, on conscientious grounds since 18 March, 2018? And in these instances:

- (a) How many children or young people in foster care or kinship care have not been vaccinated as per the National Immunisation Program?
- (b) What subsequent actions, if any, has the Department for Child Protection taken to ensuring these children and young people in foster or kinship care are protected against vaccine preventable disease?

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

It is the expectation of the department that all children and young people under the guardianship of the Chief Executive receive all immunisations as recommended by the National Immunisation Program (South Australia Schedule) within the recommended timeframes.

Whilst a carer can provide consent for immunisations, DCP case workers and case managers work with carers to support compliance with the National Immunisation Program and SA Health guidelines. This includes immunisation through school programs and vaccines required for travel, training or employment.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

910 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many applications for Exceptional Resource Funding were in the process of being assessed as of 27 September 2018?

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

Applications for Exceptional Resource Funding are recorded on case files and, as such, DCP cannot easily provide program data without diverting frontline resources to the task.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

911 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many applications for Exceptional Resource Funding have been lodged since 27 September 2018 to date?

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

Applications for Exceptional Resource Funding are recorded on case files and, as such, DCP cannot easily provide program data without diverting frontline resources to the task.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

912 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many applications for Exceptional Resource Funding have been:

- (a) rejected since 27 September 2018;
- (b) rejected and the applicant advised of this decision since 27 September 2018;
- (c) rejected and subsequently had their application determination reviewed or
- (d) reversed since 27 September 2018?

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

Applications for Exceptional Resource Funding are recorded on case files and, as such, DCP cannot easily provide program data without diverting frontline resources to the task.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

914 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many applications for Exceptional Resource Funding are outstanding as of 27 September 2018 to date?

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

Applications for Exceptional Resource Funding are recorded on case files and, as such, DCP cannot easily provide program data without diverting frontline resources to the task.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

915 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many applications for Exceptional Resource Funding lodged after 27 September 2018 were considered on a case-by-case basis?

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

All applications for Exceptional Resource Funding are considered on a case-by-case basis.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

916 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). How many carers were advised, upon lodging an application for Exceptional Resource Funding, after 27 September 2018 that the policy was under review and that their application would not be approved?

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

Applications for Exceptional Resource Funding are recorded on case files and, as such, DCP cannot easily provide program data without diverting frontline resources to the task.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

917 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Why did the Department for Child Protection withhold information from applicants that as of 27 September 2018 that the Exceptional Resource Funding Procedure had been placed under review and that applications would not be approved?

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

DCP reviewed the Exceptional Resource Funding procedure in accordance with Treasurer's Instruction 2.

Specifically, this review aimed to provide clarity about how Exceptional Resource Funding is allocated.

DCP continued to assess requests for funding on a case-by-case basis throughout the review process. For example, car rental was supported, as was assistance with accommodation where this related directly to the needs of children.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

918 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Who authorised the Chief Financial Officer of the Department for Child Protection to suspend applications for Exceptional Resource Funding, effective immediately on 27 September 2018?

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

Although the funding procedure was under review, applications were still considered on a case-by-case basis.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

919 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Was the Minister for Child Protection advised, prior to 27 September 2018, that the Exceptional Resource Funding Procedure would be placed under review and that applications would subsequently not be approved?

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

Although the funding procedure was under review, applications were still considered on a case-by-case basis.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

920 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Was the Minister for Child Protection advised of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department for Child Protection's directive to not approve applications for Exceptional Resource Funding on 27 September 2018?

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

Although the funding procedure was under review, applications were still considered on a case-by-case basis.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

922 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Was the decision, to withhold information from applicants that as of 27 September 2018 that the Exceptional Resource Funding Procedure had been placed under review and that applications would not be approved, authorised by the Minister for Child Protection?

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

Although the funding procedure was under review, applications were still considered on a case-by-case basis.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

923 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). Was the decision, to withhold information from applicants that as of 27 September 2018 that the Exceptional Resource Funding Procedure had been placed under review and that applications would not be approved, authorised by the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection?

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

Although the funding procedure was under review, applications were still considered on a case-by-case basis.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

925 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (18 June 2019). What is the breakdown, by job title and branch, of positions that have been abolished across the Department of Child Protection since 17 March 2018?

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

Fifty-nine Financial Wellbeing Counsellor positions within the Financial Wellbeing Program ceased on 30 June 2019.

Thirty-four officers employed in support and corporate roles, including positions in research, human resources and administration, accepted targeted voluntary separation packages (TVSPs) offered during 2018-19.

The position of Director State-wide Services was abolished in July 2018, while the position of Director Legislation and Reform was established and abolished within 2018-19.

POLICE STAFFING

931 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). What was the total number of sworn police officers (FTE) at 31 December 2018 of the rank of:

- (a) Constable?
- (b) Senior Constable?
- (c) Sergeant?
- (d) Senior Sergeant?
- (e) Chief Inspector?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

- (a) 605.9
- (b) 1048.5
- (c) 632.7
- (d) 79
- (e) 38

POLICE STAFFING

932 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). What was the total number of sworn police officers (FTE) at 28 February 2019 of the rank of:

- (a) Constable?
- (b) Senior Constable?
- (c) Sergeant?
- (d) Senior Sergeant?
- (e) Chief Inspector?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

- (a) 600.3
- (b) 1,052.2
- (c) 632.5
- (d) 82
- (e) 38

POLICE STAFFING

933 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). What was the total number of sworn Police Officers (FTE) at 30 April 2019 of the rank of:

- (a) Constable?
- (b) Senior Constable?
- (c) Sergeant?
- (d) Senior Sergeant?
- (e) Chief Inspector?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

- (a) 661
- (b) 1,031.3
- (c) 625.85
- (d) 79
- (e) 43

PRISONER NUMBERS

934 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). Can the minister provide the total number of people incarcerated, or held on remand, in each South Australian correctional facility as at:

- (a) 28 February 2019?
- (b) 31 March 2019?
- (c) 30 April 2019?
- (d) 31 May 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

Total Number of People Incarcerated or Held on Remand				
Facility	28 Feb 19	31 Mar 19	30 April 19	31 May 19
Yatala Labour Prison	794	749	755	734
Port Lincoln Prison	173	197	200	198
Port Augusta Prison	797	777	812	806
Mount Gambier Prison	733	758	784	745
Mobilong Prison	693	681	695	644
Cadell Training Centre	202	194	180	187
Adelaide Remand Centre	259	277	267	284
Adelaide Women's Prison	226	244	255	235
Adelaide Pre-Release Centre	84	84	86	94

POLICE STAFFING

935 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). As at 31 October 2018 what was the total number (FTE) of sworn police employed in each of the following:

- (a) Northern District?
- (b) Southern District?
- (c) Eastern Metro?
- (d) Western Metro?
- (e) Non-metropolitan areas?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

- (a) 440.4
- (b) 474.9
- (c) 446.7
- (d) 389.8
- (e) 981.3

POLICE STAFFING

936 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). As at 31 December 2018 what was the total number (FTE) of sworn police employed in each of the following:

- (a) Northern District?
- (b) Southern District?
- (c) Eastern Metro?

- (d) Western Metro?
- (e) Non-metropolitan areas?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

- (a) 450.3
- (b) 462.5
- (c) 431.7
- (d) 398.8
- (e) 980.8

POLICE STAFFING

937 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). As at 28 February 2019 what was the total number (FTE) of sworn police employed in each of the following:

- (a) Northern District?
- (b) Southern District?
- (c) Eastern Metro?
- (d) Western Metro?
- (e) Non-metropolitan areas?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

- (a) 454.1
- (b) 462.2
- (c) 423.3
- (d) 405.3
- (e) 982.8

POLICE STAFFING

938 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 June 2019). As at 30 April 2019 what was the total number (FTE) of sworn police employed in each of the following:

- (a) Northern District?
- (b) Southern District?
- (c) Eastern Metro?
- (d) Western Metro?
- (e) Non-metropolitan areas?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

- (a) 462.4
- (b) 460.7
- (c) 433.1
- (d) 410
- (e) 974.6

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

941 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). How many clients were accessing the Financial Wellbeing Counselling Service on:

- (a) 20 June 2019?
- (b) 4 September 2018?

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

Approximately 1,500 clients received a range of services under the Financial Wellbeing Program in each of the past two years.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

942 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). How many clients will transition from the Financial Wellbeing Counselling Service to a new provider on 1 July 2019? Who is the new provider or providers?

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

All clients participating in the Department for Child Protection's Financial Wellbeing Program either completed their engagement prior to its closure or have been referred to other services.

The Department for Child Protection has:

- directly negotiated with the Department of Human Services to invest in that department's existing state-wide financial counselling program, which funds various non-government organisations
- allocated funding to Relationships Australia (SA) to support various post care support services
- signed an agreement with CREATE Foundation Limited for various services, including the SORTLI app.

All new young people requiring financial counselling services will be considered for referral to one of the identified providers.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLING SERVICES

943 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Where will clients seeking financial counselling services be directed as of 1 July 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has directly negotiated with the Department of Human Services to invest in that department's existing statewide financial counselling program, as well as providing further support to Relationships Australia and CREATE Foundation Limited. All new clients requiring financial counselling services will be considered for referral to one of the identified providers.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

945 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Since 4 September 2018 how many staff from the Financial Wellbeing Counselling Service have accepted targeted voluntary separation packages?

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

Since 4 September 2018, 27 staff from the Financial Wellbeing Program have accepted targeted voluntary separation packages.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

946 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Since 4 September 2018 how many staff in the Financial Wellbeing Counselling Service have resigned?

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

Since 4 September 2018, no staff employed within the Financial Wellbeing Program have resigned.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

947 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Since 4 September 2018, how many staff in the Financial Wellbeing Counselling Service have been redeployed to positions elsewhere in the Department for Child Protection?

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

Since 4 September 2018, 30 staff in the Financial Wellbeing Program have been supported to transition to positions elsewhere in the Department for Child Protection.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

948 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Since 4 September 2018, how many staff in the Financial Wellbeing Counselling Service have been redeployed to positions elsewhere in the South Australian Public Service? Please detail the number that have been redeployed to each government department or agency.

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

Since 4 September 2018, one staff member has transferred permanently to another government agency. A second staff member has moved on a temporary basis.

FINANCIAL WELLBEING COUNSELLING SERVICE

949 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What has the \$1 million allocated to replace the Financial Wellbeing Counselling Service been spent on, or what is it allocated to be spent on? Please provide a breakdown with the spending item and the dollar figure per item.

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

Of the \$1 million redirected from the Financial Wellbeing Program for 2019-20:

- \$700,000 has been directly invested in the State-wide Financial Counselling Program, giving the Department for Child Protection the option to refer clients to an extensive network of financial counsellors across the state
- \$243,000 has been invested in Relationships Australia South Australia's existing post care support services, including counselling, case management, mentoring, support and referral
- \$57,000 has been invested with CREATE Foundation Limited, securing a premium licence for the CREATE Your Future Program.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

950 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the child to staff ratio at each residential care facility in:

- (a) 2017-18?
- (b) 2018-19?

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

The base staffing model for residential care is based upon the configuration of the facility, including the number of children placed, the type of facility (house or unit), and the complexity associated with the child(ren)'s therapeutic care needs.

The staffing configuration can temporarily increase where children present with more complex care and safety needs requiring additional staff support. Any additional staffing requires individual assessment, approval, and review.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

953 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). On average, how many children resided at each residential care facility in:

- (a) 2017-18?
- (b) 2018-19?

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

As at 30 June 2019, there were 217 children in 72 Department for Child Protection residential care facilities.

As at 30 June 2018, there were 227 children in 76 Department for Child Protection residential care facilities.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

955 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost per child, per year living in any form of state care as of 20 June 2019?

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

Out-of-home care expenditure 2017-18 is reported in tables 16A.7, 16A.33 and 16A.34 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

956 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost per child, per night living in any form of state care as of 20 June 2019?

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

Out-of-home care expenditure per placement night for 2017-18 is reported in tables 16A.27 and 16A.33 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

FAMILY-BASED CARE PROGRAM

957 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of family-based care per child, per year as of 20 June 2019?

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

Non-residential out-of-home care expenditure for 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.34 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

FAMILY-BASED CARE PROGRAM

958 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of family-based care per child, per night as of 20 June 2019?

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

Non-residential out-of-home care expenditure for 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.34 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

NON-FAMILY BASED CARE

959 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of non-family-based care per child, per year as of 20 June 2019?

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

Residential out-of-home care expenditure for 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.34 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

NON-FAMILY BASED CARE

960 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of non-family-based care per child, per night as of 20 June 2019?

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

Residential out-of-home care expenditure for 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.34 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

961 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of residential care per child, per year as at 20 June 2019?

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

Residential out-of-home care expenditure for 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.34 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

962 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of residential care per child, per year at Department for Child Protection-run residential care facilities as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

963 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of residential care per child, per year at non-department-run residential care facilities as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

964 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of residential care per child, per year as at 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

965 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of residential care per child, per night at Department for Child Protection-run residential care facilities as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

966 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of residential care per child, per year at non-Department-run residential care facilities as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

FOSTER CARE

967 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of foster care per child, per year as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

FOSTER CARE

968 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of foster care per child, per night as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

FOSTER CARE

969 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of foster care per child, per year in non-metropolitan areas as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

FOSTER CARE

970 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of foster care per child, per night in non-metropolitan areas as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

KINSHIP CARE

971 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of kinship care per child, per year as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

KINSHIP CARE

972 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of kinship care per child, per night as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

KINSHIP CARE

973 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of kinship care per child, per year in non-metropolitan areas as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

KINSHIP CARE

974 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of kinship care per child, per night in non-metropolitan areas as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILDREN IN COMMERCIAL CARE

975 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of commercial care per child, per year as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILDREN IN COMMERCIAL CARE

976 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost of commercial care per child, per night as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

977 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost per individual, per year living in independent living arrangements as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

978 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost per individual, per night living in independent living arrangements as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

GUARDIANSHIP FAMILY DAY CARE

979 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost per child, per day being cared for under the Guardianship Family Day Care response as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

GUARDIANSHIP FAMILY DAY CARE

980 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What is the average cost per child, per year being cared for under the Guardianship Family Day Care response as of 20 June 2019?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

981 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many investigations into alleged abuse or neglect of children took more than:

(a) 28 days to complete?

(b) 60 days to complete?

(c) 90 days to complete?

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

The time taken to complete investigations in 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.11 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

CHILD PROTECTION

983 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many allegations of alleged abuse or neglect of children and young people were identified as requiring no further action?

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

As at 31 May 2019, 54,098 notifications had been 'screened out' in 2018-19.

CHILD PROTECTION

984 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many allegations of alleged abuse or neglect of children and young people were identified as requiring further action?

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

As at 31 May 2019, 22,597 notifications had been 'screened in' in 2018-19 and required a response by the department. There were an additional 3,218 notifications that required a South Australia Police response.

CHILD PROTECTION

985 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many investigations into alleged abuse or neglect of children and young people were initiated?

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

The number of investigations in 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.4 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

CHILD PROTECTION

986 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many investigations into alleged abuse or neglect of children and young people were completed?

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

The number of investigations finalised in 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.12 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

CHILD PROTECTION

987 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many allegations of abuse or neglect of children received by the Department for Child Protection were substantiated?

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

The proportion of finalised investigations substantiated in 2017-18 is reported in table 16A.12 of the 2019 Report on Government Services (RoGS). The 2020 RoGS will be released early next year.

CHILD PROTECTION

988 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many complaints were lodged with the Department for Child Protection by foster or kinship carers against non-government or commercial agencies?

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

Where complaints or enquiries are received by the Department for Child Protection relating to the actions of non-government agencies these are referred to those agencies. Where complaints or enquiries relate to service provider contract performance or compliance issues, these are managed through the Department for Child Protection Contract Management Framework. No new matters were raised in 2018-19.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

989 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many complaints lodged with the Department for Child Protection by foster or kinship carers against non-government or commercial agencies were substantiated?

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

Where complaints or enquiries are received by the Department for Child Protection relating to the actions of non-government agencies these are referred to those agencies. Where complaints or enquiries relate to service

provider contract performance or compliance issues, these are managed through the Department for Child Protection Contract Management Framework. No new matters were raised in 2018-19.

FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE

990 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many complaints were lodged with non-government and commercial agencies by foster or kinship carers complained about the actions of non-government or commercial agencies?

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

The Department for Child Protection does not receive complaints that are lodged with non-government agencies.

FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE

991 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). In 2018-19, how many complaints lodged with non-government and commercial agencies by foster or kinship carers complained about the actions of non-government or commercial agencies were substantiated?

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

The Department for Child Protection does not receive complaints that are lodged with non-government agencies.

CHILD PROTECTION

992 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Which non-government agencies currently provide care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection through a contract between the agency and the department? Please list each agency.

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

The department engaged the following non-government organisations in 2018-19:

- Aboriginal Family Support Services Limited
- Anglican Community Care Incorporated
- Baptist Care (SA) Incorporated
- Centacare Catholic Country SA Limited
- Junction Australia Ltd
- Safe Places for Children
- SYC Ltd
- Uniting Communities Incorporated
- Uniting Country SA Inc
- Minda Inc
- Novita Children's Services
- CARA
- InComPro
- Autism SA
- Anglicare SA Ltd
- Relationships Australia (SA) Inc (Time for Kids)
- Catholic Church Endowment Society Inc
- Life Without Barriers
- The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust
- HenderCare
- Hessel group
- Key Assets
- Lutheran Community Care

CHILD PROTECTION

993 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Which commercial entities currently provide care to the children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection through a contract between the agency and the department? Please list each entity.

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

The department did not engage with any commercial entities for the provision of care in 2018-19.

CHILD PROTECTION

994 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection by non-government agencies in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION

995 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection by commercial agencies in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

996 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). How much money was paid to each non-government agency in 2018-19? Please provide a list with the name of each organisation and the total payments made in the 2018-19 financial year to each agency.

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

997 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). How much money was paid to each commercial agency in 2018-19? Please provide a list with the name of each organisation and the total payments made in the 2018-19 financial year to each agency.

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

FOSTER CARERS

998 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection by foster carers in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

KINSHIP CARERS

999 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection by kinship carers in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

RESIDENTIAL CARE

1000 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection through residential care in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION

1001 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection through commercial care in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

GUARDIANSHIP OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1002 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection by Family Day Care providers in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION

1003 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection under Other Person Guardianship arrangements (also known as Long Term Guardianship) in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION

1004 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost of providing care to children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection through Independent Living arrangements in 2018-19?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

FOSTER CARE

1005 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost in 2018-19 of providing foster care to individuals aged 18 or over who were previously under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

RESIDENTIAL CARE

1006 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost in 2018-19 of providing residential care to individuals aged 18 or over who were previously under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

CHILD PROTECTION

1007 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). What was the total cost in 2018-19 of providing commercial care to individuals aged 18 or over who were previously under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection?

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

The Department for Child Protection has not yet finalised its financial reporting for 2018-19, therefore this data is not currently available.

GUARDIANSHIP OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1010 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). How many children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection were awaiting finalised NDIS plans as at 20 June 2018?

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

There were no children under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection on 20 June 2018.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES

1019 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (19 June 2019). Which Aboriginal-controlled organisation has been engaged to provide a culturally responsive residential care service for young people? And:

- (a) What is the dollar value of this contract?
- (b) Was this service put out the public tender? If so, when and how many tender applications were received?
- (c) When was the tender awarded?
- (d) Is this service currently operational? If not, when will it be operational?
- (e) How many children will be cared for at the residential care facility?
- (f) How many children will receive services through the residential care service?

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

As announced by the Government on 15 May 2019, the Department for Child Protection undertook a selective tender process to identified Aboriginal community controlled organisations experienced and capable of providing culturally sensitive and therapeutic services.

Following a competitive evaluation process, InComPro was awarded an agreement for these services on 17 April 2019, with the agreement commencing on 8 May 2019. In accordance with Premier and Cabinet Circular 27, a summary of information regarding this agreement has been publicly disclosed via the SA Tenders and Contracts website, reflecting an overall contract value of \$1,354,651.

The service became operational on 31 May 2019 and supports four young people across two houses.

FAMILY GROUP CONFERENCES

1045 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (20 June 2019). How many Family Group Conferences were held by the Youth Court of South Australia in:

- (a) 2018-19?
- (b) 2017-18?
- (c) 2016-17?
- (d) 2015-16?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

Questions relating to the number of Family Group Conferences held by the Youth Court will need be directed to the Courts Administration Authority.

CARE AND PROTECTION ORDERS

1046 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (20 June 2019). How many applications for a care and protection order were sought by the Department for Child Protection in 2018-19?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

Questions relating to care and protection order data will need be directed to the Courts Administration Authority.

CARE AND PROTECTION ORDERS

1047 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (20 June 2019). How many applications for a care and protection order sought by the Department for Child Protection were granted in 2018-19?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I have been advised:

Questions relating to care and protection order data will need be directed to the Courts Administration Authority.

CARE AND PROTECTION ORDERS

1048 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (20 June 2019). How many applications for a care and protection order sought by the Department for Child Protection were rejected in 2018-19?

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

I have been advised:

Questions relating to care and protection order data will need be directed to the Courts Administration Authority.

STRATA TITLES

1070 Mr BOYER (Wright) (3 July 2019). Which Government agency has responsibility to ensure compliance with the Strata Titles Act 1988 and in particular compliance of Strata corporations maintaining fidelity guarantee insurance?

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

Responsibility for the Strata Titles Act 1988 (the Act) lies within the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI). This responsibility transferred from the Attorney-General's Department in August 2018.

Although responsibility for the Act falls within DPTI there is not currently a separate resource or body which regulates the Act in relation to requirements for strata corporations and compliance generally including the requirement to maintain fidelity guarantee insurance.

Consistent with the approach previously taken by the Attorney-General's Department for many years, DPTI encourages all those who contact us regarding strata matters to seek their own legal advice and provide the details for the Legal Service Commissions' free services as a starting point for them.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2019).

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

The Marketing Communications Guidelines were updated in March this year.

Future Adelaide is a partnership between the government of South Australia and NewsCorp to promote South Australia interstate and continue to drive confidence in the South Australian economy. It is not just an advertising campaign. For example, it draws on news content on the Adelaide Now website and as such, has already featured images of members of parliament including the Leader of the Opposition.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLING SERVICE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (6 June 2019).

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

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) has directly negotiated with the Department of Human Services (DHS) to invest in that department's existing statewide financial counselling program from 2019-20. This program was subject to a previous DHS tender process.

The State Procurement Board approved DCP's procurement approach on the basis that no further market intelligence would be obtained through a tender, when the main providers of financial counselling in South Australia underwent an extensive tendering process in December 2016.

DCP also sought input from the peak body for financial counselling in South Australia, the South Australian Financial Counsellors Association (SAFCA), which was supportive of this approach due to the unnecessary strain that a tender would place on service providers.

This was considered to be the most appropriate and cost-effective method of delivering financial counselling services in South Australia, as it reduces significant duplication of services across the non-government sector.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLING SERVICE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (6 June 2019).

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

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) has directly negotiated with the Department of Human Services (DHS) to invest in that department's existing Statewide Financial Counselling program from 2019-20. This program was subject to a previous DHS tender process.

The State Procurement Board approved DCP's procurement approach on the basis that no further market intelligence would be obtained through a tender, when the main providers of financial counselling in South Australia underwent an extensive tendering process in December 2016.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLING SERVICE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (6 June 2019).

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

As at 27 June 2019, one full-time staff member has left the department, having transferred permanently to another government agency. A second staff member has also moved on a temporary basis.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLING SERVICE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (6 June 2019).

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

All 59 full-time equivalent positions within the Department for Child Protection's Financial Wellbeing Program ceased on 30 June 2019.

Of the 59 affected staff members who worked on the DCP Financial Wellbeing Program, 27 have accepted targeted voluntary separation packages, 30 have been transitioned to other roles in DCP, one has transferred to a permanent position in another agency, and one has taken up a temporary position in another agency.

EXCEPTIONAL RESOURCE FUNDING

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (18 June 2019).

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

Although the funding procedure was under review, applications were still considered on a case-by-case basis.

CHELTENHAM PARADE INTERSECTION

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (18 June 2019).

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

Service relocation works on the Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard, and Cheltenham Parade Intersection Upgrade are expected to commence in late 2019.

CHELTENHAM PARADE INTERSECTION

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (18 June 2019).

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

To date, discussions have taken place with various stakeholders regarding the Port Road, West Lakes Boulevard, and Cheltenham Parade Intersection Upgrade, including:

- City of Charles Sturt;
- Utility Service providers (including, Telstra, APA Gas, SA Power Networks, SA Water, ElectraNet, Optus, and NBN Co);
- property owners ISPT Super Property (Bunnings and Harvey Norman site);
- JLL Property (property managers managing ISPT Super Property's commercial properties located near the project footprint); and
- local businesses, including CMI Toyota Cheltenham, National Storage, CastStone, Lofty Building Group, Tradelink, Bunnings, Harvey Norman and Statesman Windows.

Communication activities will be undertaken, including Community Information Sessions currently planned to take place late in the third quarter of 2019, to ensure key stakeholders are kept informed. Service relocation works are expected to commence late 2019.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (20 June 2019).

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

The cost is \$200,000.