

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 13 November 2019

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

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

Bills

LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Conference

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:31): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to the gallery today students from Moana Primary School, who are guests of the member for Kaurua. Welcome to parliament, and I hope you enjoy your time here.

Bills

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (NITROUS OXIDE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr BOYER (Wright) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr BOYER (Wright) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak to the Controlled Substances (Nitrous Oxide) Amendment Bill, which will amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Put simply, this bill looks to address the use of nitrous oxide for illicit purposes. Like many people here, I suspect that I was largely naive about the use of nitrous oxide for illicit purposes before I was elected to this place. Not long after my election, I was contacted by residents of Breakwater Court in Gulfview Heights, who alerted me to a longstanding issue they had with people parking in their court late at night and inhaling hundreds of nitrous oxide canisters.

I went to inspect this location on many occasions and quickly realised that the residents' claims were completely correct. Not only did that loitering, hoon driving and nitrous oxide use reported by residents cause a great disturbance in their neighbourhood but there were clearly some serious health effects for the people inhaling the nitrous oxide.

To restore the peace and amenity for the people who live there, my initial response was to work with council and police to try to somehow discourage those people from using Breakwater Court to consume nitrous oxide. With the support of Salisbury council, SAPOL and the local Messenger newspaper, we managed to achieve that aim. I still regularly visit Breakwater Court, hop out of my car and try to find empty nitrous oxide canisters. I am pleased to say that so far I have been unsuccessful.

In one of my regular meetings with SAPOL officers in the northern and north-eastern suburbs, I raised again the issue of nitrous oxide use and was told that there were strong suspicions that a fatal road accident not far from Breakwater Court may have been caused in part by young people consuming nitrous oxide, then jumping in their cars and speeding away. This information

motivated me to dig a little bit deeper into the potential harm caused by nitrous oxide to the user. It also caused me to investigate laws currently in place that discouraged or prohibited the use of nitrous oxide for illicit purposes such as inhaling.

Nitrous oxide is used for a number of very legitimate purposes, too, including as a propellant in whipped cream dispensers, as an anaesthetic and in the automotive industry. In its propellant form, nitrous oxide comes in small, metal canisters, also known as bulbs, that are inserted into a whipped cream dispenser. It is these canisters that are also used as an inhalant. This is normally achieved by the user using what is referred to as a 'cracker', a small device into which the canister can be placed, and once it is screwed up tightly it releases the nitrous oxide.

Users generally release the gas into a balloon because it comes out at sub zero temperatures that can cause damage to the inhaler's mouth and lips. Once the nitrous oxide is dispelled into the balloon, the user can then inhale it in smaller amounts. The effects of nitrous oxide on the human body are numerous and significant. In small doses, it provides the user with a short 20-second high and is characterised by light-headedness and euphoria. However, in larger amounts it can cause disassociation of the mind from the body, loss of coordination, dizziness and, in cases of extreme use, it has been known to cause permanent nerve damage.

Data around the prevalence of nitrous oxide use is scarce due mainly to the way in which it is regulated. However, through the consultation I have undertaken on this bill, it has become clear to me that people in the medical profession feel that its use is on the rise. Cases of prolific use have increased and, of course, it is these medical professionals who treat the users who see the damage that prolific use of nitrous oxide causes. Given the similarities between illicit nitrous oxide use and the use of glue, aerosol cans and other solvents used for inhaling, it occurred to me that the laissez faire approach to the purchase of nitrous oxide canisters is problematic.

Upon researching what laws are in place to prohibit illicit use, and comparing those laws with what is in place in other jurisdictions, it was apparent to me that laws regulating the sale of nitrous oxide in South Australia were out of step with the use of the drug for illicit purposes. It was for this reason that I asked the parliamentary library to research both the effects of nitrous oxide upon the human body and any mechanisms that had been put in place in other jurisdictions in Australia or across the world to prevent its illicit use.

Coincidentally, during this process I joined other members of this place, at the invitation of Encounter Youth, to conduct a late-night—or really early morning—tour of Hindley Street to look at the fantastic work that Encounter Youth does in keeping safe those people who are out enjoying themselves on a Friday or Saturday night on Hindley Street. On that journey, we came upon a couple of nitrous oxide hotspots, including one near the corner of Hindley and Morphett streets, which is regularly strewn with empty nitrous oxide canisters. I have also consulted with Encounter Youth on this bill, and I am very grateful for its support and advice.

Currently, the law prohibits the sale of nitrous oxide to a person or persons whom the seller reasonably suspects is going to use that nitrous oxide for illicit purposes. There are some quite obvious limitations to this approach, including the fact that the test of whether or not the seller believes the purchaser will be using the nitrous oxide for illicit purposes is very subjective and difficult to prove.

What I am proposing is to bring the regulation of nitrous oxide into line with other like substances, such as solvents and aerosols, which, although also designed for very legitimate uses, can also be easily misused. The bill proposes to achieve this by first of all making it an offence to sell nitrous oxide to anyone under the age of 18 years. After much consultation on this point, including with members of the restaurant and catering industry, nobody has advised me that there is a need for persons under the age of 18 years to buy nitrous oxide for any lawful reason.

The bill also seeks to make it a requirement for sellers of nitrous oxide to keep a record of the person or persons to whom they sell the product and to request identification, which will then be recorded in a register. I feel that this strikes a balance between stamping out some of the pretty transparent retailer practices currently occurring in some smaller shops that sell nitrous oxide canisters conveniently located right next to a bag of balloons and, hopefully, discouraging some would-be users from purchasing the canisters in the first place. I am completely convinced that the

sellers of this product know who is buying it and they know the intended use. In fact, there is at least one convenience store on Hindley Street that I believe only sells the canisters on Saturday nights.

The bill will also seek to create an additional offence and increase penalties specifically targeted at nitrous oxide. As part of my consultation, I have spoken with those who have advised me that, although nitrous oxide is undoubtedly harmful and dangerous, it is not high on the list of priorities in our war against drugs. But I say to them and to those in this place who may be undecided about their support for this bill: do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. A small step is better than no step at all. I look forward to working constructively with members of this place to progress this bill and address this important community safety issue. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

Parliament House Matters

CHAMBER PHOTOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER (10:41): I advise members that I have allowed a camera in the gallery today. For your convenience, please be advised.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Light, I also welcome to parliament today the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and the Hon. Steph Key. Welcome back to parliament.

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CARPARKING REQUIREMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:41): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce the car parking requirements bill to the house in order to rectify a problem that exists in many of our communities. Under the current development assessment system, suburban communities have experienced the congestion, inconvenience and lack of amenity that urban infill development has caused, specifically where developments have not been required to provide sufficient car parking for the needs of the residents.

In recent years, we have witnessed development approvals for apartment blocks, townhouses and subdivisions, which have undercut the car parking requirements of councils' development plans through an on-merit development assessment process. This has delivered streets congested with parked cars and ruined streetscapes. Members who represent suburban electorates know the problem to which I refer, as I have had much feedback from local members of parliament. This issue is not confined to just the inner city suburbs but also new developments in areas right across the state.

Both new developments, like Lightsvue, and infill developments in the inner suburbs have been affected by this development. The car parking requirements included in this bill have been developed in response to the community sentiment many members have brought to my attention, which they have encountered through doorknocking and street corner community engagement. Moreover, the car parking requirements included in this bill have also been shaped by a long and thorough process of public consultation with key stakeholders in the planning, development and building industries, as well as representatives of resident and action groups.

What we have heard loud and clear is that inadequate car parking provision is severely impacting on community wellbeing. The parked cars of residents are spilling out onto the streets,

creating unwanted congestion adversely impacting on visitors, including carers and health professionals attempting to provide essential care to residents in densely developed neighbourhoods.

Development should serve the community and the planning system should demand design standards that deliver community amenity. Unfortunately, the draft Planning and Design Code has not taken the opportunity to regulate car parking requirements which ensure that the parked cars of all residents do not spill out onto suburban streets.

In the draft code, the requirement of two off-street car parks per dwelling does not apply until a threshold of three bedrooms is reached. This is inadequate to avoid on-street car parking congestion. The bill requires a second off-street car park at the threshold of two bedrooms because young children do not stay young for long. They grow, get a driver's licence and buy cars. I am sure members have noticed that in new developments.

A criticism that has been raised against the bill is that it does not accommodate the take-up of public transport use or other more environmentally friendly modes of transport than private car use. My response to this criticism is that we must be flexible in how we deal with these problems today while intelligently planning for the future. The reality is that public transport use does not increase unless services are provided.

I will give you an example. At a recent Public Works Committee meeting, I heard evidence given by departmental officials regarding public transport services to the new Lightsview development. I also heard from residents about how public transport is not being taken up. On the one hand, the department argues that public transport is not provided because people are not using it. On the other hand, people are not using public transport because it is actually not provided, so they are buying cars. We have this chicken and egg situation of what comes first but, in the end, what we have are congested streets.

Having walked through Lightsview, as other members have, I know that all you have are streets that have actually become de facto car parks to the detriment of the amenity and the people who live there. The reality is that, despite many endeavours, private car use remains high and will remain high for some time unless a viable alternative is found. Public transport options must be convenient, accessible and frequent. We do not have that situation yet. Ride-sharing arrangements, including autonomous vehicles, may also prove popular at some time, but for how long must residents in congested suburban neighbourhoods have to wait for this reality?

The bill does not seek to deal with all the challenges presented by urban infill development—that would be a discussion for another day and perhaps on another bill—but what it does provide is an immediate remedy to a burning community problem through statute, which cannot be overturned through a development assessment process.

So what does this bill do? The objectives of the bill are to set a minimum of one car park on site per dwelling, regardless of description, like studio apartment, etc., and to provide a minimum of two on-site car parks for dwellings of two or more bedrooms. Where on-site car parking cannot be provided, car parking spaces can be contained in an off-street car parking site if the site is within 100 metres of the dwelling, providing some flexibility.

Importantly, there is another element to this bill. If these conditions are not met, the development becomes classified as a restricted development, which includes public notification and appeal rights. This means it still can go ahead, but there are proper notification and appeal rights for neighbouring residents. That is the aim of the bill and I think it warrants support. I would urge all members concerned with the amenity and, importantly, the livability of our communities to support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October 2019.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:48): In continuing my remarks, having acknowledged the contribution of members speaking on this bill, I wish to commend the thoughtful contributions respectfully delivered to the benefit of all those listening to this debate. May I also acknowledge Eva Nikitas, who is a legal research officer of our research library here at Parliament House, for her comprehensive work identifying South Australia's current laws, the history of previous attempts, the legal approaches and, of course, the current laws around the country. This is always an important assessment that is done and, on this occasion, it has been admirably carried out by Eva.

Stakeholders have been many—the people of South Australia—but there are two I would like to acknowledge. One is the South Australian police and particularly the enforcement unit. They have repeatedly made themselves available for consultation and consideration of this bill and foreshadowed amendments. The other is the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, Mr Soulio, who, in the event that the legislation does pass and has the favour ultimately of the parliament, has been very helpful in his advice as to what role he might play in a proposed regulation of the industry.

The key aspect of this legislation, which has been important to me and to many, whichever way they propose to vote, is that we must stop punishing the providers of service in this industry. We must do that. Some will think that others may be punished or should be, but it is very important that in 2019 we take a new brush to how we might deal with the provision of this service and the industry generally.

We must protect women particularly from being assaulted and abused and who feel unsafe to be able to go to the police in those circumstances. We must protect women against exploitation in their chosen field and workplace and we must support those who want to change career. There have been specific and unique aspects of that proposed in the bill. Most importantly for everyone here, we must maintain criminal sanctions to ensure that children and vulnerable persons are not able to access or be a provider of services in this industry.

The most recent and contemporary assessment of the sex work industry has taught me three new things, but it may be different for others. Firstly, the advance of the industry in 2019 means that overwhelmingly we have sex workers who operate their business on a mobile phone. It is quite a new dynamic and it has meant that there is mobility and self-management for many.

However, the spectrum of those continuing to be engaged in this industry is vast. We have the confident advocacy of members of the profession who are in coalition and who have bravely and confidently presented their arguments—indeed, they are proud of the services that they make available to those in the community—to a cohort, again principally of women, who are and remain vulnerable. They are living under a veil of silence. They are not confident to step forward. They are in need of our protection and continue to be vulnerable. I think we need to appreciate the diversity and breadth that we are working with.

The second thing that has become clear to me and confirmed—and there are foreshadowed amendments if we have the opportunity to debate them—is that there is a general South Australian public intolerance for what is known as street soliciting or public soliciting. I think it is important and incumbent on us to ensure that we respect that overwhelming concern. I do not know how many times I have had people during this debate come to me to say, 'I think you are absolutely right, Vickie. Decriminalisation is wrong. We can't let that situation abide, but don't let them be in my street.' I think we need to recognise that.

The third is that, just as we have in other industries, whether it is gambling or alcohol sales, there is a certain element of concern relating to the exposure of the vulnerable and/or young. We need to recognise that. I think the importance of having a framework of regulation is overwhelming. Accordingly, regulations to operate a business where sex workers are employed would also form part of a proposed amendment that I have foreshadowed during this debate.

I would welcome the opportunity for members to be able to contribute to this. They may well have the capacity and desire to improve it, and that is great; however, at this point, I urge members to consider supporting the final and second reading of this bill at this stage. That will enable us to discuss, thrash out and confer on how we might bring about a balance between protecting the women

who are currently in this industry and ensuring that we quell the fears that have been raised about a practice that has otherwise been behind closed doors for which the public have a level of intolerance.

I think the public are sympathetic, but there is a level of intolerance that we in this chamber must embrace. I would urge members to support the second reading of this bill so that we may deal with this, and show South Australians that we are mature in our approach to this issue, that we are willing to take on the tough issues and that we are willing to accommodate their concerns.

In conclusion, can I say that there is one area of very significant change on which I have been educated by South Australia Police and, in particular, their enforcement unit. Once we sat down and spoke to them, they were able to explain their areas of concern and how we might address them, rather than going back time and again to this threshold decision of whether we even open up the debate. I sincerely thank them for that. I urge members to consider supporting the second reading so that we may deal with the hard issues.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 19
Noes 24
Majority 5

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Gee, J.P.
Marshall, S.S.
Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.

Bedford, F.E.
Boyer, B.I.
Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.
Pisoni, D.G.
Teague, J.B.

Bell, T.S.
Chapman, V.A. (teller)
Gardner, J.A.W.
Hughes, E.J.
Sanderson, R.
Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bettison, Z.L.
Cregan, D.
Harvey, R.M.
Luethen, P.
Mullighan, S.C.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Picton, C.J.
Treloar, P.A.

Brown, M.E.
Duluk, S.
Knoll, S.K.
Malinauskas, P.
Murray, S. (teller)
Pederick, A.S.
Power, C.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Koutsantonis, A.
Michaels, A.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.
Speirs, D.J.
Wingard, C.L.

PAIRS

Stinson, J.M.

McBride, N.

Second reading thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: I thank the people in the gallery for their cordial behaviour during this debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2019.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:04): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
 Noes 22
 Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:09): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
 Noes 22
 Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome former premier the Hon. Dean Brown to parliament.

Bills

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:14): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	24
Noes	21
Majority.....	3

AYES

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

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

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CODE AMENDMENTS) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Second Reading

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:20): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes23
Noes21
Majority2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (RESERVES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:25): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes24
Noes21
Majority3

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Motions***INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITY**

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:29): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Day of People with Disability on 3 December; and
- (b) acknowledges the important social and economic contribution South Australians living with a disability provide when sufficiently supported to participate and engage in society.

I rise to recognise the International Day of People with Disability on 3 December and acknowledge the important social and economic contribution that South Australians living with disability provide when sufficiently supported to participate and engage in society.

Each year, the International Day of People with Disability is held on 3 December. In December 1992, the United Nations appealed to governments around the world to observe this important day. We use this day to celebrate the lives and contributions of people with disability all over the world. We aim to increase awareness and understanding of disability-related issues and the achievements of people with disability within our community.

In Australia, we celebrate certain people in our community more than others, people such as sports stars and celebrities. Most people with disability do not want special praise. They just want a chance at an ordinary life where they can be celebrated within their own communities as equal citizens. I acknowledge people with disability I have met who are living and working in our community today, some of whom are working and contributing when they were told they would do nothing but sit in institutions.

Over 4.4 million people in Australia have some form of disability—that is one in five people—and 2.1 million Australians of working age have disability. Unfortunately, of these, just over a million are employed, with another 114,900 looking for work. It is not just about work. The important social and economic benefits people living with disability provide to South Australia also include those who volunteer. We know that there are about 2.3 million people in Australia living with disability or long-term health conditions who volunteer in Australia. People with disability who volunteer make up 33 per cent of this population compared to people without disability who volunteer, making up 39 per cent of that population.

This important day today enables us to promote an understanding of disability issues and to mobilise support for the dignity, rights and wellbeing of persons with disability. It allows us to increase awareness of the rights and the objectives to be derived from every aspect of the political, social, economic and cultural life of persons with disability and, importantly, to reflect upon those persons closest to us whose lifestyles and daily routines are affected because of a lack of access.

Our friends, neighbours, colleagues and relatives need us to ensure that we implement positive policies which mean that people living with disability can work, have access to public transport and participate in school, TAFE, university, life and more. According to the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, persons with disability face discrimination and barriers that restrict them from participating in society on an equal footing with others on a daily basis.

It is more difficult to be included in the school system and employment, to live independently in the community, to move freely and to participate in sport and cultural activities. Although responsibility for people living with a disability has now passed to the commonwealth through its national disability scheme, which is excellent for the most part, there is still a long way for it to go before it achieves the ultimate goal. As the shadow minister for human services, I will continue to advocate to this state government and the federal government on their promises to deliver inclusion for people with disability and to properly implement and fund the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

There are currently thousands of South Australians living with disability who are facing uncertainty regarding their ongoing care and support because of the Marshall Liberal government and its failure to guarantee funding certainty for essential disability services, the responsibility for which still lies with the state, as the NDIS is not designed to meet the needs of all Australians with a disability. This includes adequate detail around the South Australian taxi subsidy scheme, in particular.

It is important to acknowledge that not all South Australians living with disability will qualify for the NDIS. The state government must stop ignoring disability support services that rely on block funding arrangements for those who are not on the NDIS. The NDIS has the potential to be of life-changing benefit to people living with a disability. That is its potential, but only if it is managed effectively and actually fully implemented.

Without the service guarantees, people living with disability are less mobile and less able to live their lives with choice and freedom. This means that they have less opportunity to spend time with family and friends, that they are less able to get to work and that their quality of life is damaged. NDIS funding is meant to improve their lives, but mismanagement means that their lives are harder rather than easier. People living with disability in rural and regional areas are particularly vulnerable to this because their services are so specialised and specific to their needs.

This means that their anxiety about continuity of funding is particularly high. The government needs to take steps to ease this anxiety. It must be a priority for this government, and we are not seeing that yet. I mentioned earlier the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme (SATSS). Around 5,000 vulnerable South Australians are still up to \$5,000 worse off under this current Liberal government's revised taxi subsidy scheme.

Just last month, after six months of petitions, rallies and action by the disability community, supported by the Labor Party as well as the Access cab operators in South Australia, the government announced the extension of the South Australian taxi subsidy scheme, providing either a 50 per cent or 75 per cent subsidy for those living with disability to get to appointments and to prevent isolation. Whilst I and all the people advocating, including the disability community, welcome an extension, it is concerning that hundreds and hundreds of vulnerable South Australians are being left out of pocket because of the transport funding deficit offered by the NDIS.

This lack of certainty still sits within the SATSS announcement. The state and federal Liberal governments both assured Australians that the state and federal systems would be cashed out into an appropriate transport funding system under the NDIS. I have an anecdotal story from Avril Meyer, who works as a public servant:

My disability at times can make transport rather difficult due to fragile bones and being in a wheelchair. I can become reliant on the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme (SATSS)/Journey to Work Subsidy Scheme (JTWSS) to ensure I can continue to participate equally and inclusively within society.

Avril has reported quite specifically that the lack of funding for transport services through her NDIS plan leaves her \$6,800.64 out of pocket, which makes it very hard for her to get to work and to make the contribution to society and the economy that she wants to make. These barriers must be overcome.

I have spoken to so many people who have laid out the loss of their transport subsidy from their NDIS plan. Without these assurances, without these certainties, people living with disability cannot achieve the full, successful life that we want to see and that they want to see. It is appalling that people are being left to pay hundreds or thousands of dollars to get to appointments, events, training or work to prevent social isolation.

I have spoken before about the \$3,500 of mobility allowance that is still not being provided, but that was being provided through Centrelink. I am calling on the federal and state governments to pull their fingers out and to sort out transport subsidies for all vulnerable South Australians. I celebrate all South Australians living with disability. I look forward to attending and seeing all members at the celebrations in Victoria Square, along with the Lifetime Support Authority, a great organisation, and many others on Friday 6 December from 11am. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:39): I move to amend the motion as follows:

After paragraph (b), insert:

- (c) recognises the state's first Disability Inclusion Plan, Inclusive SA, as an important step in improving access and inclusion for people with disability.

This year, the theme for the 2019 International Day of People with Disability is 'The future is accessible', and nothing is more fitting to support that theme than the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to working toward an inclusive and accessible future for all South Australians living with a disability.

We are very proud, as a government, that this work has been undertaken. In fact part of the government's first 100 days in office was the commitment to advance the Disability Inclusion Bill 2018, which in fact became the first piece of legislation passed in parliament, with the act commencing 1 July 2018 under the new government. This signals our government's commitment, and we applaud the Premier for progressing this.

The legal framework supported the development of South Australia's first state disability inclusion plan, Inclusive SA, which was gazetted on 31 October this year. It is a commitment we made, provided for under the legislation, and it has been delivered. It guides and coordinates the consistent approach to disability inclusion by bringing state government agencies and local councils together to reduce the barriers faced by people living with disability. All disability access and inclusion plans will be required to outline strategies that improve outcomes for people with disability in areas such as access to built environments, information, communication, transport services, programs and employment. I reiterate 'transport', given the previous contribution.

Whilst Inclusive SA sets the focus for the next four years, it is a living document that will respond to shifting priorities and new information. The government will revise the plan in two years to reflect social, political and environmental changes and to accommodate any recommendations that are approved as made by the Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability.

Can I say that the government is proud to recognise that employing people with a disability brings a range of skills, abilities and qualifications to the workplace and reflects the greater community. People living with a disability make strong connections with customers, boost team morale and enhance business image. In light of the commitment to giving opportunities in employment, the government includes several actions in the state disability inclusion plan.

These relate to item 12, which is to develop a communications strategy to promote BoardingCall, the South Australian government's recruitment register for boards and committees, to ensure it is promoted to people living with a disability; item 37, which is to support and promote the implementation of the Office of the Commissioner of Public Sector Employment; item 38, which is to increase employment opportunities across all levels in the South Australian public sector through targeting of job opportunities for people living with a disability under section 65 of the Public Sector Act; and item 39, which is to develop data measures to track the percentage of people living with a disability employed and retained in state authorities.

Many members will remember the life of Quentin Kenihan. His passing brought with it an announcement by the government of \$1 million for the City of Adelaide to build an inclusive park commemorating his legacy as a disability advocate, actor and filmmaker and someone who really warmed the hearts of many South Australians. The regional play space, which has been integrated into Rymill Park, replacing the existing play space, will be of course most welcome, in addition to other inclusive playgrounds. Guidelines will be published on these later in the year.

The website accessibility across government initiative, which was established on Global Accessibility Awareness Day on 16 May this year, is in essence an online accessibility policy with a supporting online accessibility toolkit, which has been worked on in consultation with Vision Australia, the Royal Society for the Blind and people with lived experience with a disability and other key stakeholders. The announcement of the role of the Disability Advocate and the appointment this year of David Caudrey, who commenced as the Disability Advocate in January, have been important initiatives. We commend him already for the work that he is doing in this area.

Notwithstanding the member's previous contribution, South Australia committed \$749 million to NDIS to support the delivery of quality services for South Australians, which has reached full scheme transition in June this year. There is also the National Disability Strategy, on which South Australia, along with other states and territories, is working with the national team to ensure that we develop the National Disability Strategy 2010-20.

Finally, there is the federal royal commission. As Attorney-General, I have responsibility in respect of the state's role in royal commissions. The state government has committed \$5.5 million in our 2019-20 budget, dedicated specifically to a central response unit to address and coordinate the South Australian government's response to the commonwealth Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability. This is in addition to a commitment made earlier this year to provide \$3.2 million to set up a similar response unit in relation to the aged-care quality and safety unit that operates.

Our government is vitally committed to the advancement of those who are living in South Australia with a disability. As demonstrated by the work that has been undertaken in the first 18 months of this government, we are here to make a real life-changing difference to those in South Australia.

From my own perspective, can I say that every time I look at an announcement or a proposal or a strategy for a person with a disability, I think of my own cousin who was born with a lack of oxygen. He has never walked or talked. He is now a man in his 50s. He has been a joy to our family. He is now living semi-independently from his parents. His father recently passed away. Together with his mother, my aunt, now in mature years, they spent a lifetime in dedication to his care. He is now making other people's lives happy: those with whom he lives and others on Kangaroo Island. I always look at disability initiatives within his prism and say, 'How would this affect Phillip?' For me, this is Phillip's Law.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (11:47): I would like to speak today on the motion brought forward by the member for Hurtle Vale. What is life all about? It is pretty simple for most people: loving family and friends, keeping healthy, having an active social life and a job. However, for many people with a disability, the last item on this list—having a job—is surprisingly hard to achieve.

It is very unfortunate that some people who may not have had direct contact with people with some form of disability may not understand what capabilities these people have. Over four million people in Australia have some form of disability. That is one in five people; 18.6 per cent of females, and 18 per cent of males in Australia have a disability. The likelihood of living with a disability increases with age. A person who may have a disability can have a physical or mental impairment that limits one or more major life activity.

There are many forms of disability. The three most common physical disabilities could include acquired brain injuries, epilepsy or cerebral palsy, or multiple sclerosis (MS). Disabled people may express depression and social isolation as a result of their limitations. They may also experience financial instability as a result of their mental or physical limitations. Can you imagine being confined to a restricted vehicular unit, being in a wheelchair or confined to a bed, and how that might impact on your mental wellbeing?

I have had numerous contacts with people who suffer from autism and also from Autism SA. These people are very capable of carrying out various tasks throughout their lives and in the community. While autism is classified as a disability, for the time being there is no special medicine or treatment that would make it go away. No-one can catch it from being near you. People with an autism spectrum disorder usually live a very normal life.

In Port Pirie and surrounding regional locations, we have very good facilities for people with a disability, including organisations like Bedford, Orana and SCOSA. These organisations not only provide assistance for those with an issue but, very importantly, give great support to the parents of these children or youths. They also allow these people to feel pride, as not only can they associate with others who may have similar issues but, very importantly, they can be proud to contribute something to society by making various items or products for the respective organisations.

I have previously spoken in this house about Kellie Martlew in particular, who has progressed from attending one of these organisations to now working for Woolworths. I first met Kellie some years ago. I also come into contact with various others who are being given the opportunity to work in other areas, including Woolworths, Coles, Spencer Motors Port Pirie and other firms. Kellie Martlew, in particular, has attained great achievements in the Special Olympics, playing tenpin bowling, and attending the Special Olympics World Summer Games in Abu Dhabi in 2019.

Kellie worked extremely hard to achieve this position. She had the support of our community and the business community throughout, not only physical and mental support but also financial support. In her journey, Kellie has been accompanied locally by other people who have had similar issues, including those working in other organisations or in the private sector.

Recently, I was privileged to be involved with the Lions Club of Port Pirie, who suggested that there was an opportunity to provide a Liberty Swing for the Mid North Education Centre at Port Pirie. The Liberty Swing is a swing where a person in a wheelchair or someone confined to a bed can be put into a swing apparatus, secured and locked in, and be able to actually swing. The member for Stuart was there as the minister representing the Premier at the opening of this swing.

The Mid North Education Centre accommodates children who have some form of disability, including those who are confined to a wheelchair, and one particular child, Georgia, who is basically confined to a bed. These children cannot participate in recreational activities, such as being on a swing and enjoying swinging in the air and things everybody else takes for granted.

As I said earlier, the Liberty Swing allows children in wheelchairs or in a bed, as in Georgia's case, to be locked into the enclosure and enjoy being pushed through the air. Just to see the faces and the look in their eyes when they were in this apparatus was something money cannot buy. The funds to achieve this were also supported by the Premier with a grant of up to nearly \$10,000 towards the total cost, which was in the vicinity of \$75,000.

After seeing the faces of these children, my concern about this facility is: what happens in out-of-school hours or during school holidays? There is nothing else similar in our community for these people to enjoy outside the school grounds. Therefore, I have made a suggestion to the Port Pirie Regional Council that it utilises some of the funds achieved many years ago by the sale to Country Health SA of the Port Pirie YMCA clubrooms and to put them in a trust fund. I have suggested that perhaps the Port Pirie Regional Council could utilise a portion of these funds, together with any community finances, state, local or private funds that may be available to supplement the proposal, to provide a similar facility for children with a disability to enjoy this activity outside school hours.

We must always remember that just because someone has a disability it does not preclude them from participating in the community, nor should they be excluded from other activities that others may take for granted. In closing, I want to say how emotional it can be when you see your own grandchildren enjoying facilities and activities that normal people enjoy and then see that these other children cannot enjoy what we in this community and in this house have taken for granted over many years.

To see the expression on these children's faces is worth a million dollars. Every one of us in this house, and everybody in our communities and in our great state, should appreciate and respect those people and make certain that we provide as many opportunities for them to enjoy as we do for other children. Again, I commend this motion to the house.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:54): I rise to speak today in support of this motion on behalf of people living in King, and I thank the member for Hurtle Vale for bringing this motion to parliament. I also wholeheartedly support the Attorney-General's amendments and words today, as well as the words spoken by the member for Frome. Each year, the United Nations announces a theme to consider how to address barriers to inclusion in society. The theme for 2019 is 'The future is

accessible'. What a great theme and vision. Today, I am so pleased to talk about what the government is doing to drive real change and make progress—deeds, not just words.

This year's theme fits seamlessly with the Marshall Liberal government's ongoing commitment to working towards an inclusive and accessible future for all South Australians living with a disability. We are proud of the work undertaken in this space since coming to government. An accessible and inclusive state means everyone can actively participate in and access all aspects of life, despite their age, disability, gender, religion, sexual preference or nationality. This includes, but is not limited to, services, places, events, education, training information, housing, law and justice, and employment. It is a place where everyone can feel safe, respected and comfortable being themselves.

By improving accessibility and inclusion in South Australia, everyone will benefit. An accessible and inclusive South Australia can stimulate our economy, increase tourism, improve business reputations, improve employment opportunities, increase employment satisfaction, improve community participation, breakdown stigma, improve life expectancy and increase physical and mental health.

The Marshall Liberal government recognises that people living with a disability play a vital and valuable role in shaping the state's social and economic future. As part of the Marshall Liberal government's first 100 days in office, the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 became the first piece of legislation passed in parliament and commenced 1 July 2018. The legislation signalled the government's commitment to create a more inclusive South Australia. The act provides a legal framework to support equal access and participation for people with disabilities in the community, including recreation, education, health, employment and transport.

A key requirement of the act is the development of South Australia's first state disability inclusion plan, now called Inclusive SA, which was gazetted on 31 October this year. Inclusive SA outlines the state government's vision for an accessible and inclusive South Australia based on fairness and respect. It guides a coordinated and consistent approach to disability inclusion by bringing state government agencies and local councils together to reduce the barriers faced by people living with disability.

All disability access and inclusion plans will now be required to outline strategies that improve outcomes for people with a disability in areas such as access to built environments, information, communication, transport services, programs and employment. Whilst Inclusive SA sets the focus for the next four years, it is also a living document that will respond to shifting priorities and new information.

Our government is committed to giving people a say before decisions are made, and we gathered feedback into this new Inclusive SA strategy through talking to the community about our state plan and asking for their thoughts, their recommendations and their priorities. We talked with the community about our state plan in March and April 2019, and 384 people told us what they think should be in our state plan. Some of the other people we talked to were family members, carers, people who work with people with a disability, people who work for the state and local governments, and researchers.

We talked to groups in our community. There are many groups in our community who face extra barriers and challenges. These groups include women with disabilities, children with disabilities, people with disability from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds, people with disabilities who come from different cultures and people with disabilities who speak languages other than English at home.

We also subsequently used YourSAy for online engagement from 6 August to 30 August 2019. People had myriad ways and opportunities to provide input by joining this discussion. This consultation is crucial because people with disabilities are not always included when we make decisions, and they should be. They must be included in the design of strategy and the execution of plans.

If we look at the limited numbers of people with disability elected to councils or state and federal government who are directly involved in strategy directions, decision-making and policy and

lawmaking, we see that these numbers are too low. Therefore, right now, incorporating the lived experience that is provided during consultation discussions is critical. It is important and makes perfect sense to include people living with disabilities in the decisions that affect them.

We have listened and will continue to listen to what would make quality of life better and what would provide fairer access to opportunities. The government will revise the new plan in two years to reflect social, political and environmental changes, as well as any response to recommendations made by the Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability.

Unfortunately, people living with disability face discrimination and encounter barriers to public services and shared spaces, and things many of us take for granted can be hard to use or simply inaccessible. One in five South Australians report having a disability and we are committed to supporting them to fulfil their potential as citizens.

Furthermore, the Marshall Liberal government recognises that employing people with disability brings a range of skills, abilities and qualifications to the workplace that reflects the greater community. People living with disability make strong connections with customers, boost team morale and enhance business image. Research shows that employees living with disability also create real business cost savings as they take fewer days off and stay in jobs longer than other employees, therefore reducing staff turnover and lowering recruitment and retainment costs.

People living with disability can also often provide creative and innovative business solutions, as they are used to having to find solutions to difficult and sometimes complex problems that require an open mind, creativity and flexibility. Inclusive workplaces are also more likely to generate and attract employees who are more engaged, motivated and productive.

Whilst across Australia improvement has been made in this area, we acknowledge more work needs to be done to increase employment for people living with disability, and many people have come to my office to discuss this. In light of this, the Marshall Liberal government included several actions in the State Disability Inclusion Plan, Inclusive SA, to assist in improving access to employment opportunities and provide better support within workplaces for people living with disability. South Australians have a proud history of commitment to equality and justice and now we will take steps to ensure people with disability have equal opportunities.

In closing, I wish to thank the people living in my community in King who advocate and help people living with disability. A special mention to parents, SSOs and advocates like Ben Waechter, who advocates statewide to improve the lives of people living with disability. I met Ben at the City of Salisbury, having a say on behalf of people living with disability. Ben has also initiated the KYD-X Expo and puts his heart and soul into helping parents learn about all the choices available to make things more accessible for people in their lives and helping every person reach their full potential. A special mention also to Cathy, who leads the Empowering Futures service, which is an awesome service provider enriching people's lives.

I encourage my community to share their experience with me and to educate me in their lived experience. I look forward to my community's feedback about how we can make South Australia more inclusive for all—every person, every chance. I totally support this motion.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:04): I rise to support the member for Hurtle Vale's motion:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Day of People with Disability on 3 December; and
- (b) acknowledges the important social and economic contribution South Australians living with a disability provide when sufficiently supported to participate and engage in society.

To have a full and active life involves more than just education, employment and access to services and facilities, although we all agree these are very, very important. Social inclusion is often put at the end of a long list of needs; however, social isolation is something experienced by many people with disability.

You cannot underestimate the power of sport when it comes to developing a range of life skills: teamwork, cooperation, the challenges of handling disappointment and defeat, and working

towards a common goal as a team. Sport is also a great stress reliever and helps develop self-esteem, independence and self-worth. In my electorate of Mount Gambier, there are people who work very hard to improve the access and participation of people with disability in sporting and recreational activities. They do not do it for publicity or awards and most of the time the only payment is a smile and a thankyou.

In regional communities, sport is an institution, a huge part of life. In Mount Gambier, the Tigers Netball Club has been running for nearly 30 years and, like many sporting organisations, it has been run solely by volunteers. It is a team that specifically caters for people with disabilities to play sport, engage with other people and compete against other regional teams. Danielle Burford stepped in to run the team 14 years ago not because she had a child with a disability but because she saw the benefits the team was having on other players. With a social work background, Danielle and other local volunteers got the club incorporated and helped apply for funding for uniforms and a trailer.

Whether you have a physical, neurological or intellectual disability, you are welcome at the Tigers. There are no criteria; it is for all abilities. Some players are on the spectrum, have cerebral palsy, Down syndrome or play with a walking frame. Danielle says the best thing for her is watching the players support each other and how they cheer each other on. The players like travelling away to carnivals, getting away from routine and getting to know people from other teams. Most importantly, they all enjoy being part of something.

Danielle says she gets more pleasure out of it than the players and says the team has become part of her life, so much so that she even invited all of them to her own wedding. After her own two children were born, Danielle had to take a step back to concentrate on her own family. Like all volunteer-run organisations, they are struggling to find people with the right skill set to take on roles so the team can continue.

The Commercial League is another long-running local team that welcomes players of all abilities. Every Wednesday night, around 50 bowlers take over the lanes of Mount Gambier's only tenpin bowling alley in a competition that has been running for more than 20 years. For those who have not watched, it has quite an atmosphere. Joyce Cleggett has been keeping the league going for 14 years by sorting out teams, collecting money, organising presentation nights and keeping it all flowing smoothly. Her oldest son Keith, who has Down syndrome, has been playing the game for 15 years.

Joyce says the main objective is just to have fun and have a bit of friendly competition. The players are of all skills and abilities but on the lanes all are equal. Earlier this year, the league faced a major challenge—the potential loss of their venue after it was shut down unexpectedly. Joyce says that the players were upset and for 10 weeks nobody got to bowl, and the social value of the team in people's lives became very apparent. Luckily, the venue was taken over and reopened and the team was able to play again.

You only have to look at events such as the Paralympics and the Invictus Games to see how much of an impact sport can have on the lives of those participating. This year, Paralympian Kurt Fearnley is the patron for International Day of People with Disability, and he wants to use the role as a launching pad for further action. He says:

People with disability are entitled to the same respect, independence and choice as others and we need to talk honestly about the barriers in society and work together to break them down.

Teams like the Tigers and Commercial League are great examples of people working together at a local level to break down barriers. I would like to take this opportunity to give credit to Danielle, Joyce and all those people in our community who take the time to organise these team events and make a difference in the lives of people living with a disability. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (12:10): I rise today, like other members, to support the motion that recognises the International Day of People with Disability, ahead of the formal day on 3 December 2019. A very broad range of topics has been covered so far in regard to disability within our state and more broadly. The first section of commentary I would like to make is that I think we are starting to move towards a society that really recognises the broad and vast array of people who are captured by the term 'disability'.

What is helpful for one person even within the same group or level of disability is not necessarily what empowers or strengthens the life of somebody else. That was the main underpinning argument and rationale for the introduction of the NDIS, and I think it was broadly welcomed by absolutely everybody within the community. At its core, it is about the individual, whether that be across the sectors of employment, sport or the media.

I think the goal, in terms of the forward progress within the area that everyone is seeking to achieve, is to reach a point where the community does not judge or make a determination of somebody's ability before engaging with, talking to and understanding that individual. While we still have a long way to go in that area, we are certainly making progress. Raising the profile of people with a disability within each of those sectors and across public life more broadly only helps to further that cause.

I was very pleased to hear that Kurt Fearnley was recognised as the patron of International Day of People with Disability in Australia this year. Kurt and I were colleagues for a long period of time. He is a man who is certainly very passionate about furthering the cause of people with a disability in Australia and more broadly. On a personal note, I would like to wish him well for his future.

The member for Frome touched on the issue of employment, which is key to the empowerment of the sector. Whilst I do not necessarily think that employment is any more or less important for somebody with a disability than for anybody else within our community, it certainly allows everybody to function, move and empower themselves. We have seen within the private sector a growth in willingness to engage and put forward employment programs. I take this opportunity to encourage the private sector to continue that growth.

A range of research has been done around the impact of people with a disability on particular organisations. While I will not go into specifics today, there have been very favourable results in terms of productivity, reliability and, importantly, loyalty of those employees within their organisations, and of the value they can deliver, not just by widening the diversity within the workplace but primarily in terms of the return that business can have through employing that person.

I certainly welcomed the passing of the Disability Inclusion Act and, subsequent to that, the launch of the State Disability Inclusion Plan in South Australia. I think it is very sensible for us as a state to set out a vision for the future we want to see in our community for people with a disability. I acknowledge the work that the state is doing around a range of different areas—some big, some small. There are a couple of programs in particular I would just like to draw attention to.

One that was brought to the fore by the Deputy Premier in her contribution was the legacy of Quentin Kenihan and the inclusive park within the City of Adelaide, which was certainly a vision that he personally held for a long period of time. I am very glad that the state was able to make this come to fruition, and it is very appropriate that his legacy is honoured in that manner.

I also bring attention to a very small program within the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure that identifies bus stops that are barriers and ways to make those bus stops more inclusive. I have had personal reflections from members of the community, recognising the great work that DPTI is doing in that area to make our public transport system more accessible. While some of these things are not necessarily at the front of people's minds on a day-to-day basis, the small things do matter and I am very happy to see that continue.

On a different note, I acknowledge and recognise the fact that the state, with forethought, has provided funding for the response unit to the royal commission that is underway. No matter which level of government you are in and no matter which part of society you are in, the equal treatment of everybody is obviously something we strive towards. This royal commission is an opportunity for improvement, something that I think everybody wants to see. It is probably going to reveal a range of issues that are certainly suboptimal but, at the same time, improvement and moving forward is something that we all have to strive for.

In terms of the broader scenario, I again acknowledge members for their contributions on this motion. Everybody has a wideranging viewpoint on the issue, and certainly that reflects the sector itself. As I touched on at the start, no disability affects an individual in the same way, just as a different range of things affects everyone completely differently. No set of parents or individual copes or

manages a set of circumstances in the same way. We certainly always have to have that lens across the sector.

Finally, I wish the participants of the Tri State Games the best of luck as they compete this week. For members who are unaware, the Tri State Games is an annual event that brings together athletes with a disability across southern Australia. For the last two years, the event has been held in the Port Adelaide and broader western suburbs region. I am lucky enough to be their patron and I had the privilege of opening the games on the weekend. I wish them the best of luck and welcome those from interstate to our state. I certainly support this motion and look forward to hearing other contributions.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:18): I rise to support the motion put forward by my colleague the member for Hurtle Vale. Certainly, it is an area of public policy, and it is very important that we get it right. I will not repeat everything said by other speakers, who have probably said it better than I can, but I agree that we are doing things better in terms of public policy in this area than we used to. We still have a long way to go. We still have a number of barriers in our thinking in terms of dealing with people who are living with disability.

There are a couple of areas I would like to highlight, which have come to my attention on a number of occasions. On the issue of transport, I am aware that the minister made some comments a few weeks ago about how he had essentially solved this problem, but I would respectfully disagree with that interpretation. I would suggest that—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Your glass is always half empty, isn't it, Tony?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I would respectfully disagree with the minister and certainly with the people who—

Mr Duluk: You can't respond to interjections.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Sorry? What are you talking about?

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

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Light.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I would have thought that this is an area of public policy that members may have an interest in—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —and deal with respectfully.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: —and it is a very important motion.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Members may wish to sidetrack, and if they want to make a contribution they should do so, but perhaps they should listen because this is an area of public policy that we still need to get right. We are doing it much better than we did, but to suggest, as some people have in this place, that we have got it right, that we have solved the problem, is just a nonsense. I will give the example of public transport. We were told a week or so ago that the matter had been resolved, but that is certainly not the understanding of people living with disability and their families who are consumers of transport services.

There are two issues, and one is that transport is a very important issue for everybody. We need to make sure that they are financially supported. Also, remember that it was the federal Liberal government that took this matter to the Federal Court. On money grounds, they were trying to deny people the sort of funding they require to access public transport; it went through the Federal Court. From a policy point of view, at the federal level it still remains unresolved.

There are people in the NDIS scheme who still do not receive the sort of funding they require to make sure they can fully participate in society and live full lives. It is interesting to note that that has been a feature of other speakers, which I agree with. They say that people living with disability should have the opportunity to fully participate in society in a whole range of ways.

To suggest that we have resolved that issue is wrong, but we need to. When you have a federal government that boasts a huge underspend from the NDIS and counts that underspend towards their surplus, one has to ask why we have people in the community who still do not have the sort of funding required to fully participate in society. Secondly, people who care for them also do not get the sort of support they require. There are families in my community who still do not get the sort of support they require.

I say we do it better, and I will give an example of how we do it better. However, sometimes we do not think about things enough. At a particular train station in my area there is a spot where you can get on the train and there is a spot where you can park your wheelchair to wait for the train, which is good. I think that is excellent, but the spot has no cover; it is at the other end of the train station. A person in a wheelchair has to wait in that nominated spot, which makes sense—I accept that—but the cover or the station canopy is at the other end of the platform, so this person has to wait in the rain or in the heat. If you think about this sort of thing, you would put a spot for a person to park their wheelchair under cover, but it does not exist.

I have raised this with DPTI in the past, and it still has not been fixed. There are things that we do better, but we still do not think about the implications. We tend to do things to a whole set of rules and regulations rather than the practical application of what is required. Another matter I would also like to mention—

Mr Cregan interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If the member would like to make a contribution, he has an opportunity to do so. Clearly, he has nothing meaningful to say, otherwise he would stand up himself.

Another matter I would like to raise is the issue of education. This is not necessarily a reflection on this current government because it is an area about which I think we need to do a lot more right across the country. We need to make sure that families have a whole range of education opportunities in the communities in which they live. In my community, we still do not have enough places to cater for people to undertake their schooling; they still have to move out of our community to do that.

Sadly, the number of young children requiring a special class or a disability service is increasing. The fact that a number of children and their families still have to travel outside the area to get that education and services puts an additional burden on them. Also, it does not enable those families to socialise in the community like other families, which is very important because it provides community support.

There are a number of areas where I think we are doing better, but there are a number of areas where I think we could still do better. I welcome the government's inclusion plan. I think that is a welcome addition to public policy. The only caveat I would place on that plan is that, like a lot of plans, it is only as meaningful as the funding available for its implementation.

Unlike the NDIS, I would hope that this plan is actually fully funded and implemented in the way it is written because, despite very good intentions—and I think there are very noble intentions in the NDIS—the lack of funding to date has caused a lot of families quite a few problems. With those comments, I certainly support the motion, and I congratulate the member for Hurtle Vale on bringing this very important area of public policy to our attention.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:25): I rise to make a fairly short contribution. I thank the member for Hurtle Vale for bringing this forward, and I appreciate the improvements by the amendments of the Deputy Premier, and all those who have made a contribution. I would like to comment particularly about an outstanding event in Port Augusta that runs through the winter, and that is inclusive basketball.

I have been incredibly fortunate throughout my life, and I hope it continues, with regard to health and ability to participate in all sorts of physical activities. I have never taken it for granted. While I have been fortunate not to see things through a different lens, I have never taken it for granted. I have put a fair bit of effort in a private capacity into supporting people who are not as fortunate as me in that way, but who are more fortunate than me in other ways; they might be smarter or have a lot of other things going for them that I do not have.

Most recently, over the last few years in Port Augusta inclusive basketball has taken that town's sport supporters and broader community members by storm. An absolutely outstanding program has been running there now for four years, I think. It was probably started by Emily Holden, a wonderful young woman and local leader involved in many other things, but of course aided by many people—family members, local community members, the basketball community—and lots of people come along to watch. Initially, I went along a few years ago to provide some support, offer some encouragement and to learn a bit. I go nowadays for selfish reasons, to be quite honest, as it is one of the most fun, most enjoyable and happiest things that I get to do in any week during the winter when it is on.

The joy with which the players go about their competition and participate—and there is a juniors section and a seniors section—is incredibly infectious. It is fun for family and friends and it is fun for other members of the community like me, who turn up just to be there and cheer and get pleasure from doing that. It is something that the players look forward to like you would never imagine. When I see junior players, younger kids on the street, or adults who participate, it is almost always the first topic of conversation: 'Looking forward to inclusive basketball on Tuesday night this week.' It is absolutely outstanding.

I want to very genuinely commend the organisers of this sport in Port Augusta and acknowledge the great community support. Perhaps most importantly, as I share this as one of my experiences, I highlight to the house how much good comes out of really active public team participation in many ways. Of course, there are lots of other things that people with a disability can do that are incredibly productive, but I highlight this activity because of the sheer pleasure it gives people.

Every single person in the basketball stadium—whether they are a player, a parent, a brother or a sister, whether they are a basketball follower or just a community member such as me—gets something out of this. The grand finals, which are held at the end of the season, are massive events. The number of people who come out to support the players and the families is really impressive; it is really tremendous, as is the function afterwards.

The last thing I would like to say is that people are aware of Port Augusta, people are aware of some of the challenges we have, some of the great strengths we have and some of the natural advantages we have. Port Augusta has impressed me for two decades now—in fact, a bit over two decades now—with regard to the willingness of people on the street to accept those members of the community who have a disability.

I will give you one real-world example that I have seen time and time again in Port Augusta. I am sure that it is true for many other places as well, but I have not seen it displayed quite as well as in Port Augusta—that is your typical group of mid-teenage boys acting pretty tough, looking like maybe they are up to some mischief, maybe wondering how much fun they could have in a way that might not be exactly the way their parents would expect or hope that they would behave. They are doing absolutely nothing different from what most of us did. There is probably no man who did not act that way at some stage when he was a teenager.

When these sorts of hardened young men come along and a person with a disability comes in the other direction, I see that they have complete respect for that person. If it was another 15, 16, 17-year-old boy coming the other way, who knows what might have happened, but when a person with a disability comes the other way in Port Augusta they make space and say, 'G'day, mate'. They usually know that boy or girl's, or man or woman's first name. They say 'Hello, how are you going? Everything good? Yep? No worries. See you later.'

It is the happiest, most respectful passing on the footpath that you could hope for from a group of people who at that stage in their life do not necessarily treat everybody that way. I think that speaks incredibly well of my community in Port Augusta, and I congratulate Port Augusta on that.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:32): Can I just take this quick opportunity to tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that we were thinking of you and your community during the bushfires over in Port Lincoln.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Ms COOK: You were missed. Thank you very much to all the people who contributed. I will start by confirming that we will support the amendment offered up by the Attorney-General. I also commit to our support of the work happening in the space around real inclusion. As pointed out by a number of people, there is a way to go. This real inclusion and delivery of the inclusion plan will require more than just goodwill: it will require investment and real community engagement as well. I look forward to seeing that investment and that engagement and watching the results of that.

Thank you very much to the Attorney-General for her contribution and for sharing her cousin Philip's story. The lived experience is always really valuable, and I can see that the Attorney is very caring and considerate of the experience of her cousin. We appreciate that. Thank you to the member for Frome also for his contribution and for mentioning Kellie Martlew, who is a personal friend of mine. I am a big fan and very jealous of her capacity for bowling, because I am terrible. She is not just a personal friend; she is a Facebook friend and I follow her and enjoy her contributions. I congratulate her on her employment, as well, at Coles. She is a champ.

The Hon. G.G. Brock: Woolworths.

Ms COOK: Woolworths, sorry. It is the anniversary, isn't it? I am being brainwashed by the Coles thing that is going on at the moment. Also, thank you to the members for Stuart, King and Mount Gambier for connecting the community and their participation in sport. I enjoyed hearing about the Tigers basketball club. I am a netball player myself and have recently taken up walking netball, which can be played by people of all levels and all ages. That is potentially something that you could think about, member for Stuart—some walking basketball in the city of Port Augusta. Walking netball is extremely good, and it is a lot of fun when you have very long arms because you are not allowed to jump.

Thank you to the member for Colton. I always appreciate his contributions based on lived experience. All of us here, while we might not be fans of his politics, are fans of his achievements and performances over many years.

I say a personal thankyou as well to the member for Light. When I came into this place, he gave me many opportunities and much support to provide him with representation at a number of events and briefings from his department, as I have had a special interest in supporting inclusion and the work of people in the disability space for many years of my own professional and personal life. I thank the member for Light for sharing and being so supportive. That said, I look forward to the inclusion plan being rolled out. I thank members for their contributions and commend the motion.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:36): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 21 November is National Agriculture Day;
- (b) celebrates our farmers, fishers, producers and related businesses and organisations who help feed, clothe and grow our social and economic wellbeing across South Australia; and
- (c) recognises the vital economic contribution by agriculture to South Australia's economy.

I rise today to move that this house acknowledges that 21 November is National Agriculture Day and, in so doing, recognises the vital economic powerhouse for this state and nation that is the agriculture sector. This motion suitably recognises the contribution of our farmers, fishers, primary producers and all associated businesses and organisations who feed, clothe and grow our social and economic wellbeing across South Australia and across Australia.

Not enough is made of the fact that food and farming make up Australia's biggest sector. In 2017-18, it was valued at a combined \$60 billion. Not enough is made of the fact that Australia grows 93 per cent of its own food and exports two-thirds of its produce, directly employing more than 250,000 Australians. Not enough is made of the fact that Australian grain farmers play an important role as stewards of the land, sustainably managing over 23 million hectares of agricultural land, creating over 100,000 jobs in grains and 198,000 jobs in food manufacturing and helping to underpin the social fabric of rural and regional Australia.

National Ag Day on 21 November is rightly and importantly loudly trumpeting those facts. In my view, across the board, the value of agriculture and agribusiness in this nation and here in South Australia is shamefully under-recognised, so I proudly stand to mark 21 November as National Agriculture Day. I commend the National Farmers' Federation for commencing this important annual initiative in 2017 to better get the word out about just how much this nation and this state rely on the contribution of our estimated 85,700 agricultural businesses across Australia.

They work tirelessly and triumph often against the elements. They are at the mercy of when and where it rains, drought, fire and flood, disease, competing land uses and fluctuating market prices. The many risks of farming were again on show last week in the Riverland, when a three-minute hailstorm wiped out the majority of the entire year's work and investment for multiple growers of grapes, stone fruits, nuts and grain.

Ongoing drought across the country serves to highlight the knock-on effect that goes through whole communities. We have long understood that when it is good for farmers on the land it is good for shopkeepers, mechanics, tyre fitters, rural merchandise distributors, shearers and casual farm workers, machinery and vehicle dealers, etc. The list goes on. The agriculture and livestock industries drive local economies, especially rural and regional local economies.

So often, the adversity and struggles of farmers—what needs to be done to better support them, how bad the drought is, the storm damage or the falling produce prices—are the only stories cutting through media. More must be done to get the success message out and the fact that this nation and this state are ever reliant on primary production and farming communities for their continued prosperity.

The gross value of the Australian agriculture industry increased by \$3.7 billion, from 2014-15 to \$58.1 billion in 2015-16. Australian grain farmers play an important role as stewards of the land, sustainably managing over 23 million hectares of agricultural land, creating over 100,000 jobs in grain and 198,000 jobs in food manufacturing, and helping underpin the social fabric of rural and regional Australia. Here in South Australia, primary industries and agribusiness revenue in 2017-18 was \$14.8 billion, directly and indirectly contributing \$19.7 billion to our great gross state product.

The sector in this state supports an estimated 152,000 jobs and that is approximately one in five working South Australians somewhat connected to this industry. Direct international exports grew by 3.4 per cent in 2017-18 to reach \$6.7 billion. It is very clear that the future prosperity of this state and our nation remains heavily reliant upon the performance of the sector. It is important that all these facts are better promoted and that the farmers in this state and across the country are better recognised for the job they are doing for us all.

The mantra of National Agriculture Day is that farmers deserve recognition for putting the world's best food on our tables, and the world's best fibre on our backs. With 150 registered ag day events last year, it is expected there will be even more celebratory breakfasts, morning teas, sausage sizzles, lunches and market events across cities and rural areas around our nation next week. I wish the best for all involved in planning and carrying out those events and I hope they will be successful.

According to the ABS, there are 15,000 South Australian farmers. I would like to break down the individual sector figures to ram home the vital economic importance of our primary industries across our regions. Incredibly, despite drying conditions, such is the expertise of our farming entrepreneurs that South Australia's grain harvest for 2019-20 is estimated at 6.2 million tonnes for a farmgate value estimated at \$1.8 billion, which is slightly higher than the last two seasons. All this activity is created on just some 5 per cent of the arable food producing land that is still available in this state.

I look forward to continuing to work with colleagues and stakeholders on future policy areas to ensure increased protection for our farmers and their food producing soil that is so vital for our agriculture and agribusiness industries. In celebrating the role of agriculture and primary industry around the state, the point is also made that, of all state jurisdictions, South Australia relies, and has always done, most heavily on agriculture to fuel its state's economy, well epitomised by the grapes and wheat that feature so prominently on the carpet at our feet in this chamber, such has been the longstanding reliance on these important sectors in South Australia.

The need for such protections for our prime, reliable, cropping, high-yield, increasingly scarce land is clear. In 2017-18 the grain industry—that is, wheat, barley, hay, feed grains, canola and lentils—generated \$4.2 billion in revenue. These commodity exports from around the state were worth \$2.3 billion. The primary production value of our livestock industries—beef, sheep, pig and chicken meat—totalled \$1.9 billion in 2017-18. Over 11 million sheep, 950,000 head of cattle and 57 million kilograms of wool are produced annually for a total production and processing revenue in the vicinity of \$2.4 billion.

In 2017-18, the dairy sector increased its production value by 11 per cent to \$217 million. The wool sector production was worth \$568 million. South Australia's cattle and sheep industries produced \$3.4 billion in revenue and South Australia's beef industry gross revenue exceeded \$1.3 billion. These are extraordinary contributions made by those sectors.

National Ag Day also celebrates the role of our seafood and forestry industries, both just as vital to our state's economic future as our grain and livestock sectors. In 2017-18, South Australia's seafood industries generated 70,000 tonnes of seafood, adding \$814.5 million to our state gross product with a farmgate value of \$465 million. The wild catch and aquaculture industries generated total revenue of \$515 million with tuna exports alone valued at \$115 million and the southern rock lobster fishery—wonderful fishery that it is—at \$125 million. Our forestry sector revenue totalled nearly \$2 billion with plantations covering some 176,000 hectares.

Another important underlying fact when citing all these revenue figures is that agriculture is the largest employer in many regions or rural and remote communities. Farming, primary production and agribusiness are the backbone of regional communities across South Australia and Australia, supporting retail and service industries that together all sustain life and entire populations outside capital cities.

In 2017, there were over 85,000 agricultural businesses in Australia, such is the crucial role the sector plays in job creation and regional sustainability. I am proud to be part of the Marshall Liberal government that has demonstrated in so many ways that it backs regional South Australia and recognises the incredibly valuable economic and employment role that primary producers and all the associated industries play in the wellbeing of this state as a whole.

Our \$750 million Royalties for Regions program and \$150 million Regional Growth Fund are flagship policies. But also, this government, via its 'growth state' initiative that is underway, has the plan and vision to grow by 3 per cent per annum South Australia's \$14.8 billion food, wine and agribusiness sector. We have instigated the development of the state's first Grain Industry Blueprint and we have undertaken the first trials of industrial hemp in South Australia for a projected \$3 million per annum industry.

We have introduced farm debt mediation and invested \$7.5 million in a new red meat and wool growth program. There is the well overdue \$25 million investment in the rebuild of the 100-year-old South Australian dog fence to benefit the livestock industry and the \$3.8 million announced to protect South Australian sheep and cattle industries from biosecurity threats. We have also waived stamp duty on multi-peril crop insurance, slashed the ESL bills to support farmers and communities that were so cruelly increased without notice by the former government, and abolished payroll tax for small business.

The Marshall Liberal government has introduced the Genetically Modified Crops Management (Designation of Area) Variation Regulations to lift the moratorium on GM food crops on mainland South Australia from 1 December to increase farm profitability and drought resistance. It is very important that that regulation be allowed to pass through the other house, for it will play a vital role in helping farmers who are doing it tough because of drought and other conditions to improve the profitability of their businesses. It will allow the industry to bring itself into line with other jurisdictions around the country so that they are not lagging behind in old times and so that they can access the newest technology and the newest means by which they can improve their business profitability.

We are investing in new automatic weather stations and AgTech demonstration farms. We have ensured that 29 new mobile phone towers for regional South Australia have been installed to support farmers and farming communities. We have introduced tougher laws for trespassing on ag

land and have recently announced the inaugural winner of the new South Australian Agricultural Town of the Year awards to highlight the vital role that agriculture and primary industries play in regional communities. This new program, coincidentally, was launched this time last year on National Agriculture Day.

These are all initiatives that demonstrate the priority placed by the Marshall Liberal government on providing deserving support and recognition of this state's primary industries being the economic and vital powerhouse that they are. Only last week this government, in partnership with the federal government, reached a historic agreement to increase production at the Adelaide Desalination Plant to provide 40 gigalitres of water this financial year to enable the release of the equivalent amount to help drought-affected farmers around the nation and, with this deal, secured a further \$10 million for the South Australian Drought Resilience Fund to help South Australian farmers in need.

In the last 18 months or so, since becoming the member for Narungga, I have been privileged to meet so many hardworking farmers, agribusiness owners and skilled, passionate people from primary industry, supporting organisations and companies, who all back and invest and devote their lives to our agriculture and primary production sector and to making this state a better place. I have had the honour, too, of meeting agricultural researchers and scientists. I have toured the Roseworthy and Waite campuses and had my eyes widened and opened to the possibilities that agriculture and primary production offer this state and all who live here. There are some seriously exciting things happening at those research facilities.

To mark the 2019 National Agriculture Day, this motion applauds and acknowledges the outstanding contribution of our agriculture, food and beverage, primary production and agribusiness sectors. The significance of this sector is further heightened when compared with this state's mineral sector—also vitally important, I must say. Regionally based mining and gas production accounts for more than 35 per cent of South Australia's traded exports.

National Agriculture Day will be held on 21 November around the nation to celebrate the role that agriculture and communities outside the cities have had in forming our nation and the future crucial role they will play in sustaining the future of our state and nation. It is a valuable day to sell the virtues of our regional cities and towns, to sell the opportunities available in primary industry and regional centres and to sell the exciting future ahead. The federal government's plan is to boost the size and scale of the agriculture, fishery and forestry industries, from their current \$60 billion to \$100 billion by 2030, and the Marshall Liberal government continues to play and will continue to play its part in this vision.

Already underway is our very important work in developing SA's new regional development strategy. Its purpose is to deliver a government plan for investment, support and priorities, as stated by the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. This is a step that is necessary to ensure that regional SA maintains and grows its economic capability and supports people in their decision to live in regional areas. In closing, I once again thank all in this sector, which is our biggest in the nation and our lifeblood across regional communities. You do a wonderful job. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:50): I also rise to support this motion. I commend the member for bringing this motion to the house, and I agree with him that we often take for granted the contribution of primary industries in Australia and in South Australia. Especially in metropolitan areas, people often have warm feelings about farmers, but a lot of the produce that is generated is just taken for granted, that it is just going to be there. Many people at the moment, nationally and in this state, who are involved in primary industries find that it is very hard with the extensive drought that has hit New South Wales and Queensland especially but has spread to Victoria and has been in parts of South Australia for up to three years now. That is having a major impact.

I will get on to some of the things that I think the government should be doing to assist some of the drought-hit communities and primary producers in this state. As the member for Narungga said, we stand upon this carpet, dating back to the 19th century, that acknowledges the contribution of primary industries at that time. Primary industries have remained the economic foundation of South

Australia across a broad spectrum of primary products. We have grain and grapes on the carpet, but obviously, as the member has said, the contribution from primary industries extends far beyond that.

The figures are always worth recounting. I will not go into the same detail and breakdown, but the contribution of just short of \$20 billion to our state's economy is incredibly significant. When you add primary industries and agribusinesses, the 152,000 people employed there, directly or indirectly, it is a massive contribution to our state. Clearly, there are other contributors: manufacturing, to a degree, but less so, and the service sector, of which the educational sector is part. There are a lot of other contributors to the state, but over the years, year in and year out, agriculture and primary industries have been there to massively contribute to the prosperity of our state.

I believe there is a bit of irony involved in the National Agriculture Day itself. The National Farmers' Federation, and I think one of the departments in the federal government, were involved in getting the day off the ground. I think one of the sponsors was Gina Rinehart, who is a very significant landowner in my part of the state. The irony here is that, with some of the challenges that we are now facing, the challenges that our scientists and scientists globally have predicted, Gina Rinehart is part of 'climate change denial central' in Australia. In fact, she provides very significant funding for the groups that deny the scientific consensus on human-induced climate change.

Most of the farmers I speak with, not all but a large majority, acknowledge climate change. They believe that they are on the front line of climate change in this state. I mentioned yesterday that I was west of Buckleboo last week with a young farmer in his header as we were taking in a crop of barley. We had a long discussion about climate change, about GM, about soil and about the things that they have done over the years to adapt to changes and to sustain a business in an area that is well north of Goyder's line.

We know that Goyder's line is moving south, and I would like to acknowledge that fantastic piece of work done in the 19th century. I guess our assessments now are far more sophisticated and that when we look at Goyder's line now, or a modern Goyder's line, it is that ratio between precipitation and evaporation and the changes that are actually taking place.

One of the things about our primary industries, especially during incredibly challenging periods, is that people see doom and gloom, but what they often do not see is the capacity to adapt and just how smart many of our farmers are, just how quick they are to adopt new technology and just how thoughtful they are about ensuring that they protect their important assets in a sustainable way. A lot of thought is going on there.

In a meeting that was held down at McLaren Vale the other day, there was some discussion within the Labor Party about regenerative agriculture, and that discussion is happening nationally. Some areas might go in that direction, but there are all sorts of other options. We should not be denying our farmers some of the tools that are becoming available as time goes on (and I will be quite guarded with what I am saying) and some of the tools that our farmers might well need to, in part, adapt to climate change but also to ensure ongoing productivity when it comes to the use of land.

I mentioned the drought in South Australia, and I have made this point a number of times in this chamber: the lack of real, tangible assistance provided to farmers and some of our communities on the ongoing drought in South Australia. There is a lack of assistance in comparison with what is happening in other states. When it comes to Queensland and New South Wales, the drought has been far more extensive and it has become entrenched; it has gone on in some places for six or seven years. So you could imagine there is going to be support somewhat commensurate with the challenges.

Victoria is a bit closer to the South Australian example when it comes to drought, and it is mixed, in that we have areas in our state that are doing well, we have areas that are middling, but we have areas that are doing quite badly indeed, some of which are in my electorate: the vast pastoral areas and some of the places around the north-east of Eyre Peninsula.

What has happened in all the other states is that tangible support has been provided. It came as a shock to me, I guess, as a shadow in estimates after the first budget and then after the second budget, around the question of what tangible support is being provided for farmers and pastoralists

in our state to meet the challenges that they are facing with drought. Unfortunately, there was nothing in the way of tangible assistance. There were a few bits and pieces on the peripheries.

When you look interstate at some of the things that have been put on the table, I know there was a bit of discussion about freight subsidies, but the fact is that New South Wales put in those freight subsidies, which then put a number of South Australian farmers and pastoralists at a significant disadvantage. Ideally, you would like to see a national solution to this. It is to the disadvantage of one state and their farmers and pastoralists when another state puts in a freight subsidy. You do not want to get involved in a bidding war, but you do want to look after our farmers.

I think there needs to be some agreement at the national level through COAG when it comes to some controls over that sort of thing so that it does not disadvantage states that do not have pockets as deep as those in New South Wales. I have raised previously NRM levies, council levies, water rates; they should be looked at. The minister said he would look at these things—it was reported widely in the *Stock Journal*—over a year ago, but to date he has not done that. He has not done anything tangible. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

COUNTRY ARTS SA

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell): Presented a petition signed by 5,433 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to ongoing funding and lease arrangements to ensure that Country Arts SA can continue to manage and operate the Hopgood Theatre in the long term for the benefit of our community.

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:01): I bring up the fifth report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2018-19.

Report received and ordered to be published.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:02): I bring up the 30th report of the committee.

Report received.

Question Time

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure South Australians that all the full cycle docking work, including both blue-collar and white-collar jobs, on the Collins class submarines will continue to be done in Adelaide?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): As most people in this parliament would be aware, we have been working very hard to mount the case for the continuation of the full cycle docking to be done here in South Australia. South Australia is the undisputed home of the Collins class submarine.

Mr Malinauskas: For now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition seems to want to throw stones in an area which has historically been a bipartisan area. I would be very keen to see exactly all of the representations the Leader of the Opposition has made on behalf of the people of South Australia

or even whether he can get his own party into line on this issue, because we know for a fact that the Labor Party—

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is debating. Talking about us is debate.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. Point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: On the point of order, sir: you have repeatedly ruled that that is not a demonstrable link between just the mention of another party and therefore being debate.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister for Education. I have the point of order. At this stage, I am going to allow the Premier an opportunity to provide some relevant background information, but I will be listening carefully.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And I don't need the Minister for Transport to intervene at this stage either, thank you. The Premier has the call; I would like to hear the answer, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The question is whether I can personally guarantee that all full cycle docking will continue into South Australia on an ongoing basis. I presume that this is one of those sorts of rhetorical questions because the reality is that the Leader of the Opposition, if he was actually paying any scant attention to his portfolio, would know that it is not up to me. This is a federal decision, so whether I can assure it or not is completely irrelevant.

What we are doing, though, is that we are working very hard, and my question to the opposition is: what are they doing? We know that Labor is out there talking very strongly about moving full cycle docking over to Western Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are, I think, putting forward a very cogent case as to why the full cycle docking should remain in South Australia. I am happy to go through those key issues with the parliament. Number one, South Australia is the home of the Collins class submarine. They were built here. They have been maintained here for a long period of time. Of course, we know that the intermediate docking and the mid-cycle docking is done in Western Australia, but the full cycle docking has been done here in South Australia.

The full cycle docking is far more complicated than the other maintenance work that has been done. It involves the piercing of the pressure hole, and so it is far more like construction. The federal government has made a decision for that construction work to continue in South Australia into the future, especially as evidenced by the awarding of \$90 billion worth of naval programs to South Australia, including 12 Future Submarines for South Australia.

The Western Australians believe that they have an argument to mount for moving the full cycle docking over to Western Australia. We don't support that whatsoever. There are not a lot of places in the world where there is any knowledge of the Collins class submarine anymore. South Australia is the repository of all that knowledge.

The most important thing for Australia going forward is the availability of the Collins class through to the time when the Attack class comes into service. This is going to be more than a decade away, so it's absolutely crucial not only that the Collins class is kept in service but also that it is kept available for the Royal Australian Navy. It is a critical piece of defence infrastructure for our nation.

We have done a great job in terms of the full cycle docking. There were problems associated with the full cycle docking in the past, but there have been major improvements, and I think that any move out of South Australia would put that availability at risk and then ultimately the defence of our nation at risk.

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier again. Has the Premier been asked by the commonwealth or has he discussed with the commonwealth that the white-collar and blue-collar work on the full cycle docking could be split between South Australia and Western Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): No, absolutely not. Our position is very, very clear that it would be dangerous for this to be split. Could you imagine a scenario in which the white-collar work, the design and engineering work, was done in South Australia but the fabrication work was done 2,000 kilometres away? We think this would be an absolute disaster.

We know the problems we got into with regard to the air warfare destroyers when blocks were produced in other jurisdictions. We had some blocks being done in Victoria, and I think we had some blocks being done in New South Wales. When they brought them together, there were major problems associated, and this is one of the reasons why the very first of the new air warfare destroyer class had major cost and time overruns.

HMAS *Hobart* was significantly over the original cost and time frame, and one of the reasons for this was moving the fabrication of these blocks to different places around the country rather than centralising it here in Adelaide. I appreciate there were some issues associated with the ramp-up of that proposal, but we have learned from those problems, and this is one of the big advantages of having the Coalition government in Canberra, sir. As you would be aware, there were no ships whatsoever commissioned under the Rudd/Gillard/Rudd government, so for six years nothing actually occurred down there.

When the Coalition came into government, they made two very strategic decisions: one was to increase the defence spend in Australia to 2 per cent of GDP, and the second thing was to recognise that the defence industry was a strategic defence capability for our nation. In doing that, they decided to award long contracts, which would give certainty to industry.

Certainty allows industry to invest in infrastructure and also in personnel, so we move away from this boom-bust cycle that hitherto really plagued the defence industry in Australia. That is why the first in the Hobart class was very significantly over budget and over time, but we don't envisage those problems occurring with the new platforms, the Hunter class and the Attack class. Because we are working in advance, we can provide that certainty.

Back to the question regarding splitting, it seems to me that the only argument that Western Australia has been putting forward is that Western Australia has available labour and somehow they believe that South Australia doesn't have the available labour. This is just complete nonsense. One of the first things we did on coming into government was to get a defence industry workforce plan prepared.

In fact, in our first budget we put \$200 million into apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia so that we would have those skills in place as and when they were required to deliver on these contracts. There are other parts that are beyond the blue collar that we need to keep in South Australia as well, and that's why we worked very diligently with the federal government to negotiate a Designated Area Migration Agreement (DAMA). We have been working in advance on this issue since the day we came to government to make sure that we have the workforce in place.

It is interesting that obviously the Premier of Western Australia has decided that he would like to have some of the action over in Western Australia, but this is a typical boom-bust economy in that state. They might be down on their luck at the moment and looking for work over there, but what happens when they go through another mining boom cycle? They don't have the available skills, the costs go through the roof and the programs blow out. This is one of the critical reasons why this work needs to remain in South Australia.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today year 11 legal studies students from Christian Brothers College, who are hosted by the Minister for Child Protection, and I also welcome students

from Moana Primary School, who have been hosted by the member for Kaurana. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

DUCK PONDS BUSHFIRE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister update the house on the recent fires at the bottom end of Yorke Peninsula and Port Lincoln?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:12): I thank the member for Flinders for his very important question and note that he was back in Port Lincoln yesterday to keep an eye on his community, to work with the local property owners and to thank the emergency service workers for the wonderful work they have been doing and their swift action in response to the stubble fire that erupted at Duck Ponds on Monday afternoon. Over on the West Coast, the stubble fire was burning towards 16,000 people in Port Lincoln, and the local crews did a marvellous job to get in there and put the fire out.

As so often happens in South Australia when something like this erupts, volunteers come flowing to help out in our regions, and they came to help out the people of Port Lincoln. Local brigades were approached for volunteers, and I am pleased to say to the house that they responded with 30 firefighters, seven incident management personnel and a SAFECOM IT manager, who were all deployed as overnight crew to help out on Monday.

In addition, there were local resources from the City of Port Lincoln. The CFS deployed 24 CFS appliances and bulk water carriers, eight MFS appliances came from Port Lincoln as well, and Whyalla and Port Augusta were also directed towards that fire. There were 12 aircraft, including fixed-wing bombers and rotary observation aircraft. A total of 10 appliances remain on the ground at this time supporting the people of Port Lincoln.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the volunteers who headed over to the West Coast. I know some of the people personally—some of them were quite young people—and it was a wonderful experience for them to get over there and help out where it was needed. I know that the rapid response from Adelaide that came to Port Lincoln was very much appreciated by the locals.

I also want to acknowledge the employers who give people time off to allow them to go and do this wonderful service for our community. They must be recognised and acknowledged because there is a burden that is absorbed by our community. A lot of these people, too, who let their workers go are small businesses, if not people who run a small business themselves. They head off to help out—in this case on the West Coast—and it is greatly appreciated. They are out of pocket because they leave their work if they are a small business owner.

There are also four MFS rapid damage assessment specialists who have been on the ground in Port Lincoln assessing both the conditions and the damage that has been caused. We know that there has been some damage in Duck Ponds, including to one house and a number of structures. Importantly, a significant number of properties have been inspected, as well as the vehicles that remain on the ground, so we thank the MFS crews for that.

While many of us have been keeping an eye on the Eastern States, where we are seeing these fires in New South Wales on our TV screens, our CFS and MFS have also been dealing with several bushfires at White Hut and Foul Bay, near Marion Bay on southern Yorke Peninsula. I know the member for Narungga has been keeping a very close eye on these fires. The CFS have deployed 28 appliances and bulk water carriers as well as four water bombing aircraft and two rotary wing aircraft. Of course, you will note, Mr Speaker, that in last year's budget we put a significant amount of funds into more aircraft within the CFS, some \$9 million, to increase this coverage.

As the member for Flinders and many others in our regions know, this work—assessing the damage, helping people who have lost property and preparing for the long summer ahead—will continue for many weeks. It is a good opportunity to remind members about putting bushfire action plans in place. It is a five-minute plan you get on the website. It is very important that you have that set up so that you can help out.

In closing, it would be remiss of me not to mention the work that is happening in New South Wales and the support that is happening there. A further 66 CFS, MFS and SES officers are headed over to New South Wales today, including one of our own local heroes Scott Kennedy, who has come from your office, Mr Premier. It is great that these people are taking the time to help out right across the country and right across our state.

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier join me in opposing the commonwealth's consideration of splitting the work between blue collar and white collar on the full cycle docking program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): It's news to me that the Leader of the Opposition had a thought on this issue. He has been completely and utterly absent. He hasn't—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —stood up to anybody.

Ms Stinson: He extends an olive branch and you do that. That's very statesmanlike.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's absolutely shocking to me that he's got a position on this because he has said nothing whatsoever on this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! Member for Lee! Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, he went down—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and spoke to workers to stir up a media story.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is not what is required—

The SPEAKER: Premier, be seated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and this is why you are so grossly—

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated for one moment.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —unworthy of even the Leader of the Opposition's role.

The SPEAKER: Premier! Member for West Torrens—for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, personal reflection, sir.

The SPEAKER: The question was in order, in fairness to the leader. I would like to hear the answer, but I was struggling to do that because of interjections on both sides of the chamber, so I ask that they cease so that I can listen to what the Premier has to say, and I ask him to keep to the substance of the question. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have nothing further to add.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has answered that question.

Ms Stinson: Yes, like usual—nothing to add.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned. The member for West Torrens is wanting to ask another question. He has the call.

BUS SERVICES ON DEMAND

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:18): Thank you very much, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why wasn't an open-call tender conducted for the on-demand bus trial, which was awarded to Keolis Downer, that will provide bus services in the minister's electorate?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:18): I am glad to update the house and correct the record on some of the inaccurate information on this issue that has been put out into the public by some quarters. What is interesting is that we didn't hide the fact that we went out to a select market tender. So much so we didn't hide it, we actually put out a press release in April that said the exact phrase, 'select market approach'.

We not only pooled together the people who made approaches who have the ability and the capability to provide the service but we also did a market scan to look at businesses across the country who also provide the services and invited them—seven different proponents—to put bids to us about conducting a trial in South Australia. We undertake a select market tender in the same way that the former government undertook select market tenders on a whole range of things. I don't know that that was the process that was followed at Gillman, but there are plenty—hundreds—of other examples of that being the case. We announced it in April. We didn't hide it from anybody. It was there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in a press release. What has happened over the past—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —seven months is we have gone through an independent tender evaluation process. The tender panel decided that these were the projects that were going to provide the best value for money. But what is interesting here is that there is a clear indication from the member for West Torrens that he is seeking to cast aspersions on Keolis Downer's ability to operate public transport services. He did it again on radio this morning.

What I find interesting is that, even though he is trying to do this now, the government that he was part of assigned a massive part of our public transport network for Keolis Downer to run back in 2015. So what I don't understand is that it's okay to assign them a contract in 2015, but it's not okay for them to undertake an on-demand bus trial in 2019. I can only surmise that there is one thing that changed between 2015 and 2019, and that is that the Marshall Liberal government won an election.

What these services are going to do—and it is something that I know the member for Kavel is deeply passionate about—is actually improve public transport services in areas where we do not have decent coverage and decent frequency. For the member for Kavel's electorate, they will complement existing fixed-route services through the township, connecting the township with—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna! Member for Reynell!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —shopping centres, but also with the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —bus interchange that gets people to Adelaide. In the Barossa, what's interesting is we don't have any fixed-route loop services that actually connect anything to anything. We have a full cost recovery LinkSA service that runs people down to Gawler and connects with the train, but my commuters actually pay full tote for that service. We've now got the opportunity to undertake a trial where there isn't another service that it's competing against, and it will be a really good test bed for how this service works in isolation from anything else.

This builds on the proud record that this government has in delivering better public transport services. And for the entire time of our government, we have used one measure—one measure—to determine whether or not a public transport network works.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: That measure is bums on seats.

Mr Picton: They've gone down.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What does the record show? Apart from again some fallacious information that may have been put out there a couple of weeks ago, in the annual report handed down we are 1.2 million passengers up on last year, on the 2018-19 financial year. That is 1.2 million more passengers who have decided to use the service.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Of course, there are ways to cherrypick figures to try to claim an argument, the difficulty being—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that you didn't get your maths right because the end of January is actually when the bus changes started, not the start of January. But don't let the truth get in the way of a good story.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Don't let the truth get in the way of a bit of a slur on morning radio.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The truth is, this government is delivering better services that more people are choosing to use and these on-demand bus services are a fantastic step forward for South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! The member for West Torrens and then the member for King.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the minister stand by his remarks he just gave to the house that the former government awarded a contract to Keolis Downer?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:23): Again, I think the member needs to listen to what I said. The fact is that a contract was assigned to Keolis Downer in 2015, and that happened when the company that was formerly running those services handed over the contract. That is something

that I have corrected the record on in the house before, but it is just something that those opposite don't like to hear about.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: So, they can be trusted to run a significant portion of Adelaide's metropolitan bus network—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but undertaking a six-month time-limited trial in two small areas of our state isn't okay. It's okay to run hundreds and hundreds of services each day—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but it's not okay to run a couple of little trials for six months. I think that the South Australian people and the communities of Mount Barker and the Barossa are the ones who are going to decide on this. They are our guinea pigs in this process. They are the ones who are going to test this new way of delivering services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Instead of having now to wait for sometimes over an hour for a fixed-route service, instead of having to walk potentially hundreds and hundreds of metres to get to a bus stop, we will actually now be trialling a service that will pick up somebody from their house, or near to their house, and drop them where they need to go. That is a fantastic step forward and again a way that we are looking at new technology to deliver better services in public transport, something that lay stagnant for a long period of time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I would also like to provide other information to the house, and that is that another measure that we can use for how our customers rate our service is the level of complaints they make to the department. Any business that operates in a retail environment receives complaints—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana, you can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

The honourable member for Kaurana having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, let's look at the last financial year. What do the results tell us—not cherrypicked results but annual, year-on-year results? Complaints were actually down 7½ per cent in the 2018-19 financial year compared with the financial year beforehand—a 7½ per cent reduction—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —so less complaints, more bums on seats, trialling new technology, improving the frequency of train services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —investing almost \$1 billion in improving our network from the Gawler line electrification, to the Flinders Link extension, to the Tonsley train station upgrade, to the park-and-ride at Paradise, Mr Speaker, which I know you have been hassling me about every single day—

The SPEAKER: Indeed.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —as well as looking at the park-and-ride at Golden Grove. This government is investing in improving our public transport network. But what we won't do is be cowed by those naysayers who just want to oppose everything and for any bit of positive news try to find the negative spin. I do remember calls of not wanting to lead a destructive-style opposition, wanting to lead a constructive-style opposition. Well, I think that's just gone by the wayside. It's all too hard. It's much easier just to poke a stick at the one trying to get something done and much easier just to carp from the sidelines. We as a government are delivering better services, and we've got the record to show it.

The SPEAKER: I am glad the minister has completed his answer. He started to deviate then. Member for King and then the member for West Torrens.

GOLDEN GROVE ROAD

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:26): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

Ms LUETHEN: My question—

The SPEAKER: Yes, one moment, member for King. The Minister for Education gesticulates, but I did hear the leader, and he is warned. The member for King.

Ms LUETHEN: My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the Golden Grove Road upgrade?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:26): I thank the member for King for her question. Can I say that often in this place and in this job it is hard to get something done. Often in this place, you have to fight and fight and fight to get something done. But what we've seen, last night, is the final piece in the puzzle—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —for a project that has been dear to the member for King's heart for years.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: From the waving of the first signs on Golden Grove Road to the securing of funding through the former government jumping on board with the MYBR update, obviously the Liberal government's commitment to this project, the tenaciousness and tenacity of the member for King knows no bounds. As of today, we can announce publicly that CATCON, a good local South Australian firm, is getting on to deliver Golden Grove Road for the communities in and around Golden Grove.

I lived for quite a long time not far from Golden Grove Road. In fact, I can remember when Allington's was still there. I can remember when there was actually still an attendant-operated service station on site. Can I say, what wasn't there in those times—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I was tall enough to see out the window of a car. What wasn't there at that time was an entire suburb. What we have seen is that Golden Grove and Greenwith and those suburbs around there have grown. What we haven't seen is an upgrade to Golden Grove Road, which to my mind is a massive oversight in the growth of what otherwise is a beautiful master plan community and something that needed to be rectified.

Not only was the member for King able to secure funding and make sure that this project went ahead but we then embarked upon a consultation process in conjunction with the community to make sure we got this project right. Whether it was simple things like making sure that we had a driveway crossover for the local church, whether it was making sure that the local pizza shop retained parking in front of their premises, whether it was making sure the ingress/egress to the local servo and the other shops there is actually maintained, we have made sure that this project delivers properly for the people who drive through Golden Grove Road and also those businesses and residences on Golden Grove Road.

There were some other hurdles, and those hurdles were that, like every other project of its type, like happened on dozens and dozens of occasions with the former government, we needed to partner with local government. We needed them to come onboard and pay essentially for their assets: their stormwater, their footpaths, their kerbs and gutters. The Tea Tree Gully council—after their mayor in 2017 publicly admitted that they were going to be on the hook for some cash—tried to suggest that somehow this had been sprung on them. I thought, 'I just want to try to get something done,' so, with the member for King, we went down to the previous—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —council meeting at Tea Tree Gully and we essentially begged for them to come onboard. We said, 'Look, this is a fantastic project, this is fair and reasonable, you have actually known about this for a while. Give us a hand and we can actually deliver this project for the community together.' But that's not what happened, and can I say that the speeches I heard that night I have never heard or seen anything like in my life.

The level of partisan disgrace that was spewed out of the mouths of councillors Jones, Rankine, Savvas and Field was disgraceful—absolutely disgraceful—but last night we saw common sense prevail. Even though there was more bile that was spewed from the mouths of Labor Party councillors on the Tea Tree Gully council last night, they did the right thing, they came to their senses and they have helped to fund this project.

For this long journey that the member for King has been on for a long period of time, the final hurdle has now been cleared and, for the residents of Golden Grove, they will get their road upgrade.

BUS SERVICES

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister explain to the house how it is value for money providing \$1.7 million for two bus services, while cutting or shortening 1,200 bus services, saving \$3.5 million?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:31): Mr Speaker, this is—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Let's try to break this down for the member for West Torrens. Maybe his maths doesn't add up that well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The whole point of what we are seeking to do—which, by the way, we publicised for the past seven or eight months and haven't heard a whisper from the opposition, so I figured everything was sweet except that now, after the fact, someone wants to have a dig—the point of a trial, is that we need to set up a scenario in which we can test whether this works, and there is an up-front capital cost to undertaking these trials. You've got to buy some smaller buses because you can't really run big articulated or the Scania buses down backstreets. It doesn't work that well, so we have to buy some new buses.

We also have to make sure that we can integrate this technology with our existing system and make sure that integrates not only with the ticketing system but also more generally with the operational systems that are in place. This is new to South Australia. It costs money to set up, but there is an opportunity here if we get this right, and we get the level of patronage right and we get the level of coverage and frequency right, to actually provide a better service that picks you up closer to your house so you don't need to stand in the rain or in the searing heat waiting for a bus to come and drops you where you need to go. This can be done cost effectively and with greater use of the existing asset base. Having a bus driving around in a loop picking up nobody is not an efficient use of resource.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Using technology—something which by the way—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —has disrupted the taxi industry and has been uncomfortable for the taxi industry—Uber has shown that you can use an app-based algorithm to improve point-to-point transport services and do them more cheaply. This is a way for us to deliver a more frequent service that picks you up closer to your house and means that you don't have to deal with the elements.

Also, for those who have impacted mobility, especially elderly people, the opportunity for them not to have to walk those hundreds of metres which they can't do and actually get closer to their house I think is a fantastic step forward. Yes, it costs money. We haven't hidden that fact. Again, it's in our press release. The point here is that if this works, then we've got an opportunity to look at where it can work in various parts of our network. Unlike trials that have happened interstate, we think that this could be a solution for low-frequency areas of our network.

I had occasion to go to Sydney and have a look at the on-demand bus trial being run by Torrens Transit in South Western Sydney. They were essentially having a fixed-route service on a high-frequency line from point to hub (the hub being the train station) competing with an on-demand service. That on-demand service was turning into an almost fixed-route service because of the frequency and the way that the patronage patterns happened. Essentially, if your on-demand service turns into a semi fixed-route service, is it actually delivering something that's substantially different?

But here in South Australia, in Adelaide, it is fair to say that we have many pockets across especially the outer suburbs that have a low frequency of service. I have had a number of letters, for instance, from the member for Napier about the fact that some of the emerging areas in his community—Angle Vale and the like—don't actually get the—

An honourable member: Taylor.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sorry, the member for Taylor. He used to be the member for Napier. He moved seats. So for these low-frequency areas, to be able to provide a cost-effective solution that delivers a better service that is cost effective to actually help unlock and improve patronage across our public transport network, to me, seems like something we should be investing money in. To me, \$1.7 million, seems like a smart use of money, given the hundreds of millions of dollars we spend on public transport services every year, to see if this works and we can deliver a better outcome.

BUS SERVICES ON DEMAND

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Of all the companies vying for the on-demand bus trial, was Keolis Downer the only company his office met with prior to awarding them the \$1.7 million contract?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:35): Can I say that these tender processes are actually undertaken at arms length. They are undertaken at arms length for me, so much so—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that the only point that I knew that Keolis Downer was a tenderer was when it was recommended to me to give them the contract. In fact, I don't even know who the other tenderers are, and the point here is that this is done at arms length. It is being done at arms length, as is proper. What I find interesting again is that, like a number of times before, there is a gentle insinuation that the member is seeking to make. If the member would like to make that insinuation—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It's not gentle.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —then make it. And more than that, if the member is actually pretty confident about his assertion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —maybe go out there and say it and see what happens because this castle should not be used for this kind of behaviour.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this is clearly debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: You have asked about companies vying for a contract and a certain company and whether the minister's office met with any other companies, I believe. That is the way I caught the question. The minister has provided some relevant background information. I ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sir, without any substance, I think there is nothing more I can add.

BUS SERVICES ON DEMAND

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. What is the government subsidy per passenger for the minister's on-demand bus service trial?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:36): The answer to that question is: we don't know yet how many people are going to use the services.

An honourable member: My God!

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will not blaspheme in this house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A point of order, sir: I did not blaspheme. I take gross offence at that, sir.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry. I thought I heard someone say, 'Oh my God!'

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's not blasphemy, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, okay. I would ask such expressions to please not be made. The member for West Torrens has asked his question. I will listen to the minister's answer, thank you.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: My seven-year-old daughter tells me off when I use that phrase. She certainly thinks it's blasphemy. We use 'Oh my goodness!' in our house. It's a good way to get around it. The X factor here is: how many people are going to use this service? We provide a bucket of money to undertake this trial. It has some operating costs; it obviously has some—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member, please.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —capital costs that go with it. But this is what happens when you undertake a trial. You don't know how it's going to turn out. It's why you undertake a trial. What's interesting in this case is that we are going to be running the LinkSA service up in the Barossa based on a rough cost recovery basis, or what we think could in the end turn into a cost recovery basis, understanding that there is some up-front subsidy that we will need to provide to get this thing off the ground. In Mount Barker, it will integrate with the existing Metro service where, for those who use it to get from where they are to the shopping centre, they will be able to do it cheaper than they can now. But those who then go on to connect to a service to get to Adelaide will pay a little bit more than they do now.

Essentially, we have put some maths together. We are going to go out and undertake this trial and use these two test beds—one where we are competing against a fixed-route service, one where we are doing it in isolation—which, to my mind, is the only trial I have seen where it hasn't been competing against a fixed-route service. That, for the first time, will show us what it looks like without having to compete with an existing fixed-route service.

This is actually really exciting. I would have thought that this was something that both sides of this parliament could get around to have a look at a new idea. Maybe I am wrong. Maybe the imaginations of some don't extend to looking ahead and instead prefer to look behind and look to the way the service has operated in the past, 'Hey, as long as we don't change anything, we won't upset anybody and nothing will ever change,' and that gentle decline that South Australia has seen over the 16 long and torturous years could just continue. But that is not the ambition that this government has.

We want to see this system move forward, which is why we are undertaking outsourcing. We know where it has worked in other jurisdictions and has led to increased bums on seats. We know that by providing capital injection we can improve services and encourage patronage, which again gets more bums on seats. If we are right about these on-demand bus trials it, too, will add to the suite of measures that we have to seek to improve this service so that South Australians can look forward to a more connected and a more engaged future.

WATER PRICING

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house about developments in water pricing and how residents in the seat of Elder and, of course, residents in South Australia will benefit?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:40): Of course, this government was elected in March 2018 on a mandate to reduce cost-of-living pressures across South Australian households and businesses.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: As soon as we were elected, we got on with that work. We looked at a massive reduction in the emergency services levy rate across this state. We took action on payroll tax. We have taken a suite of very significant reforms ahead on land tax, which will see substantial relief to the majority of people who pay that. We have tried to put in place a cap on council rates. Sadly, that did not get through in another place. But another major area of cost of living for South Australians—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned for a second time.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and of course the cost of doing business is the cost of water in this state. So we have seen the first part of the journey towards reducing water prices in this state get underway with the announcement at the beginning of our time in office of the independent inquiry into water pricing in this state, undertaken by the very respected utility administrator, Lew Owens. That has been a substantial body of work that will create a foundation for decision-making around water pricing going forward. But today we also saw SA Water's submission to—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: this submission is publicly available on the Essential Services Commission of South Australia's website.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. Members on my right, I will handle this matter. I don't need cries of 'bogus' from those on my right. I will listen to the minister's answer. If he provides information in addition to what is available in the public domain, that may be in order, so I will listen carefully.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I will continue to give a little bit of background to the process of reducing water bills. Today, we have seen our plan submitted to ESCOSA, that is, SA Water's pitch for how it is going to undertake its business for the next four years. Water pricing is determined in this state in four-year tranches. The next determination period is 2020 to 2024. We have seen good news from the body of work that SA Water has undertaken and their desire to see downward pressure placed on water bills, which will see the average water price reduce by 1.6 per cent.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: the information that the minister is now referring to was on the front page of *The Advertiser* this morning and is also on the Essential Services Commission's website.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am going to warn the member for Lee. If points of order become frivolous, then I will be asking members to leave. I have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I said 'if they become'. It's a hypothetical proposition. I didn't say that his point of order was frivolous, but if they become frivolous then I will deal with them. I am going to uphold my earlier ruling. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We will also see a reduction in sewerage rates. This is obviously in substantial contrast to what we saw under 16 years of Labor rule in this state. During that time, in 2001-02 the average household bill was \$236 per household; in 2017-18, it was \$782, a 232 per cent increase in the average water bill in this state. That is a substantial burden on the cost of living for South Australians and on the cost of doing business.

This government is determined—absolutely determined—to put downward pressure on water prices in this state. We have the ESCOSA determination, which is a complex process. We will now head through that process in the coming months, with a decision to be made next year. It is also important to take into consideration the value of the asset base held by SA Water as well. We know some pretty shocking things about the value of that asset base, as was determined by Mr Owens' independent report into water pricing.

We know that that report found that the Labor government, during their time in office, ignored criticism and advice from the Essential Services Commission, overinflated that base and, as a consequence, that resulted in South Australian households and businesses providing far too much to the government for their water. I do want to get this damning quote correct. I'm happy to table this. The well-respected Mr Owens said:

...despite the [Labor] government claiming it was acting in the interests of consumers, that was not apparent and it appeared that the main driver of the decision was the securing of revenue for the Government.

We are putting downward pressure on water bills. The direction is good news for South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The minister's time has expired. I am going to call the member for West Torrens. I can see the member for Mount Gambier. He was pipped at the post by the member for West Torrens.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Given he told the parliament on 30 June he had never met Mr Sasha Grebe, can he explain why FOIs released show that Mr Sasha Grebe of Keolis Downer has met with his ministerial staff on numerous occasions before he gave that answer, including in his ministerial office.

Mr Malinauskas: Uh-oh.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for a second time for saying 'uh-oh'.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:46): There is a difference between members of my office meeting Sasha Grebe and me meeting Sasha Grebe. We are different people. There is not some hive mind in my office—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —as much as sometimes they would like it to be that way. We are in fact different people. I have actually gone back and checked. I cannot remember ever having met Sasha Grebe. I certainly haven't met him in a formal capacity. We may have been in the same room at a function at one point in time, but I have absolutely no recollection of anything to do in that regard.

Regardless, this tender was operated in a completely separate, independent fashion. If there's something wrong that the member would like to make around that tender process, then say it, and again, say it outside, but there's not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: So what they would seek to do is try to chuck a little bit of mud up against the wall and see what sticks.

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

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Improper motives.

The SPEAKER: Yes, 'chucking mud'. I will caution the minister. I don't think he referred to any member in particular the way I caught it, but I am going to caution the minister and ask that he not use that sort of terminology, especially with his alma mater students behind him watching.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Thank you, Speaker. I will take your guidance, as I always do. Here's the other thing that I would like to say: Sasha Grebe actually doesn't work for Keolis Downer. He actually works for the Downer Group, which is a separate company. Keolis Downer is actually a joint venture between Downer and Keolis and is actually a separate company.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford can leave for the remainder of question time for leading that charge.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has finished his answer. The member for West Torrens and then the member for Mount Gambier.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:48): Does the minister stand by his statement to the house on 4 July that Keolis Downer had not made any unsolicited bids to own or operate the tram network, given that FOIs show that Keolis Downer held discussions in the minister's office on 11 May to discuss infrastructure and, in particular, transport opportunities and issues with the government?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:48): An unsolicited bid means something specific. What's interesting is that an unsolicited bid process actually doesn't get run by my office: it gets run by the Department of Treasury and Finance. In fact, there are strict confidentiality provisions around how that works.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But I certainly stand by my statements. I also stand by the fact I have never met this guy. More than that, who I do meet with are people who are public transport operators, and of course I have discussions with them—for instance, going to visit Newcastle and having a look at some innovative work that's being done there, or going with Torrens Transit to have a look at their on-demand bus trials in New South Wales. The reason you do that, especially as a young minister, is to learn. You do that to get smarter, and you do that by engaging with people who have experience in this area for decades.

I stand by everything I have said but, more than that, to try to somehow insinuate that anything that this government has done is improper is wrong and needs to be called out for what it is, and that is an attempt to denigrate what is otherwise an attempt to improve public transport services in South Australia.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Was Mr Sasha Grebe at a meeting in the minister's office on 11 May 2019 discussing an unsolicited bid proposal by Keolis Downer with the South Australian government?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:50): I wasn't at that meeting. I must admit that I don't know who was at that meeting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I know that members of my staff were at that meeting.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I do understand about unsolicited bid processes that go wrong, and I think that the Gillman saga provides a pretty decent example of where, if you don't follow the rules, if you try to heavy a few Renewal SA board members, sometimes things don't work out that well, and I learned from that example. I learn from those examples to make sure that, when it comes to the expending of taxpayers' dollars, dollars that aren't mine and aren't anyone's in these houses but the taxpayers of South Australia, we do so with the utmost integrity and independence.

BUS SERVICES ON DEMAND

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister inform the house how Mount Barker and Barossa were selected as on-demand trial sites, and were any other regional sites considered?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:51): They were considered because they were the best opportunity to actually provide a test case for how this solution might work in a broader context. One of them, obviously, is inside the metro boundary for Adelaide Metro services and one that is outside and is within one of the exclusive contractual arrangements.

I am more than happy to have a discussion with the member and get some detail on whether options were considered in other regional towns, but quite clearly when it comes to this kind of service you need a level of density to make this work. We do actually have 28 separate regional bus contracts—off the top of my head 10 or 11 of them are fixed-route sort of point-to-Adelaide type coach services essentially. Then there is a smattering of different kinds of arrangements for intracity services in towns across regional South Australia, and whether it would be towns like Port Pirie, Port Augusta or Mount Gambier there are different and quite an eclectic group of arrangements in place.

Can I say that one of the hypotheses that I have is that providing an on-demand service can actually be a solution for those services as well. So what you see in a lot of these regional communities is a nice tightly defined township area that has some two, three or four specific points of interest: the high street, a separate shopping centre, or some sort of larger sporting or community facility. What we have at the moment is a series of very antiquated dial-a-ride type services where you literally need to dial up beforehand and book a service. We actually do have some fixed-route services with low frequency. I think that on-demand is a way, if it works, that it can be rolled out into regional centres.

In fact, it is something that has worked well in Warrnambool, and can I declare to the house that I did meet with an operator who undertakes those services in Warrnambool. They showed how they can use technology and quite an interesting model of how they are able to improve public transport services within those townships using the existing bucket of money. I think the point here is that we are operating in a time when we see \$2.3 billion worth of writedown to GST and to stamp duty, and in that environment we need to make sure that we drive those dollars as far as we can.

If you have a capital asset, a bus, and you have a guy who is in a bus sitting around not doing too much, then that is not the best use of resources. The opportunity to provide a more flexible service that increases and encourages patronage means we can actually get better use of that existing bucket. I think that it actually does have positive implications for regional South Australia, but again we need to undertake the trial. We have high hopes for this thing, but once again we will be guided by reality.

SPORT AND RECREATION

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. How is the Marshall Liberal government making grassroot sports more affordable for parents?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:54): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question and note his passion to—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

The honourable member for Reynell having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, again, Mr Speaker. I note the member for MacKillop's passion to grow participation in sport and to make sport more affordable for families. It's a noble goal and one that we are very much striving towards.

We know that learning to swim is a really important facet of life in Australia, and in particular in South Australia. People have come to me and we, as a government, have listened. Many members have raised with me issues about the Sports Vouchers program—which, of course, we increased at the last election, taking it from \$50 to \$100. We added in dance as well to grow the program, again to get people to become more active.

In fact, a lady came to me and chatted about the voucher program. She said, 'Look, I have an issue. My daughter is playing Auskick, which is fantastic, and she can use the voucher, but my son is doing dance and he can't.' That was a really great point so we added dance to the program so that everyone who wants to take part can use the extra voucher.

When it comes to swimming, it was pointed out to me that swimming lessons are not necessarily a sport. Because this is aimed at getting people more active and into sport, when it came to swimming lessons they didn't fit under the right category. But we did listen. We listened to what people had to say—and the member for MacKillop was an advocate for this—and realised that people have to learn to swim before they can become competitive swimmers. The member for Colton, of course, was a very strong advocate for this as well; in fact, we might get him to run some programs because he is such a good swimmer himself.

It was a great opportunity for us to take on swimming lessons and we thought, 'Let's help young people learn how to swim.' Now people can use the \$100 sports voucher—brought in by us at the last election, elevating it from \$50—with recognised swimming clubs to make sure that they learn to swim. They will be registered through the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Recreation SA are big supporters of this. This is a great opportunity.

One drowning death in South Australia is one too many. We have some stats on the number of people who have drowned in South Australia: in 2017-18, there were 15 drownings in South Australia, and three of those were children aged under 17; and in 2018-19 there were 14 drownings, and two of those were aged under 17. The majority of deaths of children under 14 are those who drown in swimming pools.

We can see that taking the sports voucher and rolling it over and including swimming has been really well received, and it is something that we are very proud to have done as a government. We have listened to the people of South Australia and we are getting great results. We are teaching people how to swim and, hopefully, we are also making future swimming champions, like the member for Colton. No doubt the member for MacKillop was a very good swimmer himself.

Since January this year, more than 64,000 primary school-age children have claimed the voucher, and that is putting money back in the pockets of South Australians. The environment minister was talking about reducing costs for families, and that is exactly what we want to do. This is more than \$6.2 million back in the pockets of South Australian families to help them to get their kids more active, get their kids into sport and, in this case, get them swimming and, hopefully, help to save lives.

This is a great program and we are very proud to be delivering this for the people of South Australia. We have listened to what they have said. We know that it is very important to get people active, to get them swimming and, as we head into the summer, we hope that from next year, when this kicks off, many more people will take up this opportunity.

POLICE ANIMALS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister confirm that the police greys and the police dog squad have been tasked to meet a budget savings of around \$10,000, whether this is for each operational arm or a shared target, and whether the cuts will mean less or poorer quality food for the animals or reduced conditions for the staff and animals?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:58): I thank the member for Florey for allowing me to clarify this Labor lie. This is something that has been perpetuated in the public and it is another Labor lie, and it is an absolute disgrace. To accuse the police commissioner of malnourishing the dogs and horses within SAPOL is a blight on the commissioner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and it's a blight on SAPOL. There has been no directive whatsoever given, so it is an absolute lie that has been perpetuated in the media. I cannot for the life of me work out why the police commissioner was not phoned up and asked, 'You're in charge of the

police budget. What are you actually doing here?' If you actually made that phone call you would find that there was an allocation of money put towards food last year for the horses and the dogs, as there is every year, and whoever was using that budget to acquire the food actually underspent so that there was money left over. The horses were fed; the horses will always be fed exactly as they are, as will the dogs, and I can say that they are much loved.

I have been out there and seen the greys, and I know the member for Florey would be a big fan of the greys. They do an outstanding job on patrol and they are a great resource for SAPOL, as are the dogs. That was the case—they actually underspent their budget and that money was used in other areas. If the dogs need more food or if the horses need more food, they will be given more food. The police commissioner has given the guarantee. To assert that SAPOL and/or the commissioner would not feed the dogs and not feed the horses is ludicrous, and those on the other side who have perpetuated this should be ashamed of themselves.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, and then the member for Torrens.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:59): Just to clarify, there is no cut or no target for the police greys or the police dog squad and nothing for the police band either?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:00): The police band will be given all the hay and dog food they like. There is no way—and I see you nod there, Mr Speaker—that the police band will be fed hay or dog food, and there are no cuts for the police band. We know they do an outstanding job, and I know the member for Florey is very passionate about all three arms of SAPOL. They are a great arm of the community and we support them very much. I know the police commissioner is very supportive as well.

FOSTERS AND NORTH EAST ROAD INTERSECTION

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Transport. When will the minister deliver on his election promise to install traffic signals at the intersection of Fosters and North East roads?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00): I do thank the member for Torrens for her question and bring her back to questioning that was undertaken via the member for Torrens in last year's budget, in the first budget the Marshall Liberal government handed down. Essentially, in estimates questioning we outlined the fact that a signalised intersection on North East Road, whilst providing a greater level of service for the people on Fosters Road, would actually have delayed traffic significantly for the tens and tens and tens of thousands of people who use North East Road every single day.

When faced with that information, we had the choice of either doing something that would actually cause pain to tens of thousands of north-eastern suburbs residents or looking at alternative treatments that help to provide an improved level of service. We took that bucket of money, that one point something million dollars that was promised as part of the election, and actually provided a different kind of upgrade to Fosters Road—essentially a line-marking scheme, as well as a number of other treatments along that corridor.

I was pretty honest in estimates questioning about the fact that we weren't going to deliver a signalised intersection but also honest as to the reasons why. The truth is that, in this situation, to go ahead and deliver a signalised intersection may have brought some relief for the people who live along Fosters Road, but the members for Wright, Newland, King and Morialta would have seen an increased delay at that intersection.

Again, coming to government, what we said early and often was that we wanted to take an evidence-based approach to delivering infrastructure. So, when faced with the evidence that what you were going to do was going to ruin traffic, you don't do it. I think we have been pretty honest about that, having delivered other solutions to help the people of Fosters Road, whilst keeping North

East Road, which is one of the major thoroughfares and major arterial roads into Adelaide, free for passing traffic.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:02): Was Mr Grebe present at a meeting in the minister's—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, sir, my apologies. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

The SPEAKER: Time is about to run out, but I am going to allow the question from the start. It's for the Minister for—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Transport and Infrastructure.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Was Mr Sasha Grebe present at the meeting in the minister's office on 11 May 2019 to discuss proposals for outsourcing and managing public transport services provided by the South Australian government, and was a probity officer present during that meeting with the minister's chief of staff and his advisers?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:03): I might check, but I think the meeting that the member is referring to actually occurred in 2018 as opposed to 2019. I am happy to correct the information before the house, but I am fairly certain it was.

Essentially, what happened was that, very early upon coming to government, as a new minister with a new government there was a whole series of people who wanted to catch up and meet. At that time, I actually declined to meet personally with representatives from that company and did so because I wanted to get my feet under the desk and actually make sure that I had a greater handle on the job. But, more than that, I also took a cautious approach to make sure that I didn't do anything or meet with anybody that would otherwise create compromise down the track.

I was not at the meeting, and I think under FOI the member knows and has all the information that there is to have on this topic. I am fairly certain that that meeting was not in 2019 but, in fact, in 2018.

Grievance Debate

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:04): Something has gone horribly wrong in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. I think the problem is a very inexperienced and youthful minister who may have, I think, done something incredibly damaging to himself personally and to his career.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the member for West Torrens is making some very unfortunate reflections on the member for Lee right now.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, I am sorry, I did not hear it. Can we stop the clock? The Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The member for West Torrens is claiming that a youthful and new Minister for Transport was doing silly things and making himself look foolish. Naturally, I assumed he was talking about the member for Lee, and so I thought it was appropriate—

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education can definitely leave for the next half an hour. Thank you, member for West Torrens.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Something has gone horribly wrong. The government want us to accept that they have cut 1,200 bus services per year costing \$3.5 million, saving that to their budget, but have implemented two new bus services, costing \$1.7 million without an open tender, as value for money. It is an absurd proposition. On top of that, a cloud hangs over this entire process: Keolis Downer and their government relations leader, Mr Sasha Grebe.

Mr Sasha Grebe is someone well known to those in the Liberal Party. Mr Sasha Grebe worked for both treasurer Hockey and treasurer Morrison before leaving to work for Downer EDI, the Downer Group, Keolis Downer. Mr Grebe, through FOI, we have now discovered wrote to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure to meet with him to congratulate him on his election and offered, I think, unsolicited approaches to the minister and the government (detailed in FOI) about providing government services.

The minister travelled to Newcastle and met with Keolis Downer, and a few weeks later we find that they are outsourcing our trams and trains. Who is a bidder for our trams and trains? Keolis Downer. Keolis Downer also organised a trip to the United Kingdom and offered their assistance with the minister meeting with public transport and private transport operators in the United Kingdom. Who did the minister cite wrongly as an example for the benefits of privatising our trams and trains? The United Kingdom tube system. There is a pattern emerging here.

We have emails where Sasha Grebe is telling the minister, 'I'll see you at this lunch where you are speaking at the Institute of Public Affairs (IPA).' We know that they are in the same room. We know that Mr Sasha Grebe has been to the minister's office. We know that he has met in the minister's ministerial office with his chief of staff and his ministerial advisers. We know the agenda at that meeting: providing services on behalf of the government in public transport—i.e., an unsolicited bid. It all comes together.

These two services replacing 1,200 services at a cost of \$1.7 million and awarded without an open tender, guess where one of these services is being provided? In the minister's own electorate. Did he recuse himself? Did he step out of the room when these decisions were taken? What was the process to select Keolis Downer to participate? Was it his old mate Sasha Grebe, whom he has never met? I have met Sasha Grebe. Sasha Grebe was beating down my door, demanding, begging us to privatise our transport systems and I said no. But that did not stop Sasha Grebe from providing false, inaccurate and made-up comments from me and the member for Lee to the government pretending that this is a defence in the government's plans to privatise.

What he had done was use the resources of Keolis Downer to find fake articles that were written up as if the former transport minister, the member for Lee, and I were planning to privatise our transport system. He gave this to the minister, saying, 'Use this as justification for your privatisation,' which they are bidding for. However, the minister now on three occasions has said in this parliament that he has never met Sasha Grebe. He has told me privately that he has never even heard of him, yet his chief of staff has met him, his ministerial advisers have met him, the department has met him and he has organised trips to the United Kingdom and Newcastle. The minister's reputation now is on the line.

He did not meet him at the IPA, he did not meet him in his office when they had meetings with the department, he knows nothing about this mysterious figure called Sasha Grebe. All we know is that Keolis Downer won a tender that did not go to tender to provide services. Where? In the minister's electorate. Well, we will see what happens here.

CHAFFEY ELECTORATE

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:10): I rise to speak about a local experience in the electorate of Chaffey through the month of October, and what a great month it was, celebrating the 25th year of the Renmark Rose Festival. The event ran over 10 days in the Riverland, and I was absolutely delighted to officially open the rose festival at the Jarrett Memorial Gardens, where we had many stallholders and the roses were in full bloom. The Riverland is picture perfect coming into the rose season.

The 10-day annual Renmark Rose Festival is one of my favourite Riverland events. It attracts thousands of visitors from around the world, as the region blooms and the gardens across the

Riverland flourish. Fifty-one garden beds were opened up, with over 3½ thousand rose bushes, really highlighting the importance of the rose economy to the region. The attractions are not only the gardens but it is getting out there and experiencing the people who are generous enough to put their hard work and dedication into their homes and gardens and open them up to the public to allow people to come in to have a look at the great work. In many instances, some of the gardens on show are a work of art.

Again, the festival was great for the local economy—it packed out the streets and all the accommodation facilities were full—and it really does bring the region to life. The winner of the Renmark Rose Festival Ambassador this year was a tie between Peter-Marie Phillipou and Barbara Tsolomitis. Peter is a local journalist at *The Murray Pioneer* and Barbara Tsolomitis works at the Renmark Medical Clinic. They both raised money at several events for the Ronald McDonald House charity.

I would like to commend the outstanding job that the committee and the volunteers do to plan and coordinate this run. It is a magic event and it has now been going for 25 years. Well done to the rose festival committee: chairperson, Celeste Newbery; secretary, Mardi Townsend; and treasurer, Chris Peterson. Well done to the rest of the longstanding committee: Lorna Taylor, Richard Fewster, Allan and Sandy Maddocks and Sheree Chappel. They have all done an outstanding job. They are great community workers who get out there and bring this festival to life.

I was also lucky enough to cut the ribbon at the Riverland Relay For Life at the Berri Oval. I was humbled by the level of support and the stories I was told about people who have been touched or impacted by cancer and to see the people who participated in the Relay For Life. It was a great testament to those who are prepared to get out there and run the relay day and night. It is celebrated right round the world—four million people over 20 countries who really empower and unite local communities with the issue of cancer.

In 2018, the Riverland event raised \$52,000. Now in its 16th year, the event is showing no signs of slowing. There were 14 teams and 160 participants, and they walked 19 consecutive hours to raise money for the Cancer Council of South Australia. This year's event raised even more: \$55,500, and there is still money to be collected. Congratulations to all the people who participated and organised. I must say that Nancy Murdock has done an outstanding job as one of the event organisers. Her trusty team provided food and refreshments and organisation skills and kept the entertainment rolling along.

I would also like to touch on the Riverland Ambassador program. Proudly, I am a Riverland Ambassador, and I wear that badge with pride and honour. It is a very simple program. You go online and answer a questionnaire. To be eligible to be an ambassador, you have to understand some of the attributes and some of the history of the region so that you can be an ambassador when you are out and about in social circles or at community functions, or in another community, with the knowledge and skill to spruik and back your own backyard.

The Riverland Ambassador program was launched in July. We now have 140 locals who have completed their online training. I would like to commend Destination Riverland General Manager, Caroline Phillips; Brenton Pankhurst, who is the chair; the coordinator, Kate Gillespie; and the entire Destination Riverland board for their great advocacy for the Riverland and for the outstanding work they do to promote tourism for the Riverland.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:15): 'Lest we forget' are three words deeply connected to who we are as a nation. This week, at the passing of the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month—101 years since the guns fell silent on the Western Front—we paused to pay our respects on Remembrance Day. It is a phrase that has its origins even deeper in our history, its roots found in the poem *Recessional*, penned by Rudyard Kipling. It was in fact composed to mark the jubilee of Queen Victoria. With the *Ode of Remembrance*, we stopped as a nation across Australia as the *Last Post* rang loud from the single, lone bugle. We said with one voice, 'Lest we forget.'

To mark Remembrance Day this year I, along with the Minister for Transport and the Hon. Ms Bourke from the other place, attended the ceremony at the Cross of Sacrifice at the Australian Imperial Forces section of the West Terrace Cemetery. The Australian Imperial Forces

section of the cemetery was constituted thanks to the activism and protests of the League of Loyal Women because until 1920, and the establishment of the section, the burial of returned soldiers was desperate and disorganised. Over 150 returned soldiers had been buried at West Terrace Cemetery in unmarked graves. The section has seen numerous extensions and renovations over the years and, after being closed for new burials in 1944, today it finds itself the final resting place of 4,147 ex-service personnel.

At this solemn service, we heard from Major Alex Heinrich. Major Heinrich is a former major of the SAS who saw active service duty in both Afghanistan and Timor-Leste and has been awarded the Chief of Joint Operations gold commendation. He spoke about the changing face of war of conflict and of the changing nature and complexities of modern-day deployment. He spoke of conflict of generations past, of the clear adversaries encountered by soldiers, of a sense of loss and of a sense of success. He spoke of a type of camaraderie that took special form and shape through lengthy post-deployment journeys back home by sea and what those journeys look like today for soldiers who, in suffering the extremities of loss and sacrifice, find therapy and counsel through shared experience in at least a small way, a tiny way, for the horrors and dislocation of their shellshock.

Major Heinrich also spoke of modern-day conflict and deployment, of quick insertion and extraction, of a disconnect between policy, ideology and purpose at times, and of course the debilitating and profound effects of post-traumatic stress on returned soldiers, their families and friends.

I want to make special mention of a charity dedicated to the wellbeing and resilience of not only returned service men and women but also emergency services personnel and first responders—The Road Home. The Road Home, a charity of the Hospital Research Foundation, funds vital and groundbreaking research into the care and wellbeing of those who, in the pursuit of their service of this country, of our state and of our people, have sacrificed so much themselves.

They live with the trauma of post-traumatic stress, and it is often this psychological stress, the trauma they have experienced, which takes a dramatic toll on the physical wellbeing of those who have been affected. The research and programs facilitated and funded by The Road Home ensure the service and sacrifice of these people will never be in vain. Whether it is through their art therapy program or their Theatre for Change program, an innovative program run in conjunction with the State Theatre Company, The Road Home continues to innovate and take a holistic approach to therapeutic intervention.

They are also involved heavily in the world-leading Australian Centre of Excellence for Post-Traumatic Stress, co-located at the Jamie Larcombe Centre, dedicated to research that will improve the lives, the care and recovery of veterans to ultimately improve both their wellbeing and that of their family wellbeing. So, thanks to The Road Home, we can truly say, 'Lest we forget.'

MORPHETT ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:20): I take this opportunity in parliament to speak about some of the local schools in the electorate of Morphett and some of their award-winning teaching programs. One of the important schools, not only in Park Holme but in South Australia, is Kilparrin. Kilparrin is a school for students with multiple disabilities and with hearing and/or vision impairments. The class sizes are small, with approximately six students in each class, and they have a teacher along with two or three school services officers to support the students in the classroom.

The students at Kilparrin love music. They come along to school and enjoy singing and making a lot of noise with their instruments. Their music teacher is Lucy Standish. She was instrumental in introducing a fantastic program called Music for All. The Music for All program was based on the concept of using the book *Fancy Pants*, which is about Australian bush animals dressing up, as inspiration to compose music. Lucy met with the book's author, Kelly Hibbert, and Kelly was also very excited.

To compose the music, world-class musicians Paul Rissmann and Belinda McFarlane and some members of the Australian Youth Orchestra came together for a four-day workshop with the students. Lucy also made connections with another important school in Morphett, the South Australian School for the Vision Impaired (SASVI), and Suneden school to position the students at

the centre of the creative process. Paul Rissmann explained that each student came together with different levels of experience but with everyone participating in having a part to play in the performance.

After four days of turning *Fancy Pants* into a musical, the students and the Youth Orchestra held a live performance at the Marion Cultural Centre. The performance was an inspiring and emotional experience that showcased the determination and success of the students. Kilparrin principal, Cathy Roche Wells, described the musical event by saying, 'The joy that it brings the whole school community is about the students and the celebration that their families can participate in something like music with their children.'

SASVI student Cheyanne loved how everyone felt that they were contributing to the whole event. She said, 'The Australian Youth Orchestra have written the music and us adding on to it makes it sound better. I loved everything about music. You do not have to be able to see to make music.' Fellow student Anthony agreed, saying 'It makes me feel relaxed, feel myself. I like being able to hear music, to be able to play it, because I can really connect with it.' Kilparrin student Shaun summed it up best, saying 'Music makes me feel happy.'

Thank you to Lucy Standish for her fantastic work to bring this together. Cathy Roche Wells noted the musical was only possible because of Lucy's passion to form connections with Marion council, Suneden, SASVI, author Kelly Hibbert, world-class musicians Paul Rissmann and Belinda McFarlane, and the Australian Youth Orchestra. Congratulations to all the students on their part in the Music for All event. Fittingly, Lucy Standish recently won the 2019 Department for Education South Australian Community Engagement Award for this inclusive, community-based model of music education that a school on its own could not provide.

The Department of Education also recognised Glenelg Primary School's year 1 teacher Sharnie Jamieson with the Early Years Teacher of the Year award. Sharnie focuses on a direct instructional model where the focus is 'I do, we do, you do'. School principal, Rae Taggart, said the award was a reinforcement of how committed Sharnie is to learning, which is evident both to the students and the parents.

Rae Taggart has been a principal for 30 years, with the last 10 years being at Glenelg primary. To spend more time with her family, Rae decided to retire at the end of term 3. The school held a farewell function involving many people who had been involved in Rae's professional career. It was obvious, listening to students, staff and colleagues, the affection they have for her and the positive impact that she has had on the school. Acting principal, Anthony Fischer, paid tribute by saying, 'Rae would always have time for everyone. She would listen actively and carefully to families, and Rae genuinely changed children's lives every day.'

I am sure that all members of parliament would join me in thanking Rae for her commitment to education in South Australia, and we wish her and her family all the very best in her retirement.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:25): Yesterday in this place, I asked the Premier some questions about the removal of the concession for vehicle registrations on Kangaroo Island, and I did not receive any answers. I want to put on the record the dismay, the disbelief and the disgust of the people of Kangaroo Island about this move, which will see their vehicle registration costs double.

This is a very red-hot issue on the island. Just last Saturday week I was at the Kingscote show and we had more than 400 people sign our petition to have that concession reinstated in the next budget. At this year's budget, the concession was cut in half and the plan is, from 1 July next year, for it to be totally abolished. This is having a really big impact on people already and it will obviously have a further impact if it is allowed to happen.

The island community is calling on the government to reverse this move and to reinstate the concession to 50 per cent next year. People on Kangaroo Island are already faced with much higher cost pressures than other people in South Australia. Fuel is pretty much always more expensive than you pay in most parts of South Australia, and you also have the additional freight costs.

I want to thank all the businesses on the island who have a petition that I have had drawn up, the one that we had at the Kingscote show and we will have at the Parndana show this Saturday. I want to thank the businesses, including Davo's Deli and the general store out at Parndana; Roger's Deli, the Ozone Hotel and the other businesses in Kingscote; the American River post office and general store; and the IGA, the Penneshaw Hotel and the service station in Penneshaw. This is not a Labor versus Liberal thing, this is a Kangaroo Island versus dumb idea thing. All the people on Kangaroo Island pretty much are against the removal of this concession.

I have a letter here from Kangaroo Island Freight Services. Mike Smith is a very hardworking businessman on the island who has done a great job over many years getting freight on and off the island. I spoke to him at the show and again earlier today. Mike told me that a trailer he has might only do 20,000 kilometres per year, but he has to have all the different sorts of trailers and combinations, including refrigerated trailers, tray trailers and everything else. His trailers might only do 20,000 kilometres per year, while someone who has a trailer registered in another part of South Australia could be doing around 280,000 kilometres per year.

Mike Smith of Kangaroo Island Freight Service wrote to the Deputy Premier back in June. Firstly, he pointed out that fuel on Saturday was \$1.68.9 on the island, and it was \$1.17.9 in Adelaide. There is normally a 30¢ per litre price difference, with the people on the island paying more. He says:

Because we live on an Island and are limited by the number of boats running, we can only get one trip per vehicle off the island per day.

Our capital expenditure costs are far greater per kilometre than our mainland based operators.

We have to have multiple trailers per prime mover to cover our shipping requirements. You can appreciate we are paying Registration on these vehicles whilst they are sitting in our yard or at the wharf and not moving (and not causing any wear and tear on the road networks.)

In our busy time we register 7 prime movers 27 trailers and numerous Utes, forklifts and a car with an estimated \$50-\$60,000 increase in registration costs when this concession is abolished.

You can see that a \$50,000 to 60,000 increase in the cost of registration for just one freight business is going to have to be passed on to the people on Kangaroo Island. They are going to get hit with a double registration. The council has many vehicles as well, so their registration costs are going to go up, which has to be passed on or absorbed somehow, and of course freight costs go up.

I could not get any answers from the Premier yesterday. Mr Smith wrote to the Deputy Premier over four months ago and still has not had a response. Please, government of South Australia, I implore you on behalf of all the great people on Kangaroo Island to address this issue and reinstate the concession.

ONE TREE HILL FRIENDSHIP CLUB

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:30): It gives me much pleasure today to share a short story given to me to read out in this place by the senior citizens of the One Tree Hill Friendship Club, a remarkable group of King locals, many in their 90s, who meet once a week at the One Tree Hill Institute.

The One Tree Hill Friendship Club meets for socialisation, craft and afternoons of bingo from time to time. It has been my absolute pleasure to join in on the fun on multiple occasions since my election. On my last visit there, we had great fun moulding and throwing clay to make wind chimes, and on the visit before that I was asked to read out this short story that reflects times gone past:

Congratulations to all the kids who were born in the 1930s, 40's, 50's, 60's, 70's and 80's!

First, we survived being born to mothers who smoked and/or drank while they carried us. They took aspirin, ate blue cheese dressing, tuna from a can, and didn't get tested for diabetes. Then after that trauma, our baby cribs were covered with bright coloured lead-based paints. We had no childproof lids on medicine bottles, doors or cabinets, and when we rode our bikes, we had no helmets, not to mention the risks we took hitchhiking.

As children, we would ride in cars with no seat belts or air bags. We drank water from the garden hose and NOT from a bottle. We shared one soft drink with four friends, from one bottle and NO ONE actually died from this. We ate cakes, white bread and real butter and drank pop with sugar in it, but we weren't overweight because WE WERE ALWAYS OUTSIDE PLAYING!! We would leave home in the morning and play all day, as long as we were back when the streetlights came on. No one was able to reach us all day. And we were O.K..

We would spend hours building our go-carts out of scraps and then ride down the hill, only to find out we forgot the brakes. After running into the bushes a few times, we learned to solve the problem. We did not have PlayStations, Nintendo's, X-boxes, no video games at all, no 99 channels, no video tape movies, no surround sound, no mobile phones, no personal computers, no tablets, internet chat rooms. WE HAD FRIENDS and we went outside and found them!

We fell out of trees, got cut, broke bones and teeth and there were no lawsuits from these accidents. We made up games with sticks and tennis balls and, although we were told it would happen, we did not poke out very many eyes. We rode bikes or walked to a friend's house and knocked on the door or rang the bell, or just yelled for them! Football teams had trials and not everyone made the team. Those who didn't had to learn to deal with disappointment. Imagine that!! The idea of a parent bailing us out if we broke the law was unheard of. They actually sided with the law!

This generation has produced some of the best risk-takers, problem solvers and inventors ever! The past 50 years have been an explosion of innovation and new ideas. We had freedom, failure, success and responsibility, and we learned HOW TO DEAL WITH IT ALL!

And YOU are ONE OF THEM! Congratulations!

I thank the One Tree Hill senior citizens for welcoming me, for including me and for sharing your stories with me.

In closing, I want to mention that, on my last visit to the Friendship Club, two King constituents asked me to pass on their positive Lyell McEwin stories to the Minister for Health, and I have done this. They commended Lyell McEwin staff, and they said that they were treated very well on their visit. They both told me they had sent their stories of a good experience off to *The Advertiser's* Letter to the Editor, and both were really disappointed they had not been published. They are not sure whether our papers today want to publish good news.

I thank these constituents for sharing their good news story with me, and I told them that we are absolutely focused on improving health outcomes. It is a key priority for our government, and I look forward to sharing more good news and more good stories about better services in the future.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education) (15:35): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2019 to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House and for ministers to be examined on matters contained in the papers in accordance with the timetable as distributed.

I move the motion standing in my name, which is the standard process that the leader of the house does every year to put into the program of the house the Auditor-General's questioning. I can reassure members of the house that we have taken the standard form from the Clerk and applied the appropriate dates and times in the last two standard sitting weeks of the year for Auditor-General's questioning.

The schedule is set out as per the motion, and I anticipate that the arrangements during the course of that questioning should take place as has been the case in previous years. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF COUNCILS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 October 2019.)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:36): I indicate that I am the lead speaker on this bill, and I rise to indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill in the house and that there will be no need to go into committee.

Following troubling reports from both the Ombudsman and the Auditor-General last year, the Labor opposition was quick to demand that the minister act and place the District Council of Coober Pedy in administration. Belatedly, the minister did invoke section 273 of the Local Government Act 1999, declaring the council to be a defaulting council on 24 January this year, but unfortunately that was after the elections took place.

Since this period, I am advised that the administrator, Mr Tim Jackson, a highly respected, long-serving local government executive officer, has worked diligently to rectify the financial standing and the operations of the council. I am also aware that he has recently appointed a new CEO to the council of Coober Pedy. However, under the act a council may only be placed in administration for a maximum period of 12 months, which will end for the Coober Pedy council in January next year.

Appropriately, therefore, this bill makes specific provision for the period of administration of the Coober Pedy council to be extended until the end of the current council electoral term in November 2022. Given the significant financial mismanagement identified by the Auditor-General, as well as the complexities involved in the council providing both electricity and water utility services, this provision appears eminently sensible. The 70 per cent community support for this extension, as captured by an Electoral Commission poll, lends further weight to this clause.

This bill also eliminates an anomaly of the act whereby councillors retain their allowances in spite of a council being declared defaulting and placed in administration. On the bill's general extension of the maximum period a council can be in administration from 12 to 24 months, Labor reserves its right to consult with the local government sector further prior to the bill being debated in the Legislative Council.

Additionally, we also need to consider a circumstance where the end of an administration ends with an election year. While we appreciate that the serious matters for which a council can be declared defaulting may require a two-year period to rectify, we are also aware that democratic governance should be restored to councils as responsibly possible. With those few comments, I indicate that we will be supporting this bill through this chamber.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:39): I also rise in fulsome support of the bill. I think it was back in 2016 or 2017, in an interview on ABC radio, that I called for the dismissal of the Coober Pedy council. I then had the great pleasure to be in Coober Pedy about a week later, and I had a very long meeting with the Coober Pedy council that went for 2½ hours. The council had been in trouble for an extended period of time, and clearly a minister cannot just dismiss a council; a process has to be gone through.

That council had faced a number of challenges over the years. There were revolving door CEOs, revolving door senior officers, revolving door mayors, with a small population base electing a council, and it was a very small rate base. There were issues around governance, both experience and knowledge, and other issues, and there is a high level of socio-economic disadvantage in Coober Pedy. As a result of that history, because prior to the Coober Pedy council there was the Opal Miners Progress Association that was essentially the body that ran Coober Pedy many years ago, there was a real culture in Coober Pedy.

I have to put on record that I love Coober Pedy. When people say that it is a unique community, it is a unique community and I like visiting there, and the people are great, but when it came to governance there were a few issues. I have a bit of sympathy, given some of the things I have already mentioned—that is, the small rate base and the difficulty in getting expertise there at times—as they were expected to run facilities that bigger councils in the rest of the state were not expected to run.

Their water was drawn from a saline aquifer, pumped to a desalination plant and then distributed to the community. When you see how spread out that community is, you can see that it is a bit of an undertaking, plus at one stage they directly operated the generator assets and the distribution and retail (and they still do distribution and retail), but the decisions made in relation to the generator assets when the council was directly running it were bizarre. Of course, it was then outsourced and we had the whole debate, the toing and froing, about the hybrid solar plant with backup diesel. It was clear that the council was out of its depth.

I look forward to the administrator continuing in the role he has undertaken because it will take more than a year to get things back on an even keel. Hopefully, we can get back to a fully elected council in Coober Pedy, but we have to address some of the outstanding issues. When we were in government, towards the tail end of government I wrote to the minister, indicating that I believed that the water assets in Coober Pedy should be outsourced to SA Water. I thought it was far too great a risk to leave them in the hands of the council. The distribution assets and the retail side of things were a mess as well. Often people on very low incomes ended up being cut off, running up bills of over \$10,000, and it was often people in the Aboriginal community who were copping those massive bills.

A raft of issues need to be addressed in Coober Pedy, and I think this bill starts to move us in the right direction, at least as far as governance is concerned, but there are some hard, practical issues that need to be addressed.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:43): I would like to thank the members of the opposition who contributed to this debate. This is one of those things where we all need to work together to clean it up, and obviously the community in Coober Pedy has voted quite overwhelmingly in favour of wanting to keep it in administration for a time longer, and we are essentially trying to accede to their request.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**SUMMARY OFFENCES (TRESPASS ON PRIMARY PRODUCTION PREMISES) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 November 2019.)

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:45): I rise to speak in support of the Summary Offences (Trespass on Primary Production Premises) Amendment Bill 2019. I personally have very strongly advocated for tougher penalties to deter illegal activism which targets legitimate farming and primary production businesses. I commend the Attorney-General for her work on this bill and the Minister Primary Industries and Regional Development for his work consulting with farmers and stakeholders.

In my previous role in the dairy industry, one of the roles I held was chair of animal health and welfare for the dairy industry right across Australia. In that role, I learnt a lot in this space about the difficulties that businesses face from activists coming onto their premises and causing enormous disruption in the way they conduct their business. Particularly, when we see people illegally come onto properties, my great concern is the risk they pose to the animals and the biosecurity of the property they invade.

There are many reasons why we need to make sure we look after the boundaries of a property. Firstly, on the biosecurity aspects, every time someone enters a property, there is a chance that they may bring something onto that property with them that is not wanted, whether it be some seeds on their shoes or, even worse, some disease that is from another property, which may infect the animals on the property they have entered. We need to make sure that those businesses are protected from that incursion.

The problem with biosecurity breaches is that they can last for years and years. It might just be one small weed seed that gets onto that property, but that can cause problems. That can cause plants to grow that may even be poisonous to some of the livestock on the property, which has to be

managed for years. We need to make sure that that risk is eliminated, but we also need to eliminate the risk of strangers entering a property and disturbing the animals.

As a dairy farmer, I would often have people come and see me while I was milking. Cows are very much creatures of habit. If there is anyone extra in their environment, they get agitated and bit excited about what is going on. When I am there, I am able to manage that, but if the operators of the farm are not around when that occurs, anything can happen. Animals can get spooked so much they can break through fences or gates and end up injuring themselves. We do not want to see that. We cannot see that. We need to make sure those people and those businesses are protected from that risk.

In my roles over the years, I have seen some significant issues on properties and farms. I remember one situation back in 2003 at Portland in Victoria when a load of sheep were destined to go to the Middle East. An activist went in there and fed them some ham, which made them unsuitable to be exported to the Middle East because they were no longer halal; they could not be used for that purpose.

What was even sadder was that they had actually been treated with medication to deal with disease issues in the Middle East so that they could go to the Middle East, but that meant they could not come back into the Australian system. So we had this large proportion of sheep stuck, unable to be processed one way or the other, and those sheep had to be destroyed and removed from the food chain because someone had fed them ham. It is just outrageous that that occurred.

In March this year, a family-owned feedlot at a dairy in Millmerran in southern Queensland, which happens to be right next door to a very close friend of mine, was invaded by a group of about 100 activists. There was a risk to biosecurity and the family felt threatened in their own home after those people invaded their property. Cattle were being mixed up in groups as the activists opened gates to allow the cattle to move through parts of the property they were not allowed on. Sadly, the police were just standing on the side of the road because there were too few police to deal with the number of activists. Only two out of the 100 trespassers were fined. Security cameras have now been installed on that feedlot at Millmerran to manage that going forward.

I congratulate the Morrison government on putting through the Criminal Code Amendment (Agricultural Protection) Act in 2019 to strengthen penalties in this area. First offences now apply where a person uses a carriage service to transmit, make available, publish or otherwise distribute material with the intent to incite another person to trespass on agricultural land. It is great that we now have the ability to stop some of that mass use of social media and other means that encourage people to break the law in this area.

It is great that the Attorney has brought a bill before us to increase penalties. The new aggravated trespass offence will penalise a person who trespasses on primary production land and interferes with the conduct of the business, does anything to put the safety of the people at risk or increases the risk of biosecurity and food contamination impacts. That has a fine of up to \$10,000 or 12 months' imprisonment.

We have seen an increase in penalties for interfering with farm gates. I was doing a quick sum of the farm gates on my property at Mount Compass. We have 7½ kilometres of road fencing with 22 farm gates that open out onto the road. It is almost impossible to check those gates, even on a daily basis, to see whether anyone has interfered with them. We have to rely on the community not interfering with our gates. It is important that we stop people from maliciously opening gates and allowing cattle onto the roads, thereby putting the animals and the people driving down those roads at risk.

We have also seen the doubling of existing penalties for trespass offences when they take place on primary production land. It is sad that in our society we have to go down the path of putting these extra penalties in place. It is obvious to me that we should not be trespassing and interfering with people's legal activities. It is legal to run a dairy farm. It is legal to run a sheep farm. It is legal to run a cattle farm. Those businesses should be allowed to operate legally. If there is a breach of animal welfare on those properties, we also need to call that out.

In my time working with industry, if we found out there was a problem on a particular property, we would go in there and make sure that it was addressed. We would make sure that those farmers not doing the right thing were brought to account. The dairy, cattle, sheep, pork and chicken industries all want their participants to do the right thing, and they are more than happy to call them out when they do not.

In my time in leadership roles in the dairy industry, which spans about 11 years, I can remember only three dairy industry welfare cases. Sadly, in the case of all three, the farmers themselves were suffering through illness. Two out of the three cases related to mental illness and the third one was a case of extreme financial distress. Animal welfare is at the heart of farming. Farmers do everything they can to look after their livestock. It is only when they cannot look after themselves that they cannot look after their livestock. It is so important that we help farmers and protect them from the pressures of having someone come onto their farm, their home, and make sure they can continue to do what they do so well.

The standard Australia has in relation to animal welfare is second to none. We as a community insist that we do the right thing. We insist as a world participant in animal welfare that the rest of the world tries to do the right thing, too. I very much thank the Attorney-General and the Minister for Primary Industries for bringing this forward.

I want to again say that many farmers are not just businesses. They have family homes where generations have often lived, and they must be protected from illegal activities that threaten the livelihoods, their property and the personal safety of the people who live and work there. It is my expectation that the authorities will apply these new penalties with vigour to ensure our farmers and their primary industries have the full protection of the law.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:56): I rise today to support the Summary Offences (Trespass on Primary Production Premises) Amendment Bill. I am pleased to hear that the opposition is also prepared to support this bill. I will declare an interest at this stage of the debate: for 30 years prior to coming into this place I was an active farmer. We ran livestock on our property and, in fact, the property is share-farmed by my son-in-law and his brothers, but we still run sheep on the property.

Across the country, there has been a huge surge in antifarm activism. This has predominantly occurred in the Eastern States, and South Australia has remained somewhat protected from this activism. That said, some of our farmers have experienced trespass, halting their primary production and impacting their ability to manage their farms. I think the member for Hammond—if he has not already—will talk about the incident that occurred at the Strathalbyn abattoir. It is interesting that many of these activists do not travel too far from major metropolitan areas. For that reason—and I think the member for Giles mentioned it when he was talking about his trip to Buckleboo the other day—the more remote places, the more remote livestock producers, are less likely to see visits from animal activists.

Those who seek to be negligent and do damage to our farmers and primary producers must take responsibility for their actions and their impact on our local farmers. This bill seeks to do that. South Australia's primary industries are a vital part of our state's economy. Spread across the state, South Australia's grain, livestock, horticulture, wine, seafood, forest and dairy sectors are significant contributors to our exports.

Remember that the farmers who are producing livestock—and essentially we are talking about livestock activities here because that seems to be the activity that has gained the ire of our activists—are actually running a business. They are running a legitimate and legal business. They are producing income for themselves and their family and they are producing income for the state through both the domestic market and the export market. Almost all these farmers also live on the farm where they do business, so people need to be conscious and cognisant of the fact that not only are they entering a property but they are entering a business and often a home as well.

Numerically, in 2017-18 primary industries and agribusiness supported 152,000 jobs and contributed almost \$20 billion to the state's economy. Regional South Australia, where many of our primary producers are of course, contributes about \$25 billion to the state's economy with just 29 per cent of the state's population and engages about one in five working Australians.

Primarily, we are talking about livestock industries in relation to this bill, and the major livestock industries of this state include beef, sheep, pig and chicken meat, with a total primary production value of \$1.89 billion. There are over 11 million sheep, but I remember a time when it was up around 17 million. Our shearing gangs would have been busy then, member for Hammond. That has seen a drop after the collapse of the Wool Reserve Price Scheme, but slowly but surely the sheep numbers have lifted, although they are being impacted by the dry conditions. There are 950,000 head of cattle and 57 million kilograms of wool produced. Even though the wool market has been bouncing around a bit of late, it still remains relatively firm compared with where it was.

The member for Finniss will be familiar with and well versed in the dairy sector. It has had an 11 per cent increase in production value in 2017-18 to over \$200 million, and the wool sector production is valued at \$568 million in 2017-18. Combined, South Australia's cattle and sheep industries generate \$3.4 billion in revenue. South Australia's beef industry alone grosses a revenue in excess of \$1.3 billion, so we are not talking about insignificant industries that are potentially being impacted upon by visitations from activists.

Aquaculture also gets a mention in all of this. I have not known or been aware of any impact on any aquaculture ventures at this point. That said, much of South Australia's aquaculture exists within my electorate of course, including oysters, kingfish, and tuna ranching, which is vertically integrated with the pilchard industry and processing. So, once again, perhaps geography and distance will prevent any issues at this point in time at least.

In 2017-18, the wild catch and aquaculture industries produced approximately 70,000 tonnes of seafood, generating a total revenue of over \$500 million. Southern bluefin tuna is the state's largest single aquaculture product, with international exports of over \$100 million in 2017-18. The southern rock lobster is the state's highest value fishery at \$125 million and, if we add to that the northern zone rock lobster—which exists from Kangaroo Island and up the West Coast—you can see that they are significantly valuable industries.

We have recently seen in Australia the arrival of the Aussie Farms animal activist website. To anyone who wants to look at it, this website provides maps with the locations of meat-processing facilities, horseracing tracks, showground pens, dairies, chicken and pig farms, sheep and cattle properties and aquaculture sites, including those in South Australia. As I said earlier, farms are often the homes of families, mums and dads with young children, and it is important that people feel safe in their home and their workplace.

There are concerns—hence this legislation—that activists may now target South Australian farms with little appreciation or understanding of the biosecurity threats that unauthorised access can pose to industry, and the member for Finniss talked extensively about the biosecurity threats. Essentially, disease and weeds are being introduced potentially to properties that are otherwise free of them without any consideration of that biosecurity stance.

A strong and effective biosecurity system is a priority for the South Australian government. It is essential for maintaining and increasing access to international and domestic markets. Remember, we are essentially a primary production sector that exports, and there are huge markets and huge opportunities in Asia, of course, and we wish to maintain them.

Farmers are constantly improving their on-farm practices in recognition of consumer expectations and in response to up-to-date biosecurity and animal management advice. Good farmers look after their animals and rarely are animals neglected on a property. If they are, there is generally a reason for it and that can be determined and that particular property owner, business and farmer can be assisted.

Disruption to farming practices by protesters is an ongoing risk that needs to be managed in a sensitive and reasonable fashion, and our farmers need support to be informed about how to deal with these challenges, their rights and what steps they can take should their farms become targeted. There has been extensive consultation in the lead-up to this bill and I congratulate all members of the government for their work, and the Attorney-General and also the member for Finniss for their work in preparing this.

The stakeholders consulted were, in the broad, primary production industries as well as the justice sector and the general community. They included the Australian Chicken Growers Council, the Australian Lot Feeders' Association, the Australian Meat Industry Council, the Commercial Egg Farmers Association of South Australia and Tasmania—there you go, a combined effort—the Commissioner of Police, the Law Society of South Australia, Livestock SA, Minister for Environment and Water, National Farmers' Federation, Kangaroo Industries Association of Australia, PIRSA, Pork SA, Primary Producers SA, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) and the South Australian Dairyfarmers' Association. I commend the bill and I do expect that this adds an extra deterrent to people who might wish to interfere with others' lives and businesses.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:06): I thank all members for their contribution to the debate on this bill, in particular the expression of support for the government's bill from the opposition by the member for Kaurana. I also take the opportunity to answer some questions raised by the member for Kaurana during a briefing on the bill, attended by my advisers and the Attorney-General's Department, and during his second reading contribution yesterday.

Firstly, why make farms, as distinct from any other primary industry, a special case such that it needs to have new standalone trespass offences and increased penalties in respect of other offences committed against farms? The member will note that the new definition to be added in for 'primary production activities' does extend beyond farms, and I would urge him to have a look at that, but it is true that the proposal here is to deal with primary production enterprises.

Quite simply, South Australia's primary production industries are a vital part of our state's economy, a significant contributor to our exports—this has been outlined by a number of the speakers on this bill—and to our ability to feed our own population. This bill goes a small way to protecting our produce and our growth for a long-term and sustainable future. Again, in that regard I urge the member to refresh his memory on the definition proposed for 'primary production activities'. It also allows for further prescription by regulation.

Secondly, why has the current law of trespass not been used in farming cases? Although I do not have the data available to me now, I have made presentations to the parliament in relation to examples of trespass. Exactly how often this has occurred that has resulted in prosecution and conviction is not here today, but I remind the member that, as has been advised by SAPOL, there are a number of reasons why they are called onto properties to deal with persons who are trespassing. It may be that they have overstayed their welcome, they are no longer the lawful owner, or it might be somebody going in to pick mushrooms. They are disturbing the quiet occupation of the property and have no intention to be animal activists or anything else.

In relation to the latter, that has been less frequent in this state, as was previously identified, although the impact of the recent case in late 2018 at Strathalbyn ought to be clear to everyone of what can occur. I am advised, and I understand the member for Kaurana was advised by a memorandum of email, that the Strathalbyn meatworks incident resulted in 23 protesters being arrested for trespass or unlawfully on the premises, all of whom were subsequently issued an adult caution. The protest on that occasion involved a sit-in that lasted for some 10 hours.

The purpose of this legislation is to be pre-emptive. It responds to a request around the country, as I have indicated, to all attorneys-general to address this issue within their jurisdictions. It follows the work of the commonwealth in dealing immediately with the new offence of using the internet, essentially, to incite someone to enter upon a property in these circumstances.

The bill also specifically responds to advice that was provided by the Commissioner of Police in June that, while there had not been a great deal of organised protest activity in general farming operations, as the Animal Liberation movement grew nationally it was likely, in their view, that South Australia will see an increase in frequency of protest activity undertaken by these groups.

Thirdly, I am advised that, although the Surveillance Devices Act 2016 contains a public interest exemption to the general prohibition against using a surveillance device to record a private activity or conversation, this does not mean that the person then has a lawful excuse—in other words, an entitlement or a right—to commit a crime by entering another person's premises without their consent to use or plant the device.

Fourthly, the new aggravated farm trespass offence in the bill is broad in scope. In particular, it will capture anything that gives rise to a serious risk to the safety of the person or any other persons on the premises, or anything that involves or gives rise to a risk of the introduction, spread or increase of a disease or pest, or the contamination or any substance or thing. Again, many members in this debate have contributed examples of where that has occurred, even to the extent of bacon being fed to pigs, which disqualifies the meat from being able to be exported. So there are massive consequences in those circumstances.

Concern has been expressed by the member for Kaurua that the word 'risk' in this context is uncertain and that it is difficult to imagine a scenario that does not involve some level of risk of bringing disease, pests or contamination of some sort onto a primary production premises. There are three points I would like to make to alleviate those concerns. Firstly, if the bill is passed it would not be the first instance of the use of the expression 'risk' in the Summary Offences Act.

An example of forming of a belief that there is a risk to public order and safety, which triggers the power of the police officer to order a person to leave a declared public precinct, under section 66O, is relevant to other public precinct provisions in the act. Also, section 83BA refers to the forming of an opinion that there is a serious risk of injury or damage due to the overcrowding at a public venue, which triggers a senior police officer's power to direct that people leave the venue immediately.

These examples suggest that forming a view as to the existence of a risk of certain matters is something that the parliament has previously been comfortable to leave to the discretion of the police officers involved. It can therefore be safely assumed that the police would be capable of forming a judgement on whether certain conduct gave rise to a risk of spreading disease, pests or contamination on primary production premises.

Secondly, it is the government's policy that the highest penalty under section 17 should apply only to aggravated farm trespass. In those cases where no aggravation can be established, which might be uncommon but it is more than a hypothetical possibility, only the non-aggravated penalty should apply. Also, we can also reasonably assume that the police would not use their prosecutorial discretion to prosecute a person for a mere theoretical or negligible risk.

Another matter raised by the member for Kaurua was in reference to the 24-hour period in section 17A; that is, it is an offence if a trespasser is asked to leave a premises and either fails to leave or trespasses again on those premises within 24 hours. The government consulted on the bill very broadly with primary production stakeholders and received no feedback seeking any change to the 24-hour period.

The sixth matter raised by the honourable member was when he asked why a section 17B offence for interfering with gates does not carry a potential term of imprisonment. The government considers that this offence is a relatively low-level offence as it is not necessary to establish any loss or damage, and it is therefore sufficient to increase the maximum fine and impose a significant expiation fee. The more serious offences carry terms of imprisonment, which have been increased in this bill. These other offences are the ones that are more likely to be charged where the interference with gates has led to the loss or damage to stock on the farm.

The seventh matter raised was when the honourable member asked about section 17C. Whilst there may be some overlap between this section and the aggravated farm trespass offence, the government does not wish to repeal section 17C and prefers to leave it available to be charged at the discretion of the prosecutor.

Finally, the honourable member is correct that the government does not intend to amend the hoon driving offence in section 17AA and the forcible entry offence in section 17D. It is not necessary to do so, as these offences remain available to be charged where the relevant conduct occurs on primary production premises. I am advised that those are all the matters that have been raised by the member, but no doubt if there are further issues, they can be dealt with in committee.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: I have a question in relation to consultation. At the briefing I asked about this and subsequently via email to your office as well. I was provided a list of people from whom consultation had been received. The email from the Attorney's office indicated that further information about what that consultation feedback was can be provided within the committee stage. Therefore, I am asking whether you can update the house on what feedback you have received from those stakeholders you consulted with.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am reviewing the email in which, I think, some 30 submissions were received in addition to comments on the YourSAy website, and I note that there is an indication here that we could provide summaries through the committee stage if required. I am not aware that that had been sought, so we do not have that information available.

Nevertheless, I am happy to read a list of these, and you can contact them if you wish: the National Farmers' Federation; Primary Producers SA; the National Kangaroo Association; the Chief Executive, PIRSA; the Commissioner of Police; the Commercial Egg Farmers Association of SA; the Australian Meat Industry Council; the Australian Lot Feeders' Association; the SA Dairyfarmers Association; the Acting Director of Public Prosecutions; The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals South Australia Inc; and Pork SA.

There is also the Australian Chicken Growers' Council; Livestock SA; the Minister for Environment and Water; the Law Society of South Australia; the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development; Grain Producers SA; YouSAy (and ad hoc responses, as I have indicated); Horse SA; Vivien Clayton; Neil Winkley, Forester Green Triangle (I think it is Forest Green Triangle, but anyway, it may be 'Forester') PF Olsen Limited Australia; Australian Pork Limited; the South Australian Wine Industry Association Inc; the Australian Forest Products Association; the Animal Justice Party SA; and, the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC.

Mr PICTON: Thank you, Attorney. I note that in future we have to flag that with your office to ask to get that detail.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Mr PICTON: Yes, well, I did require it and asked for it in committee. The Attorney did touch on this during her summing-up, but does the Attorney have any statistics whatsoever or any information at all to clarify whether any of these offences have been used in recent times, that is, the past five years or so; if so, how many times and what were the outcomes?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I do not have that data, as I indicated in reply, but I think I confirmed that the 23 protestors in the Strathalbyn meatworks sit-in were all given adult cautions.

Mr PICTON: Under which section?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not have that in front of me, but there is an adult caution procedure, which means they are not prosecuted under any section. It is a policy that was introduced in 2017, so I assume the member is aware of how that operates; that is, the police can give an adult caution to someone not to do certain conduct on the basis that they are not charged.

Mr PICTON: Of course they get a caution, but my understanding is that they get a caution saying, 'Well, this is the caution in terms of the offence that we're concerned about.' You just do not get a caution saying, 'Well, we're just generally concerned about what you're up to.' I would have thought there would be particular cautions under sections 17, 17A or 17C as the case would be. If you do not have that information, perhaps you could provide it between the houses.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I can make that inquiry, but I think it has been already provided on the material that was provided by the police, but if you did not have that information I will give you a quick summary of what there is. Section 17(1) is being on a premises for an unlawful purpose or without lawful excuse. It currently has a \$2,500 fine or imprisonment for six months, and there are various iterations of that as it becomes more aggravated.

Section 17A(1) is trespassing on premises such as to interfere with the enjoyment of the premises by the occupier and failing to leave, etc.; that is the 24-hour leave. Section 17B relates to interference with gates on land on which animals are kept in the course of primary production. Section 17C relates to disturbance of farm animals while trespassing on land on which animals are kept in the course of primary production.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I am just indicating that these are the ones that are referenced. Section 17D(1) relates to without lawful authority using force, threats or intimidation to enter land or premises to expel a person in possession. Section 17D(2) relates to entering upon land or premises unlawfully and retaining possession of the land or premises by force or in a manner that would render the use of force the only reasonably practicable means of recovering lawful possession of the land or premises. Section 18(2) relates to loitering on a public space, that is, a public road leading to farmland.

My understanding of the Strathalbyn incident is that there was a 10-hour entering of the property, occupation on the roof—it was a sit-in protest arrangement—and they were ultimately coaxed down by the police and left the property. Depending on what the actual factual situation was, I am assuming that the police could have referred to any number of those divisions.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr PICTON: Does the Attorney believe that if a similar situation was going to happen again—noting that she cited this as the example—following the commencement of this act, it would be taken further than an adult caution by police under these additional provisions that she is seeking to enact?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot say what the charges would be. That would be a matter for the police to assess in relation to the circumstances of any entering or trespassing that they found was in breach of any of these sections in the upgraded form, and it allows for an aggravated penalty application. Obviously, there is a significant change to the definition as to what can be done. Instead of just being able to be prosecuted for leaving a gate open, which could cause loss and damage if stock walked out, if someone was to interfere with a fence—that is, cut a fence line—or remove stock from a temporarily fenced arrangement, that is why the expansion of definition is there. Those matters would need to be assessed by the police, as they would normally do, in order for them to make the decision about whether there was any breach pursuant to these new provisions.

The adult cautioning has the capacity for them to do that and, again, they would have to make the assessment themselves on whether that would be recommended. I imagine that the nature of the trespass, the number trespassing and the cause of damage are all factors that would be relevant to the decision of the police in those circumstances, as they are the investigative and prosecuting bodies on those matters.

Mr PICTON: Following the commencement of this act, is the Attorney able to outline any conduct that is currently legal that would be illegal following the commencement of this act, except for the fact of the slight expansion of the definition of interference with gates and fences which, as we have discussed, is the one provision here that does not carry any serious penalties involving significant amounts of money or potential imprisonment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is really the aggravated level of offences. The other reform that you would be aware of is that we have already in this parliament recently removed the \$20,000 cap on compensation claims that are available through the Magistrates Court to be accessed for that purpose. The question of biosecurity, which is dealt with through a different set of laws, is a matter that is under review by the Minister for Primary Industries to deal with potential further offences and/or fines relating to contamination.

There are three things that I think the occupier and owner of the premises wants: firstly, to be free of interference with their lawful business and often home life and livelihood; secondly, to ensure that if that is breached that it is quickly attended to and that the police, of course, have the

power to do that; and, thirdly, that there be sufficient deterrent in our legal system to ensure that if they are guilty they have a big disincentive not to come back. I think from memory we also made provision for on-the-spot fines on the gates. So, on some of the matters, there can be immediate action by on-the-spot fines.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Mr PICTON: The Attorney did touch on this in her summing-up, but can expand and clarify, in that from this provision of section 17 it is clear that it is for an unlawful purpose that the penalty and the provision can be applied. It is not merely a fact of being on premises; you have to also demonstrate to the court that it is for an unlawful purpose for without lawful excuse. We did raise some questions about whether there is an interplay here with the Surveillance Devices Act, which does have a defence in the public interest.

I am wondering if the Attorney can outline whether she is confident that that would have no intersection here, in that that would not extend to protecting people against prosecution in relation to section 17, and are there any other provisions that would negate this fact? Also, what would be the likely unlawful purposes that would be sought to be used in the sorts of examples she has been discussing, such as in relation to the Strathalbyn case?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not think that generally there is anything more helpful that I can add to the operation of how this is to apply and its intersection with the Surveillance Devices Act. If the member reads through what I have said in that regard, I hope that it would be clearer, if it is not now.

In relation to the question of 'for unlawful purposes', we frequently have legislation which gives a higher penalty if someone does something with the purpose of doing something else. For example, if you enter upon the property under our laws with the purpose of stealing property from it, then it has a higher penalty approach or regime that applies. One is not going in there and just walking through the property; it is to do something, and it may be to cause disturbance to animals, it may be to open the gate, it may be to throw bacon over into a pork pen. It can be all sorts of things that are for an unlawful purpose, and I think that is fairly self-evident.

Mr PICTON: It might be self-evident to the Attorney, but perhaps I can put it another way. If a person was to enter a primary production facility or property for the purpose of filming, does that fall foul of her proposed section 17?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, I think if the member just reviews the matters I have outlined, it will be clear but, in short, I can say this. The advice we have is that somebody who is trespassing on a farm, taking a photograph of operations there, cannot rely on the provisions under the Surveillance Devices Act—it is a different legislation—where a public interest clause is a feature of that legislation in allowing there to be surveillance.

Here, we are talking about a trespass and whether there is a criminal offence that goes with that. I think it is fair to say that one should not read this legislation as a licence or permission to go onto a property and be filming activity and then try to argue that that is covered by or protected by exceptions under the Surveillance Devices Act. They might feel very let down if they did.

Mr PICTON: To clarify, does filming in itself constitute an unlawful purpose under this provision?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If it is filming contrary to the Surveillance Devices Act, then it would be.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr PICTON: Is the Attorney aware of any example or any circumstance where there have been the sorts of animal rights protestors that the bill is designed to address, where essentially this

clause would have effect? My understanding of this clause is that somebody trespasses, they are told to leave the property and they return within 24 hours.

I am not an expert in this area, but my presumption of the type of people we are talking about here are that they are probably trying to operate relatively covertly. It is not dissimilar to an irritant in a shopping centre, where this clause, as I understand it, is quite often used in terms of asking that person to leave Westfield Marion and the like. Also, this presumably does not stop that person from returning within 25 hours and undertaking the same trespass. Does the Attorney agree with that and therefore is this actually going to have quite limited use in terms of the type of conduct she is seeking to prohibit?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We are just trying to clarify what provision we are at. Clause 6, which is an amendment to section 17A, already makes it an offence if the trespasser either fails to leave the premises forthwith or again trespasses on the premises within 24 hours; in either circumstance, they are guilty of an offence.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8.

Mr PICTON: The last clause of the bill, clause 8, which as I said in my second reading actually might be the most significant change in this legislation, is in relation to the disturbance of farm animals. Currently, there is a relatively small penalty of \$750, which in the context of a whole range of traffic offences is relatively small these days. That is not even expiation; it is the maximum penalty that could be applied. My presumption, even though the Attorney does not have any statistics available to her, is that it has probably not been used very often, but now it is going to be changed to \$2,500 or imprisonment for six months. The definition is relatively broad, which therefore might mean that the sort of conduct that is seeking to be addressed here might actually now be used by section 17C, in my opinion, rather than other sections.

It depends upon the definition of 'causes harm to the animal' or 'loss, convenience or inconvenience' to the owner of the animals. My presumption is that this has not been used very often and that therefore to date there is probably very little case law interpretation as to these clauses. Can the Attorney-General outline what she and the government believe would be the appropriate definition and what is the test that is seeking to be met here in terms of causing harm to the animal? Do you have to physically cause harm to the animal, or is it just merely a presence that could be causing harm to the animal? What would be the loss or inconvenience to the owner of the animal?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will try to give an example. Because there are plenty of circumstances where the word 'harm' is in our legislation, the courts understand what we are talking about. It is broader than simply physical damage to the person or, in this case, a piece of livestock. I think the member for Finnis described to the parliament a circumstance where somebody entering a dairy can cause some stress to a dairy cow just by being an extra person in the perimeter. I think his description was that they are creatures of habit, and if they are used to just a bald-headed bloke being in the dairy and, suddenly, there are three people there with green hair or something, then they might be stressed. They might be a bit—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Mr Hughes might go, yes, or they might be helping out Mr Basham. The bottom line is that it can cause some disturbance to the cattle. That is the understanding I have from the member, and he is the expert on dairy cows, so I have no reason to doubt that. If that causes them to be distressed and not produce milk or kick the bucket over or, worse still, kick the member for Finnis, then that may be a harm that is able to be established as a direct consequence of being disturbed in the dairy.

If they are able to satisfy that, on the balance of probability, to a court as an element of this breach, then I expect that will form part of the argument that the person should be successfully convicted of that. It may also have considerable weight in the determination of whether any

compensation is paid. Here, we are talking about the level of penalty that is to apply as a result of trespassing and causing harm arising from the disturbance of farm animals.

I will check one thing in relation to the standard of proof. Is the standard of proof on the balance of probability for harm within the definition? Not quite sure. It is possible. Certainly, if it is not on the element of harm—that not being beyond reasonable doubt—usually 'beyond reasonable doubt' applies to the extra criminal offence itself, but some elements of it may only need to have the threshold of 'on the balance of probability'. That is what I am assuming it is. My adviser, brilliantly wise as she is, is not able to assist me on this particular point, but if it is anything different we will get it to you between the houses.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:45): I move, without notice:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the following procedure in relation to the Gambling Administration Bill and the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Bill—

- (a) one second reading debate to be undertaken regarding the two bills;
- (b) separate questions to be put on each bill at the conclusion of that debate;
- (c) the bills to be considered in one Committee of the Whole House;
- (d) one third reading debate to be undertaken regarding the two bills; and
- (e) separate questions to be put on each bill at the conclusion of the third reading debates.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We require an absolute majority for this, Attorney. I am counting the members in the house and I see there is not an absolute majority. Please ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority is present. I accept the motion. For members' information, the question is that a cognate debate occur in order to discuss two bills at the same time.

Motion carried.

Bills

GAMBLING ADMINISTRATION BILL

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REGULATION) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 September 2019.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:48): I rise to speak on both the Gambling Administration Bill and the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Bill brought by the government. These are important bills that seek to do a broad range of things, none the least mostly contained within the Gambling Administration Bill to continue with—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you are the lead speaker I take it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —yes—the government's program of changing the regulatory regime that applies to gambling in South Australia and to consolidate those powers within the Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming. I indicate that the opposition is broadly supportive of these measures, with some caveats.

While there are some changes in the Gambling Administration Bill which broaden and better specify the commissioner's powers, aside from the case of the Lotteries Bill, there is also the intention of the government to leave in place the remaining bills, which will continue to regulate those parts of gaming, in particular the Authorised Betting Operations Act, the Casino Act, the Gaming Machines Act, the Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act and so on.

Mr Speaker, as you and many others would be aware, it has been of great concern to me and to many of my colleagues that the landscape for gambling in South Australia has fundamentally changed over the last 10 years. While we in South Australia are used to prosecuting public debates about the impact of gaming machines, or indeed the impact of having a licensed casino operation in South Australia, there is a far greater and, in my view, more prevalent form of gambling occurring in our community, and that is with respect to online gambling.

Unlike all those other areas I touched on in reciting the different names of the other acts, which also regulate types of gambling in South Australia, online gambling is comparatively lightly regulated. Indeed, insofar as governments are able to control the provision of online gambling channels, some of it is even unregulated, which is a great frustration to governments across all jurisdictions.

While I take to heart some of the concerns raised by members of the community, which are related to the regulation of gambling activities with regard to gaming machines, I would respectfully suggest that there is also a very significant concern which needs to be addressed through online gambling. Before I pursue further remarks in that vein, I did want to also touch on what has been seen as a fairly significant reform in this area, and that is to provide a broader range of opportunities for gaming and gaming machines through the provision of note acceptors.

The opposition is prepared to support that with some additional suggestions for improvements. I am very grateful to the government, and in particular to the Deputy Premier, for their willingness to accommodate some of those suggestions. We have a significant number of amendments between both the government and the opposition in these two bills. Some of them, as you would imagine, when trying to amend a large number of bills and amend them as thoroughly as these two bills intend to do, are of relatively technical nature, and some of them are of a more substantive policy nature. But I look forward to moving those amendments, and hopefully succeeding with those amendments, along with the government, during the course of this bill's passage through the house.

Again, I put on the record my appreciation of the approach of the government in being willing to accommodate those requests of the opposition, which I feel will mean that not only will we have a far greater capacity to regulate and a far greater capacity to understand the breadth and the extent of online gambling in South Australia but there will also be far greater controls in some areas, nation-leading controls over gambling on gaming machines, or poker machines as they are colloquially known in our community.

While many in the community maintain reservations about the introduction of note acceptors, along with the other package of reforms that the opposition and the government agreed upon, I think we have the balance right and, importantly, those more than 25,000 people who are supported by the operations of hotels in South Australia can look forward to maintaining a livelihood and not being continually undermined by that area of largely unregulated gaming.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:54): I thank the member for Lee for his comments in relation to the advancing of these reforms and some foreshadowed amendments that have been considered since the tabling of these bills. May I add two things to the fulsome matters that need to be looked at. One is the question of online gambling and the commitment, which I make here today on behalf of the government, to ensure that a select

committee is presented for parliament's consideration to be established to investigate online gambling in both its application and its current regulation, or inadequacy thereto, what protections we have to deal with vulnerable persons—that includes every 18 year old who is eligible to get a phone account—and how we might manage that in the future.

It is clearly a form of gambling that has its challenges. I commend the commonwealth parliament for recently passing legislation to introduce offences to prohibit other aspects of online gambling. They have undertaken significant studies in this regard. There was some work done by the IGA, which is a body that is now discontinued here in South Australia, and one of our committees in the parliament has been vested with terms of reference to consider. However, it is a serious issue. I agree with the member for Lee that we need to look into this. I would expect that we can prepare terms of reference and look to introduce that for consideration of the parliament early next year so that we can get on with that important work.

The second aspect relates to not only providing support to any future inquiry but also, generally, the public being informed with sufficient data to enable reasonable assessment of what we are dealing with. That publication of data is significantly already provided to the commissioner. It is a question of making sure that it is available in a format to enable public access to it. The agencies that are able to provide these services have the possession of this data. It needs to be provided to the commissioner. He would then be responsible for making it available.

There is just one minor issue on the question of commercial-in-confidence information that may need to be sorted out before that is finalised but, as I have said, my understanding is that agencies have to make provision of this type of information in Victoria, and if they can do it there they can do it here. I simply indicate that I agree that that is a matter which needs to be progressed. We need to have some assistance from the community for them to be informed, to work with us on how we might deal with gambling regulation in relation to the online options. With that, I thank the member for his indication and commend the bills to the house.

Bills read a second time.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I ask that the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Bill be the first bill we deal with in committee. If that requires us to change the order, I would appreciate that. I am advised that, for the purposes of amendments that are being proposed, it would assist the committee and us if it could be done in that order: Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Bill 2019 to be followed by the Gambling Administration Bill 2019.

The CHAIR: My advice is that there is no issue with that whatsoever.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REGULATION) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 44 passed.

Clause 45.

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

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 17, after line 25—After subclause (2) insert:

(2a) Section 14B—after subsection (11) insert:

(11a) The Commissioner may, by instrument in writing, exempt the licensee from compliance with this section to an extent specified in the instrument of exemption.

Amendment carried; clause as amendment passed.

Clause 46 negatived.

Clauses 47 and 48 passed.

Clause 49.

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

Amendment No 2 [AG-1]—

Page 13, after line 32—After subclause (9) insert:

- (9a) The Commissioner must cause any codes of practice prescribed under this section to be published on a website maintained by the Commissioner.

Amendment No 3 [AG-1]—

Page 17, after line 3 [clause 19(4), definition of *authorised person*—After paragraph (d) insert:

- (da) a person who is or has been, at any time, a member of the gambling advisory committee established under section 73BA of the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*;

Amendment No 4 [AG-1]—

Page 21, line 16 [clause 29(1)]—After 'conducted,' insert:

and who the inspector reasonably suspects is under the age of 18 years,

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 50 and 51 passed.

Clause 52.

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

Amendment No 5 [AG-1]—

Page 27, lines 5 to 9 [clause 39(2)(e)]—

Delete paragraph (e) and substitute:

- (e) in the case of the holder of a gaming machine licence under the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*, the Commissioner may determine that 1 or more gaming machine entitlements be forfeited to the Commissioner and may cancel the forfeited entitlements accordingly.

This amendment deletes provisions within section 40A(5).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 53.

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

Amendment No 6 [AG-1]—

Page 23, lines 4 to 5 [clause 53, inserted section 40B(5)]—Delete subsection (5) and substitute:

- (5) The Commissioner may—
(a) on the Commissioner's own initiative, by written notice to the licensee; or
(b) on application by the licensee,
vary or revoke an approval under this section.

Amendment No 7 [AG-1]—

Page 23, line 6 [clause 53, inserted section 40B(6)]—Delete 'revokes an approval under this section' and substitute 'varies or revokes an approval under subsection (5)(a)'

Amendment No 8 [AG-1]—

Page 23, line 8 [clause 53, inserted section 40B(6)(a)]—After 'proposed' insert 'variation or'

Amendment No 9 [AG-1]—

Page 23, line 15 [clause 53, inserted section 40B(7)(b)]—Before 'revokes' insert 'varies or'

Amendments carried.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 23, after line 39—After inserted section 40C insert:

40D—Commissioner may approve facial recognition system

- (1) The Commissioner may, on application by a person, approve a system to be operated by the licensee that enables the facial image of a person who is about to enter a gaming area to be recognised, identified and recorded (*a facial recognition system*).
- (2) The Commissioner must not approve a facial recognition system under this section unless the system complies with any applicable gambling administration guidelines or any requirements prescribed by the regulations.
- (3) The Commissioner may—
 - (a) on the Commissioner's own initiative, by notice to the licensee and the facial recognition system provider; or
 - (b) on application by the licensee or the facial recognition system provider, vary or revoke an approval under this section.
- (4) Before the Commissioner varies or revokes an approval under subsection (3)(a), the Commissioner must—
 - (a) give notice in writing of the proposed variation or revocation to the licensee; and
 - (b) consider any representations made within 21 days after the notice is given or a longer period allowed in the notice.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Because this is a significant change, I will just indicate that this is a clause to introduce the approval of a facial recognition system, to be introduced in the terms as outlined. The government agrees this is an appropriate addition to the overall regulation in this area.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I appreciate the Deputy Premier's support for this initiative.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 54 to 56 passed.

Clause 57.

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

Amendment No 10 [AG-1]—

Page 25, after line 26 [clause 57(1)]—After inserted subsection (3a) insert:

- (3b) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must not provide any gaming machine in a gaming area that allows the operation of a game by insertion of a banknote if the cash value of the credit balance on the gaming machine is \$100 or more.

This amendment relates to restriction of a credit balance on gaming machines of \$100. There is to be provision for conditions under the Casino licence.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 25, lines 27 to 35 [clause 57(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

- (2) Section 42B(4)—delete 'bank note' and substitute:
banknote of a denomination greater than \$50

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I also indicate that this matter is to restrict the banknote use to a denomination of not greater than \$50. Whilst this is a matter that could have been in regulations, the government agrees to having it incorporated in the legislation.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 57A.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 26, after line 13—After clause 57 insert:

57A—Insertion of section 42D

After section 42C insert:

42D—Provisions relating to operation of facial recognition system

- (1) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must, for the purposes of identifying barred persons about to enter a gaming area, operate a facial recognition system approved under section 40D in accordance with any requirements prescribed by the regulations.
- (2) It is a condition of the casino licence that the licensee must not allow a person to enter a gaming area unless the licensee has caused a record of the person's facial image to be made by means of a facial recognition system approved under section 40D in accordance with any requirements prescribed by the regulations.

This inserts new clause 57A after clause 57, which relates to provisions relating to the requirement of a facial recognition system in the Casino.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 58 to 78 passed.

Clause 79.

The CHAIR: All you need to do, member for Lee, is oppose this amendment. Did you wish to speak to it at all?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I oppose this clause.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 80 to 86 passed.

Clause 87.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 39, after line 24 [clause 87, inserted section 27(7)(b)]—After paragraph (b) insert:

and

- (ba) must ensure that gaming operations cannot be conducted on the premises on Christmas Day or Good Friday.

This relates to whether gaming is allowed on either Christmas Day or Good Friday.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I indicate that the government accepts that this will continue to be a no-trading day.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 88 and 89 passed.

Clause 90.

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

Amendment No 11 [AG-1]—

Page 40, line 22 [clause 90(4)]—Delete subclause (4) and substitute:

- (4) Section 27B(3)(e)—delete 'Crown' first and second occurring and substitute:
Commissioner

Amendment carried.

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

Amendment No 12 [AG-1]—

Page 40, lines 25 to 33 [clause 90(6), inserted subsection 27B(9)]—Delete subsection (9) and substitute:

- (9) The Commissioner may determine that gaming machine entitlements held under a gaming machine licence that is to be transferred, or that is suspended, or has been surrendered or revoked, may be held temporarily by the Commissioner on the basis that the entitlements will, by the Commissioner's subsequent approval or determination—
- (a) vest in the licensee or another person; or
 - (b) be allocated to licensed premises, or a gaming area within the meaning of the *Casino Act 1997*; or
 - (c) be forfeited to the Commissioner and cancelled under section 27CA.

This amendment substitutes a new subsection (9).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 91 passed.

Clause 92.

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

Amendment No 13 [AG-1]—

Page 41, lines 11 and 12 [clause 92, inserted section 27CA(1)]—Delete 'cancelled and, if so, cancel them accordingly' and substitute:

forfeited to the Commissioner (and any entitlements so forfeited must be cancelled by the Commissioner accordingly)

Amendment No 14 [AG-1]—

Page 41, lines 13 to 19 [clause 92, inserted section 27CA(2)]—Delete inserted subsection (2) and substitute:

- (2) If the Commissioner cancels gaming machine entitlements, any gaming machines to which the entitlements related may be dealt with under section 16(5) or in the manner prescribed by the regulations.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 93.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 41, lines 22 to 32 [clause 93, inserted section 27E]—Delete inserted section 27E and substitute:

27E—Statement of Parliamentary intention to reduce gaming machine numbers etc

- (1) It is Parliament's intention to reduce the number of gaming machines that may be operated in the State—
- (a) in respect of the casino premises—to a number not exceeding 1,081; and
 - (b) in respect of any other premises—to a number not exceeding 12,000, (the statutory objective).
- (2) The Minister must cause a review to be undertaken of the operation of the approved trading system established under section 27B(2) with a view to determining how it should be modified in order to meet the statutory objective and a written report on the review to be prepared and submitted to the Minister.
- (3) The review under subsection (2) must seek and consider written submissions from the holder of the casino licence, a body representative of licensees and Club One.
- (4) The review and the report must be completed after the first but before the second anniversary of the day on which the *Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Act 2019* is assented to by the Governor.
- (5) The Minister must cause a copy of the report submitted under subsection (2) to be tabled in both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after its submission.

I am grateful once again for the support of the government in this approach. I believe it is important for the community to retain a gaming machine reduction target. In doing so, we have been discussing with the government that perhaps it might be more useful for the community to have that gaming machine entitlement number split between the gaming machine reduction target as it applies to the Casino and as it applies to other premises, or perhaps we can be more particular and refer to pubs and clubs or hotels and clubs.

Amendment No. 7 in my name, which inserts a new section 27E in place of the old section 27E, states that it is the parliament's intention to reduce the number of gaming machines that may be operated in the state and in respect of the Casino premises, to a number not exceeding 1,081. It is also the parliament's intention to reduce the number of gaming machines that may be operated in this state in respect of any other premises, to a number not exceeding 12,000.

It is my understanding that although some progress has been made particularly in regard to that second objective as it relates to other premises, namely, hotels and clubs, we are not quite there at that figure of 12,000 and there is more work to be done. This perhaps also directly relates to another amendment or suite of amendments that is to be put to the house about what we have at the moment, which is unfortunately a trading system for gaming machine entitlements, which within it has an aim to remove the number of gaming machine entitlements in the system, if I can put it like that.

I think we can all admit that it has not been as successful as we would have hoped. It is almost to the point now where for the industry, let alone for the government of the day and the regulator, the current trading system that has been in place for several years now is not of use. There are other amendments that will enable the Attorney, the government and the commissioner to come up with a better and revised trading regime to try to give effect to this reduction target.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is the government's view that the processes outlined by the member for Lee be incorporated to ensure that there is a continued reduction in gaming machines. I am very lately advised that the process, whilst we agree in principle, is one that would frustrate some matters.

I place on the record this position: the current scheme of the limit of 13,081 machines is in our regulations. The AHA and the clubs currently have 12,660 of those, with the need to reduce by 660 down to 12,000. That is implicit in what is being proposed here. The problem is that the Casino currently has 1,081 machines operating but has an entitlement of 1,500 under their ALA. Whilst the ALA, entered into by the previous government with the Casino, overrides the regulations, apparently, I am very lately advised, that would be subservient, however, to a statutory change.

I want to make it clear that we have every intention of recognising the retention of the scheme and its objectives as set out in the proposed amendment of the member for Lee, but it appears on latest advice that actually is not possible. I had wondered whether we might be able to consider passing it with the view to perhaps changing the number in the other place; however, the practical problem is that it would create a difficulty. It may be that we need to incorporate this provision in a regulation.

We can do one of two things. The member can withdraw his amendment on the basis of what I have indicated. One alternate option presented is that we still have a statement of parliamentary intention, but the mover considers removing subsection (1), which incorporates the offending numbers, and we still progress subsections (2), (3), (4) and (5), but obviously renumbered. I am easy either way. I am just saying that if you want to have a statutory provision of the parliament's intent without subsection (1), we could do that today, I am advised. If we need to tidy that up further in some way, we can look at it alternatively, and we do not progress with that section at all but look to how it can be incorporated either by regulation or agreement.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Bragg would be conversant with my unflinching willingness to assist the house in resolving these matters, particularly between the government and the opposition—and so my willingness continues in this regard. However, before we complete this—and this may be a matter about which the Attorney may like to seek some further information from her advisers—I would be willing to withdraw the detail within subsection (1), principally paragraphs (a) and (b), but would be grateful for some further advice from the Attorney as to whether

the initial proposal, which was put by the opposition, of having the total number between the two, remains problematic or not or if there is some other number that would not cause us a disturbance between what we are trying to achieve here and what has been agreed with the Casino and the ALA.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that in subsection (1), if that were to survive, of proposed section 27E, after the word 'State', it will read, 'It is Parliament's intention to reduce the number of gaming machines that may be operated in the State to 13,081,' and delete paragraphs (a) and (b) as proposed. I would be more than happy to support that.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Then I would be happy to see my amendment adjusted in those terms.

The CHAIR: So, by leave of the committee, you are moving your amendment in an amended form. You can talk us through how the amendment is now.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move the amendment as amended as follows:

Amendment No 7 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 41, lines 22 to 32 [clause 93, inserted section 27E]—Delete inserted section 27E and substitute:

27E—Statement of Parliamentary intention to reduce gaming machine numbers etc—

which is the heading, and subsection (1) within that would now read:

- (1) It is Parliament's intention to reduce the number of gaming machines that may be operated in the State to 13,081—
(the statutory objective).
- (2) The Minister must cause a review to be undertaken of the operation of the approved trading system established under section 27B(2) with a view to determining how it should be modified in order to meet the statutory objective and a written report on the review to be prepared and submitted to the Minister.
- (3) The review under subsection (2) must seek and consider written submissions from the holder of the casino licence, a body representative of licensees and Club One.
- (4) The review and the report must be completed after the first but before the second anniversary of the day on which the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Act 2019 is assented to by the Governor.
- (5) The Minister must cause a copy of the report submitted under subsection (2) to be tabled in both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after its submission.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 94.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 8 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 44, lines 15 to 17 [clause 94, inserted section 27H(3)(e)]—Delete 'but only such as to allow the amalgamated club to hold up to a maximum of 60 gaming machine entitlements'

Amendment No 9 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 44, lines 30 to 31 [clause 94, inserted section 27I(2)]—Delete ', but only such as to allow the transferee to hold up to a maximum of 60 gaming machine entitlements'

Amendment No 10 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 44, lines 35 to 37 [clause 94, inserted section 27I(3)]—Delete ', but only such as to allow the transferee to hold up to a maximum of 60 gaming machine entitlements'

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 95 to 105 passed.

Clause 106.

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

Amendment No 15 [AG-1]—

Page 47, after line 15—Before its present contents (now to be designated as subclause (2)) insert:

- (1) Section 40(3)—delete '(and, in such a case, the machine and the other equipment will together constitute the approved gaming machine for the purposes of this Act)'

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 107.

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

Amendment No 16 [AG-1]—

Page 48, lines 7 to 8 [clause 107, inserted section 40A(3)]—Delete subsection (3) and substitute:

- (3) The Commissioner may—
 - (a) on the Commissioner's own initiative, by written notice to the system provider and a body representative of licensees; or
 - (b) on application by the system provider or a body representative of licensees, vary or revoke an approval under this section.

Amendment No 17 [AG-1]—

Page 48, line 9 [clause 107, inserted section 40A(4)]—Delete 'revokes an approval under this section' and substitute 'varies or revokes an approval under subsection (3)(a)'

Amendment No 18 [AG-1]—

Page 48, line 11 [clause 107, inserted section 40A(4)(a)]—After 'proposed' insert 'variation or'

Amendment No 19 [AG-1]—

Page 48, line 18 [clause 107, inserted section 40A(5)(b)]—Before 'revokes' insert 'varies or'

Amendments carried.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move a further amendment to clause 107:

Amendment No 11 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 49, after line 15—After inserted section 40C insert:

40D—Commissioner may approve facial recognition system

- (1) The Commissioner may, on application by a person, approve a system to be operated by certain licensees that enables the facial image of a person who is about to enter a gaming area to be recognised, identified and recorded (*a facial recognition system*).
- (2) The Commissioner must not approve a facial recognition system under this section unless the system complies with any applicable gambling administration guidelines or any requirements prescribed by the regulations.
- (3) The Commissioner may—
 - (a) on the Commissioner's own initiative, by notice to a body representative of licensees and the facial recognition system provider; or
 - (b) on application by a body representative of licensees or the facial recognition system provider, vary or revoke an approval under this section.
- (4) Before the Commissioner varies or revokes an approval under subsection (3)(a), the Commissioner must—
 - (a) give notice in writing of the proposed variation or revocation to a body representative of licensees; and
 - (b) consider any representations made within 21 days after the notice is given or a longer period allowed in the notice.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 108 to 111 passed.

New Clause 111A.

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

Amendment No 20 [AG-1]—

Page 49, after line 28—Insert:

111A—Amendment of section 44A—Prohibition of links between dealers and other licensees

- (1) Section 44A(1)—delete 'A' and substitute:
Subject to subsection (1a), a
- (2) Section 44A—after subsection (1) insert:
 - (1a) Despite subsection (1), a person may, at the 1 time—
 - (a) be the holder of both a gaming machine dealer's licence and a gaming machine service licence; or
 - (b) be the holder of a gaming machine dealer's licence and be associated with the holder of a gaming machine service licence; or
 - (c) be associated with both a gaming machine dealer and the holder of a gaming machine service licence.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 112 to 116 passed.

New clause 116A.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 12 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 55, after line 24—Insert:

116A—Amendment of section 51B—Cash facilities limitations

- (1) Section 51B(1)—delete subsection (1)
- (2) Section 51B(2)—delete 'cash otherwise than in accordance with the limitations prescribed under subsection (1)' and substitute:
by means of any 1 cash facility, in a transaction or set of transactions on that cash facility, on any 1 debit or credit card within a 24 hour period, an amount of cash that exceeds the sum of \$250

This amendment seeks to impose a further limit on the amount of cash which can be accessed by a person in a facility, particularly from EFTPOS facilities which currently do not have a limit whereas, as you may be aware, sir, ATMs do.

New clause inserted.

Clause 117.

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

Amendment No 21 [AG-1]—

Page 56, after line 16—After subclause (1) insert:

- (1a) Section 53A—after subsection (4) insert:
 - (4a) The holder of a gaming machine licence must not provide any gaming machine on the licensed premises that allows the operation of a game by insertion of a banknote if the cash value of the credit balance on the gaming machine is \$100 or more.
Maximum penalty: \$35,000.

This amendment will make provision for a new subparagraph (4a) in section 53A, which again relates to the operation of banknotes if the cash value of the credit balance of the gaming machine is \$100 or more.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 13 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 56, lines 17 to 24 [clause 117(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

- (2) Section 53A(5)—after 'banknote' insert:
of a denomination greater than \$50

I rise to move amendment No. 13 in my name, which follows closely from the amendment the Attorney has just moved further to the use of banknotes in gaming machines and proposes a denomination limit of \$50.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 118 to 122 passed.

New clause 122A.

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

Amendment No 22 [AG-1]—

Page 58, after line 8—Insert:

122A—Amendment of section 72A—Gaming tax

Section 72A(4)(ba)—delete '\$3.845 million' and substitute '\$4.845 million'

This amendment inserts new clause 122A. I indicate that that will add an extra \$1 million a year to the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 123 to 125 passed.

Clause 126.

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

Amendment No 23 [AG-1]—

Page 59, line 20 [clause 126, inserted section 76AA(2)]—After 'jackpots' insert 'accumulated by playing the machine or game'

This adds the insertion of 'accumulated by playing the machine or game'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 127 to 132 passed.

Clause 133.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 14 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 60, after line 41—After subclause (2) insert:

- (2a) Schedule 1—after paragraph (k) insert:
- (ka) in the case of a licence authorising the operation of 30 or more gaming machines any 1 of which may be operated by the insertion of a banknote—
- (i) that the licensee must, for the purposes of identifying barred persons who are about to enter a gaming area, operate a facial recognition system approved under section 40D in accordance with any requirements prescribed by the regulations; and
- (ii) that the licensee must not allow a person to enter a gaming area unless the licensee has caused a record of the person's facial image to be made by means of a facial recognition system approved under section 40D in accordance with any requirements prescribed by the regulations; and

This amendment relates to the requirement of the operation of a facial recognition system in a gaming venue that has 30 or more gaming machines, any one of which may be operated by the use of a banknote.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 134 to 142 passed.

Schedule 1.

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

Amendment No 24 [AG-1]—

Page 63, after line 4 [Schedule 1, clause 2]—After subclause (2) insert:

- (2a) A person who was, immediately before the commencement of section 49 of this Act, approved by the Commissioner as a suitable person to work in sensitive positions or positions of responsibility of a particular class or particular classes under section 30 of the *Casino Act 1997* will, on the commencement of section 49, be taken to have been notified to the Commissioner as a person employed or appointed as a special employee under section 29(1) of the *Casino Act 1997*.

This amendment inserts new subclause (2a) after subclause (2).

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Clause 93—reconsidered.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I suggest a further amendment to clause 93. At amended clause 93, we substituted section 27E, 'Statement of Parliamentary intention to reduce gaming machine numbers etc'. We had left the clause at subsection (1) with the wording:

It is Parliament's intention to reduce the number of gaming machines that may be operated in the State—

I had suggested to the house a figure after that statement. I now suggest that that figure not be recorded in the clause and, instead, the phrase 'to be prescribed by regulation' inserted.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We agree to the words 'as prescribed in regulations' being included. That clause would still have '(the statutory objective)' at the end.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes. Perhaps one last clarification which I failed to seek: that subsections (2) to (5) inclusive remain as well?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, we are getting quite a bit of ink on our paper. I wonder if you could write down what you intend to do. The committee will bear with you. Please write down your proposed amendment.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It has previously been mourned that my writing is close to illegible.

The CHAIR: It is probably better than the Clerk's, member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that I inadvertently prescribed 36 tablets of Phenergan. What I attempted to say was:

(1) It is Parliament's intention to reduce the number of gaming machines that may be operated in the State—

- (a) ...to a number to be prescribed by regulation;

The CHAIR: The member for Lee is moving to amend the amended clause by deleting 'to a number not exceeding 1,081' and replacing it with 'to a number to be prescribed by regulation'.

Amendment carried; clause as further amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

GAMBLING ADMINISTRATION BILL*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

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

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 4, lines 26 to 28 [clause 3(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

- (3) A person exercising functions and powers under a gambling Act must have regard to the objects set out in subsection (2).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 4 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

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

Amendment No 2 [AG-1]—

Page 13, after line 32—After subclause (9) insert:

- (9a) The Commissioner must cause any codes of practice prescribed under this section to be published on a website maintained by the Commissioner.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16 passed.

Clause 17.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 15, after line 3 [clause 17(1)]—After paragraph (d) insert:

- (da) requirements for facial recognition systems to be approved by the Commissioner under the *Casino Act 1997* or the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*;

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 18 passed.

Clause 19.

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

Amendment No 3 [AG-1]—

Page 17, after line 3 [clause 19(4), definition of *authorised person*]—After paragraph (d) insert:

- (da) a person who is or has been, at any time, a member of the gambling advisory committee established under section 73BA of the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*;

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 20.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 17, lines 17 to 21 [clause 20(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

- (2) The Commissioner may make publicly available information regarding expenditure on gambling activities undertaken under a gambling Act (including statistical information that has not been aggregated in accordance with subsection (1)) if—

- (a) the Commissioner considers it is in the public interest to do so; or
- (b) making the information available is reasonable in the circumstances; or
- (c) the information is of a prescribed kind.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 28 passed.

Clause 29.

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

Amendment No 4 [AG-1]—

Page 21, line 16 [clause 29(1)]—After 'conducted,' insert:

and who the inspector reasonably suspects is under the age of 18 years,

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 30 to 38 passed.

Clause 39.

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

Amendment No 5 [AG-1]—

Page 27, lines 5 to 9 [clause 39(2)(e)]—

Delete paragraph (e) and substitute:

- (e) in the case of the holder of a gaming machine licence under the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*, the Commissioner may determine that 1 or more gaming machine entitlements be forfeited to the Commissioner and may cancel the forfeited entitlements accordingly.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 40 to 60 passed.

Clause 61.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 35, after line 34—After subclause (2) insert:

- (2a) The Commissioner's report must include the following information:
 - (a) the total net State wagering revenue of all authorised betting operators under the *Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000* in respect of the financial year to which the report relates;
 - (b) the total net gambling revenue of the holders of all gaming machine licences and the special club licence under the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* in respect of the financial year to which the report relates.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (62 to 66), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REGULATION) BILL

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until 14 November 2019 at 11:00.