

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 23 July 2020

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

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

### *Motions*

#### **CITY OF MARION, CATS (CONFINEMENT) VARIATION BY-LAWS**

Private Members Business, Notice of Motion No. 24: Mr Teague to move:

That by-laws made under the Local Government Act 1999, entitled Cats Confinement for the City of Marion, made on 25 February 2020 and laid on the table of this house on 24 March 2020, be disallowed.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:02):** I advise that I no longer wish to proceed with Notice of Motion No. 24 standing in my name, as a similar motion has been passed in the Legislative Council, so I move:

That this notice of motion be withdrawn.

Motion carried; notice of motion withdrawn.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: STRATHALBYN RESIDENTIAL AGED CARE FACILITY EXPANSION**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:02):** I move:

That the 89<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Strathalbyn Residential Aged Care Facility Expansion, be noted.

Mr Speaker, as you will be aware, the Strathalbyn Residential Aged Care Facility was established in 1988, with extensions built in 2003. Services include permanent residential aged care, dementia care, respite care and ageing in place. The country community of Strathalbyn is growing and requires additional aged-care places. The proposed works will expand the existing residential aged-care facility by 36 additional beds. This will increase the current capacity of the facility from 56 to 92 beds.

The 36-bed expansion includes two new wards and a 24-bed ward for general aged-care residents and a dedicated 12-bed memory support unit. A further feature is a spacious and private lifestyle garden to extend from the 12-bed memory support unit. This new garden is intended to serve as a space for social connectivity and also for residents' relaxation and hobbies.

The committee has been informed that the proposed project represents an opportunity to redesign the delivery of aged care. Of note, the project has included consultation with service and consumer representatives and consumer advisory groups. The design details have been based upon firsthand experience and ongoing service requirements. When complete, the proposed expansion at the Strathalbyn Residential Aged Care Facility is expected to appropriately support community need by increasing the number of available aged-care places.

The estimated cost on completion for the proposed expansion project is \$11.4 million and construction for the aged-care facility expansion is expected to be complete by August 2021. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

I also add my very grateful thanks to the member for Heysen for his determination to see this project through. He has worked closely with his community to ensure that their needs were identified

early. He has lobbied incredibly hard within government to ensure that this project has been funded and I am very pleased as a neighbouring member, since my community in part will benefit, too, from this project, that the member for Heysen has been able to see it through. It is a very happy day for that reason.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:05):** It is a very happy occasion indeed for me to have the opportunity to rise to commend the work of the Public Works Committee in this respect. I am grateful for the remarks of the member for Kavel in relation to my involvement in this work as it has developed, and I return the thanks.

We have very much worked together as neighbouring members to work in the interests of our constituents, and indeed our part of regional South Australia, to ensure that this very significant improvement is now being delivered. There is a real context to this work that speaks to the nature of the commitment of the new Marshall Liberal government to the whole of our state when it comes to health and wellbeing and in this respect to ensuring that there are world's best aged-care facilities available for people throughout the state.

We have seen over the 16 years of the former Labor regime—and I might say increasingly over time—a particularly city-centric view of the world, especially when it came to health and aged-care services, such that those of my constituents and others in regional South Australia became used to looking on as significant developments, significant capital investments, were being increasingly made in the city of Adelaide while regional South Australia was left neglected in so many ways. It is not just a rhetorical story. It is not just a theme. This particular project tells that story very clearly.

We go back to January 2017 and a decision by then minister for health Snelling, who literally with the stroke of a pen at his desk in the city closed a community aged-care facility. It was called Kalimna Hostel and it was built by the locals with community fundraising and an effort over a period of years in the late seventies and early eighties with a view to the local community being able to provide for local aged care to ensure that the fabric of the community remained strong so that people, when they moved from home into a level of care, remained in the community, remained connected to their communities of interest and maintained ties that, in many ways, characterise the nature of regional communities.

While on the surface a decision to close the facility by the previous minister might have appealed in terms of its having become no longer fit for a purpose that it had been stretched into performing, the story it told was one of neglect for the better part of a generation of the region. The need for those aged-care facilities in Strathalbyn had been crying out for over a decade. Rather than make appropriate investment, rather than ensure that the facilities were there to provide for those needs in Strathalbyn, the response of the previous government had been to allow the facility in Strathalbyn to care for an ever more dependent and ever more elderly group of people, and then to say, 'Well, when the time comes, if you need aged-care help, if you need aged-care services, oh well, you're just as well off being sent off to Mount Pleasant or possibly over to some distant part of the Hills—

**Mr Pederick:** Gumeracha.

**Mr TEAGUE:** —Gumeracha perhaps—'and you'll just do what you're told when someone in Adelaide suggests that you're part of that broader region, so as good here as good there'. You are dealing with people who might suddenly have found a loved one not down a street anymore but, sorry, they are now 80 ks away, or they are 100 ks away at a facility the government has decided is going to be good enough. Well, it wasn't.

And it goes deeper because what the government had also done was coopt what was a perfectly good hostel for able-bodied older people, and it had allowed people to both age in place and be stretched to try to provide nursing care in the absence of investment, so that Kalimna Hostel was really endeavouring to serve a purpose that it was never really built to serve.

So what do we do as a community? Well, in response to that closure, at no notice to the community and with no consultation, in February 2017 the community met in a town hall meeting that will stay very clearly in my memory. I was just one in the hall, but I remember that the member for Hammond was up front. He was up on the stage. The shadow minister for health and wellbeing, now

the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Hon. Stephen Wade, he was up front and he was speaking to those assembled.

I acknowledge that the Hon. John Darley of the other place was also on the stage, as was Mayor Keith Parkes. There was no sign of the minister. There was no sign of minister Snelling. He was not there. It was left to the community and those representing the community there assembled to go about formulating a strategy and response. Strath had a track record: it had got together 30 years earlier to build it in the first place. So the community got together and said, 'Right, well, we'll establish a working group,' and a working group was established.

Over the course of 2017 the work was done to identify the need, to identify where the trajectory of the town was headed and, if you like, to go about the same task that happened in the late seventies and early eighties to say, 'We're still interested in the strength of the community. We're still interested in maintaining the fabric of our community. We still recognise the importance of making sure that we provide for the community by having appropriate facilities in place.'

That working group did tremendous work, and I acknowledge all those who contributed to it. It was a combination of demographic health research. There were local professionals, local practitioners, local contributors to the community debate and representatives of the senior citizens as well, and the results of that working group's efforts were then able to be put in a form that could be responded to by an incoming government. So from opposition, the Marshall Liberal team committed to doing right by Strath, and it was a very happy day at the end of 2017, as we headed for the March 2018 election, that we could make that election commitment.

I want to also acknowledge the work of our candidate for Mayo, Georgina Downer, over elections that followed the March election because she backed our vision as well, and there were plenty who said it could not be done. She ensured that our commitment for 24 aged-care beds was amplified to 36, that our commitment for the capital necessary to build the facility was amplified to make sure we could build it all in one go, and that is exactly what we will do. There will be more to be said about it, but today is a very significant step towards that end outcome and I commend the motion.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:16):** I rise to make a brief contribution and reiterate all the remarks by the member for Heysen and the member for Kavel, the Chair of the Public Works Committee, in regard to the report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Strathalbyn Residential Aged Care Facility Expansion. I note that I did look after Strathalbyn directly between the years of 2006 and 2010. As I understand it, I have something like 120 addresses attributed to Strathalbyn, so some of my people are obviously directly affected by this.

I reflect upon the comments by the member for Heysen and the shortsightedness of the previous Labor government of using the cover of upkeeping the Kalimna Hostel to the fire safety ratings, a hostel that was on community-owned land, fundraised land, and a community fundraised facility that had been stretched to cater for other needs as time went on.

It was outrageous that, with no consultation, people suddenly found themselves 80 or 100 kilometres away, whether it be, as has been said, at Mount Pleasant, Gumeracha or other places. These people were essentially pulled out of somewhere they called home. It is difficult for people to go into these facilities at the start, but over time—as I know from personal experience with my father—they do accept it as their home, and that is what they call it. It is their home, and just to be evicted ruthlessly like that is completely outrageous.

I commend the work of the member for Kavel and the member for Heysen. I acknowledge the community meeting that night in 2017 at Strathalbyn. Strathalbyn people are a very vocal and strong community, and there were about 300 people there that night. I also want to commend Mayor Keith Parkes and also the health minister, who was the shadow health minister at the time. I absolutely want to commend the work of the community and the working group, who made sure we got the right result. It has been expanded to 36 beds, which will be a real boon not just for the Strathalbyn township but for the area into the future. It is a fantastic result, lobbied and worked hard for by the local members. It is a fantastic result from the Marshall Liberal government.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:18):** I recognise and thank the member for Heysen and the member for Hammond, who have been fierce advocates for this project. I am grateful to the member for Heysen for setting out some of the history in relation to a commitment that was made by the then opposition, now government, to bring this project forward and to address a very serious injustice in the Strathalbyn community.

It was quite clear that minister Snelling was prepared to bring about a state of affairs that would mean that families were, in practice, unable to see their loved ones in aged care on a regular basis. That is a disgrace. That is not a government acting in the interests of its community. That is a government hell-bent on stripping out costs from Health and not meeting its fundamental responsibilities to a regional community.

This was a facility that was brought about by community action. It was a facility that was constructed in part with community funds. The campaign to ensure that appropriate facilities continued to be available in Strathalbyn was also spearheaded by the community and led, of course, ably and in part by the member for Heysen, and the member for Hammond in the course of his time, ensuring that the issues that otherwise would have been left unaddressed were rightly addressed.

That issue burned for some time—it rightly burned for some time—and it is an important and significant day that we are able to report to this place that the community of Strathalbyn will continue to enjoy appropriate aged-care facilities. I am exceedingly grateful to the member for Heysen for his determined and passionate advocacy. He rightly should be proud of this moment, as we are also as a government.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SEAVIEW HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:23):** I move:

That the 63<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Seaview High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Mr Speaker, as you would be aware, Seaview High School is located on Seacombe Road, Seacombe Heights, in the City of Marion. The school was allocated funding of \$16.175 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program. The high school has ageing accommodation, and the proposed redevelopment will provide new and more efficient facilities for the school community.

The proposed redevelopment will provide the required capacity for the expected increase in school enrolments, which includes the transition of year 7 students to high school in 2022. The scope of the Seaview High School redevelopment project includes the construction of a new multipurpose performing arts building, as well as new creative design facilities. The redevelopment will also include refurbishment of existing buildings and the demolition of aged facilities at the school site, as earlier foreshadowed. The redevelopment project will be staged, with construction expected to be completed by November 2021.

The committee in the course of its business examined written evidence from the Department for Education in relation to the project, advising that the appropriate consultation in relation to the project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

In accordance with the form of the report that we give to this place, based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of proposed public works.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:25):** It gives me pleasure to move:

That the 64<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Port Lincoln High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

The Port Lincoln High School was allocated funding of \$15 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program announced in October 2017. The redevelopment at Port Lincoln High School will include new works, demolition of ageing accommodation and refurbishment to existing facilities. The redevelopment works will also include the construction of new buildings and, a particular scope for the new construction will include a year 7 building, a specialised building with art and language learning areas, a home economics and school canteen building, and a physical education weights room.

There will also be refurbishment to other buildings on the school site, as well as an upgrade to the site paving and landscaping. This upgrade will ensure that the redeveloped areas of the site are fully accessible. When complete, the redevelopment project will enable Port Lincoln High School to accommodate 1,000 students. This is expected to provide the required capacity for anticipated enrolment growth, which includes the transition of year 7 students into high school. The project will be staged and construction is expected to be completed by December 2021.

The committee examined written evidence in relation to the project from the Department for Education, advising that the appropriate consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed scope of the public works contemplated by the report.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:28):** I rise today to comment on the 64<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee, the final report on the Port Lincoln High School redevelopment project. This is something that the Port Lincoln school community and I, as the local member, have been working towards for many years. In fact, even under the previous Labor government I was approached by the school community, and particularly the then principal Mr Tony Green, to begin efforts to talk with the then government about providing some funds to Port Lincoln High School for refurbishment. Top of mind were the temporary transportable classrooms that were placed at Port Lincoln High School some 40 years ago. They had well and truly outlived their usefulness, and they were at the stage where they were quite dilapidated and, amongst everything else, had little or no air conditioning.

Time progresses, and this project was actually announced in October 2017, towards the end of the previous government, and of course it is a project that the current government is pleased to be able to support. It is a \$15 million project, which is a big spend in a relatively small regional centre like Port Lincoln.

Currently, Port Lincoln High School, which is the largest state school in the seat of Flinders, accommodates some 720 students, but next year will come the time when year 7s are moving into high school, a transition that in my mind is well overdue. For many of the schools on Eyre Peninsula and in the seat of Flinders, it is not going to make a whole lot of difference because most of them are area schools, but in the City of Port Lincoln we certainly have a number of primary schools that feed into the Port Lincoln High School.

Current enrolments are around 720 and the redevelopment will take potential accommodation up to 1,000 students. The build is underway, and it is a very exciting project. My plan is to visit it hopefully with the Minister for Education in the next few weeks, so we look forward to doing that. The current proposal includes:

- construction of a new year 7 building with general learning areas, withdrawal spaces, breakout spaces and amenities;
- construction of a new specialist building with art and language learning centres, teacher preparation spaces and storage, as well as a special school annexe including a classroom, withdrawal spaces, amenities and a secure outdoor area;
- construction of a new home economics and school canteen building;
- construction of a new physical education weights room, which I look forward to seeing;

- refurbishment of tech studies building 9, including a new store and project office extension under the existing verandah;
- minor refurbishments to buildings 20 and 28—those more familiar with the school than I am will know which buildings they are;
- demolition of aged transportable buildings, of which there are a dozen, as well as four sheds on site;
- upgrading site paving and landscaping to ensure the redeveloped areas of the site are fully accessible; and
- provision of all-important car parking.

I am assuming that some of the demolition includes the removal of asbestos, because, invariably, those older school buildings contain some of that.

It is an exciting and much-needed project, as I said. My congratulations to school principals, Mr Tony Green, Mr Greg Barry and Mr Todd George, who have worked tirelessly over the years towards getting this project up. There has been support from staff and school council, and broader community input has of course gone into this.

Work is underway, which will include demolition, new works and refurbishment. I look forward to seeing the progress of the project in the next few weeks. I would like to thank the member for Kavel, as the Presiding Member of the committee, and the committee for their consideration of what is a very important project in Port Lincoln and the seat of Flinders.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:33):** In closing the debate, I wish to acknowledge the member for Flinders, who is closely familiar with the needs of his community and has been a very determined and passionate advocate for this project over many years.

He has worked with principals Messrs Green, Barry and George to ensure that the school and the school governing council were closely engaged with the education department, also providing the advocacy, support and encouragement for which he is well known to his community, the school and its governing council. He is well known for that not just within this school community but of course across his entire community.

This is a significant moment for the school community and, as the member for Flinders has said, it is also an exciting and much-needed project. I also wish to acknowledge the governing councils that have worked over the years to ensure that there was a focus on this project, but I think that it is appropriate and right that we acknowledge the member for Flinders, who has seen this project through and ensured that it remained front of mind with education department officials and with education ministers over time.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ABERFOYLE PARK HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:34):** I move:

That the 65<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Aberfoyle Park High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

The redevelopment works at Aberfoyle Park High School include the construction and refurbishment of existing buildings, new external courtyard works and landscaping, new elevated walkways and the construction refurbishment of the school's performing arts centre.

The estimate for the redevelopment costs at the site is \$14 million. When complete, the Aberfoyle Park High School redevelopment project will deliver the required capacity to accommodate 1,500 students on the school site. The project is expected to support the expected future enrolment growth at the school, which of course includes the transition of year 7 students into high school in 2022. The project will be delivered in four stages, with construction expected to be complete by November 2021.

Mr Speaker, as you would anticipate, being familiar with our processes, the committee examined written evidence from the Department for Education regarding this project advising that the appropriate consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects as set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it has considered and recommends the proposed scope of the public works noted in the report I bring to you now.

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (11:36):** I rise to support the motion before us regarding the 65<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee, being the redevelopment and refurbishment of Aberfoyle Park High School, which is in my electorate of Davenport. In so doing, could I thank the Chair of the Public Works Committee, the member for Kavel, and indeed all members of the Public Works Committee for their collegial and incisive review of not just this particular submission but indeed of all the in excess of 100 reports the committee has worked its way through as at the time of this morning's meeting.

This project will, in my admittedly partisan view, cement the position of Aberfoyle Park High School as the pre-eminent public school of choice in the south. It will substantially increase its capacity and comes at a time when significant other developments that are beneficial to the people of Davenport, and indeed the southern suburbs more generally, are being conducted at the school.

I want to congratulate the staff, the parents, the students and, in particular, principal Marion Coady and all the governing council members. I point out that I think it is instructive that of the \$14 million being spent at Aberfoyle Park \$4 million has come from the resources of the school itself, which I think is testament to the manner in which it is being run. Again, my congratulations to the staff, parents, students, principal and governing council.

I have referred to other developments and enhancements that apply or appertain to the school itself. Aberfoyle Park High School has the added distinction of having been selected by the current government, which I am proud to be a part of, as one of five high schools to participate in the International Baccalaureate program. Aberfoyle Park is the only school in the southern suburbs that is a participant in that regard, and this development both enhances and recognises that particular position.

I will move now to very briefly consider the nature of the developments at the school and what the \$14 million so approved will in fact provide for us. Of particular note is that the money so expended will increase the current capacity versus enrolments by a factor of close to 50 per cent, which I think is astounding.

Aberfoyle Park currently has 1,054 students enrolled as of February this year and by the completion of this project the capacity for the high school will be some 1,500 students, which is indicative of its growth, its success and its capacity to attract students. As I said, in my admittedly partisan and jaundiced view, it is the public high school of choice in the southern suburbs. I will talk shortly about the time line, but the work to be developed includes:

- the refurbishment of the performing arts centre and the English teaching area to provide quality music teaching, practice spaces, a 250-seat auditorium and a new commercial kitchen;
- the creation of a senior and a year 7 hub through the refurbishment;
- a new school entry between buildings 1 and 4 at the front of the school, double-storey, complete with a lift, a staircase and an atrium;
- an enlargement and consolidation of the administration areas and so-called wellness function areas; and
- considerable landscaping work.

One of the more pertinent points is that the school will be able to cater for anywhere up to 50 per cent more students than it currently has. Contracts have been awarded and construction is due to

commence literally any day, with a construction completion date (which I am advised is on track) of November 2021. With that, I conclude my remarks and commend this report and the works described therein to the house.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:42):** I would like to add my support to the works that are being undertaken to support the redevelopment and enhancement of the services that are available to be offered at Aberfoyle Park High School. Some five years ago now, I believe, many of these programs were flagged with me as the local member at that time and we started on a path to plan for the future for Aberfoyle Park in the south and how it would promote and best utilise some of its best assets and also increase what it was able to offer.

The STEM investment happened over the last few years, and that has seen a redesign and development happen for science, technology and mathematics within the school. The investment now around their performing arts is going to be very well received by the community. The Aberfoyle Park High School has certainly been able to perform well above its capabilities, given the spaces that they have been working in.

The performing arts program has developed over the years and has most definitely outgrown the room and the space. I have been privileged to attend rehearsals and performing arts programs delivered by the school in dance and in music. Their orchestra is certainly very highly skilled. To watch them practise in such a small space has certainly been interesting over the years. I am very pleased that they will have new spaces and a new auditorium to be able to show their skills and their talents and prepare for other performances that they will do for the public across a range of venues.

I would like to congratulate Marion Coady, as the principal of Aberfoyle Park High School. She went there about three or so years ago now from Blackwood High School and she certainly brings some amazing leadership skills. She has been able to continue with some lovely cultural development that has happened with that school across the years.

Congratulations to Marion Coady on her leadership. Thank you to the governing council for supporting the principal and the teaching team. To all the students and parents from Aberfoyle Park High School, who I meet on a regular basis as they come from all over the south to go to the school, congratulations. I look forward to visiting again soon and seeing what you are able to do in the new spaces as they develop.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:45):** I acknowledge the contributions of the member for Davenport and the member for Hurtle Vale, who are closely familiar with the school community. I think it is right to say that the member for Davenport has been a fierce and determined advocate for this project. He is well known in this place as a principled and clear thinker, and he is also far-sighted on a number of issues. He is particularly passionate about education.

It is important to recognise, as the member for Davenport has, that of the \$14 million allocated to the project, substantial funds are coming from the school community. We are very grateful to Marion Coady's work, not just in ensuring that this project is brought forward with the assistance of the local member but equally that there is sound financial management at the school, ensuring that they can make the very most of public money that is available and see through a scope of works that is directed to their needs.

It has also been rightly observed that the school has a very well-regarded IB program. I believe that it is in no small part a relevant factor that has allowed for enrolment growth at the school and the substantial and ongoing good standing in which the school is held in the wider community. I mentioned earlier the principled and far-sighted leadership of the member for Davenport; he should be rightly proud. This is a significant moment for his community and as the local member he has seen this project to completion.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BRIGHTON SECONDARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:47):** I move:

That the 66<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Brighton Secondary School Redevelopment Project, be noted.



Brighton Secondary School requires additional student accommodation to support the projected increase in student enrolment numbers at the school. This includes supporting the transition of year 7 students to high school, which is anticipated in 2022.

The proposed redevelopment will ensure that there is the required capacity to accommodate a total of 1,800 students by 2022. The total cost estimate for the redevelopment works at Brighton Secondary School is \$13.1841 million. The redevelopment project will be delivering the construction of a new two-storey building and this will provide the school with new general learning areas; classrooms of science, technology, engineering and mathematics; dedicated meeting spaces; and staff and student amenities.

The redevelopment project will also deliver a refurbishment to the existing main school building and external works including the relocation of the existing beach volleyball courts. The Public Works Committee examined written evidence from the Department for Education regarding this project and it was satisfied that the appropriate consultation was undertaken for this project.

The committee was satisfied that the proposal meets the criteria for the examination of public works projects which is described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Mr Speaker, based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works, which are detailed in the report that the committee has brought before you.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:49):** I rise to speak on the 66<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee on the Brighton Secondary School upgrade. It is a very much welcomed upgrade to what is a much-loved school in the local area. If you get your map out, the electorate of Morphett sits just outside Brighton Secondary School. It is in the member for Gibson's electorate, but the member for Gibson, who is a past scholar of Brighton Secondary School, one of the alumni, works very closely with me at this school.

We often attend the year 12 graduation ceremonies together. It is always a fantastic night to see so many young people graduating from this school, and I can touch on that a little bit later. In terms of the school itself, it is located just off Brighton Road. It was established in 1952 and currently provides education for years 8 to 12. It has a number of specialist programs as well, which makes it very important and a reason why the children of a number of constituents of Morphett go to Brighton Secondary School.

The motto of the school, 'Do all things well', sums up the school to a tee because there are many fantastic specialist programs that this school provides. I commend the principal, Tony Lunniss, for his hard work, taking over in 2019 from previous principal, Olivia O'Neill, who really worked hard to set up some of these programs. As an example, it is one of the schools of choice for international students. It is one of 400 schools across the world that is an Apple Distinguished School, so from an international student perspective it is much sought after as well, not just by people in our local area.

One of the reasons why it is sought after is that it has a highly credentialled music program, established in 1976 and now run by Head of Music, Andrew Barrett. Some of the musical talents of these students are amazing. On first becoming a member of parliament, I remember Jeffrey Kong, who was the previous head of music and acted as the conductor. Some of the music and the range of music as well is outstanding, from classical to modern day. Quite often, you will see the same student be the lead guitarist in a contemporary band and then move into playing another instrument, such as the saxophone, in their classical orchestra. They are very talented students ably led by the Head of Music.

At the graduation ceremonies I talked about previously, the member for Gibson and I are able to see their skills up close and personal. One of their notable music alumni is Rachael Leahcar, who graduated in 2010. You might know that in 2012 she was a finalist and came third in *The Voice Australia* and then continued on to do many high-profile music events, as well as singing in our local community.

Another specialist program at this school is volleyball, a program established in 1994. This is where many prospective elite volleyballers go to really form a foundation for their skills. The school itself is very well known in not only South Australia but also Australia. It was in fact the champion

volleyball school of Australia for many years: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2014, 2015, 2017 and 2018. I list them in order to really make the point that this school in our local area is one that is well renowned throughout Australia and one of the great reasons why this school is much sought after.

In terms of current enrolments, the school has 1,634 enrolments and is looking to move in 2022 to increase that to 1,800 places. One of those reasons is that it is looking to move year 7 students into the secondary college there. Of course, at the moment, with such a high capacity, it is really important that that is taken into account.

Many of the schools in Morphett, such as Glenelg Primary School, are feeder schools for this school, so those year 7s at Glenelg Primary will subsequently look to continue on from 2022 onwards at Brighton Secondary School. To that end, it was a fantastic announcement when the education minister and the Marshall Liberal government backed this school in and allocated \$13.841 million as part of our capital works education program, which was announced in February 2019, to really set about increasing the capacity of the school.

In terms of what the current proposal contemplates, it is aiming to provide new and refurbished learning areas that are more suited to the delivery of contemporary pedagogy to improve those learning outcomes for students. It also looks to construct a new two-storey building providing new general learning areas, STEM classrooms with flexible learning spaces, dedicated meeting spaces, and staff and student amenities.

It also looks at refurbishing the existing main school building, which is the building you can see from Brighton Road and which was built in 1952. It was originally built there, and the architecture looks very impressive from the main road, Brighton Road, but it does need to be retrofitted, improved and refurbished, and that will include general learning areas to create open and flexible learning spaces.

Finally, there will be some external works done, which will include the removal and relocation of the existing beach volleyball courts and minor landscaping works. Those beach volleyball courts are directly adjacent to the school's performing arts centre. With respect to that performing arts centre, we have been very lucky. We have heard previous reports in the Public Works Committee of other schools having a performing arts centre, and that certainly has been a highlight for this school.

It has been in place for many years and provides a terrific facility not only for the school students to do their concerts but also for the local community to use. Upcoming in August, the City of Holdfast Bay is looking to hold a citizenship ceremony there. I have attended many citizenship ceremonies there. They are joyful events not only for the school students but also for the local community, and I commend the Brighton Secondary School for welcoming the community into their school.

In terms of the public value of the proposed project, the Public Works Committee looked into it and agreed that it would provide contemporary learning areas that would support 21<sup>st</sup> century pedagogy, create flexible learning spaces to enhance student engagement and allow collaborative teaching practices. It will also provide additional spaces to support the transition of year 7 to high school and, finally, some new, efficient facilities to replace the existing aged buildings on the school site.

All in all, the Public Works Committee saw this as a very good use of taxpayer funds. The Morphett community and also the Gibson community, I am certain, welcome this with open arms and really look forward to the students who are starting in 2022, those year 7s, when they graduate in 2027 to really have made great use of what will be a fantastic upgrade.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:58):** I rise very briefly not only as an MP for some students who are part of the wonderful music program at Brighton Secondary School but also to do a little shout out to a band that was the feature band on triple j two weeks ago. They came together as 14 year olds at Brighton Secondary School. Well done to the quintet, Bermuda Bay, and appearing on the national youth broadcasting station. It was terrific to hear their music, and as Molly Meldrum might say: do yourself a favour, go out and get Bermuda Bay's latest single that was dropped last month. It is called *All My Life* and is a really good listen.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:59):** I am very appreciative of those members who have made a contribution. I specifically want to recognise the member for Morphett, who is very closely familiar with the school community. He has been a very passionate and determined advocate for this project, together with the member for Gibson. The member for Gibson is a past scholar of the school and so is therefore deeply familiar with the environment and, of course, very welcoming of the upgrades contemplated by this Public Works report.

I was very interested to learn about the musical success of students under the direction and encouragement of Andrew Barrett and thank the member for Morphett for bringing that matter up in the house. It was a very great interest to us. It is also right for me to recognise the governing council and principals Tony Lunniss and Olivia O'Neill, who have been very focused on bringing this project forward.

It is right for me, too, to take this opportunity in closing moments to thank the staff of the Public Works Committee, who work particularly hard. There is a large volume of documents they bring in. They are intelligent and far-sighted in relation to the matters that we want to raise with them, and our research officer is transitioning to another committee. She will not be named in this place, in accordance with the convention in relation to public servants, but it does not mean that we are less grateful for her work—we particularly are.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE (FURTHER MEASURES) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Second reading.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:01):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The COVID-19 Emergency Response (Further Measures) (No. 2) Amendment Bill 2020 continues the Marshall Liberal government's approach of constantly strengthening the legislative framework underpinning the COVID-19 response.

This bill focuses on building on the strong contribution that pharmacists have made to the pandemic response thus far and supporting their contribution to the ongoing response. The amendments only operate for the COVID-19 emergency period and will expire in the same way as any other provisions of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, that being either when the emergency is no longer declared or six months after the act commenced on 9 October 2020. The bill provides an opportunity to strengthen the protection of front-line workers in pharmacies and general practices, as well as strengthen our approach to pharmacy services.

Firstly, the amendment bill seeks to include pharmacists, pharmacy assistants and persons performing duties in a pharmacy, as well as medical practitioners, nurses or otherwise performing duties at a place where medical treatment is provided or medical testing is undertaken, including a general practice, medical centre or place at which people are screened for COVID-19 or other diseases within the scope of a prescribed emergency worker under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to provide them with the same additional protection as other front-line health workers.

Medical practitioners, pharmacists and those performing duties in a pharmacy, or at a place where medical treatment is provided or medical testing is undertaken, make a significant contribution to supporting the community, and this has been especially evident throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. This change recognises that they need to have the same protections as other health workers operating in our community and seeks to make sure that anyone who assaults or causes harm to those front-line workers is subject to the same increased penalties.

This change is particularly relevant for pharmacists and those performing duties in a pharmacy who are required to limit dispensing and sales of certain prescription and over-the-counter medicines in response to the increased demand due to COVID-19.

Secondly, the amendment bill also seeks to amend the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 to provide the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA with the express power to authorise certain pharmacy premises to operate without a pharmacist physically in attendance, provided they are in attendance through the use of computer, video or audio links. This will allow the pharmacist to communicate with patients and appropriately trained pharmacy staff remotely. The changes provide clarity in the operation of the law to allow for the remote attendance of a pharmacist by telepharmacy.

Telepharmacy services are a key strategy to support provision and access to health care during the COVID-19 pandemic. They also allow essential pharmacy services to be maintained and are especially important in rural and regional areas of South Australia, where the pharmacy workforce is limited. Telepharmacy has previously been authorised in our state before the commencement of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010.

In 2004, telepharmacy was provided as part of a national trial to enable provision of care to rural and remote communities. More recently, telepharmacy has been provided on the understanding that it is not prohibited under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010. These amendments have been sought to clarify the powers of the regulatory authority and provide assurance to the communities that may rely on the services during the pandemic. The Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA will only authorise remote attendance of pharmacists where there is a demonstrable need for the service.

COVID-19 pandemic preparedness and continuity planning for community pharmacies have highlighted the risk to continuity of services should there be an outbreak of COVID-19 in rural and remote areas of our state. The amendment bill will ensure continuity of service through this emergency period. The Pharmacy Regulation Authority of SA, supported by the Chief Pharmacist, will ensure the establishment of a strict regulatory regime for the provision of telepharmacy to ensure continued high standards in the operation of any pharmacy utilising telepharmacy.

These changes also give the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA the power to limit the kinds of communication that may be utilised in the provision of telepharmacy. Telepharmacy by remote attendance of pharmacists is also aligned with the commonwealth government's move to provide medication review services through telehealth systems to ensure vulnerable patients can receive pharmacist-delivered support while remaining isolated from COVID-19.

Community pharmacists play an important role in our community. They provide critical access to medicines, and the services they provide lead to improved patient compliance, reduced inappropriate medication use, fewer preventable adverse drug effects and interactions, reduced hospitalisations and GP visitation, and a better quality of life for the community. Enabling continued access to the services through the COVID-19 pandemic is essential. I would like to acknowledge the opposition's interest in ensuring general practitioners and persons performing duties in a pharmacy or general practice are also prescribed emergency workers.

In summary, I indicate to the house again that this is a proposal that would automatically lapse at the expiration of a declared period or in October, as I have indicated, at the expiration of the six months. The parliament will have an opportunity to review this matter again should it be necessary, or indeed desirable, to continue to make provision for these important initiatives and protections as outlined in the bill. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020

## 3—Amendment of Schedule 2—Temporary modification of particular State laws

This clause amends Schedule 2 of the principal Act to insert 2 new Parts.

The first, Part A2, modifies the operation of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* to include pharmacists and other pharmacy workers in the scope of what is a prescribed emergency worker for the purposes of that section. Similarly, it extends paragraph (e) of the definition of 'prescribed emergency worker' to include medical professionals and others working in GP clinics and other places at which medical treatment or testing is undertaken, in addition to those people working in hospitals.

The second, Part 2AA, modifies the operation of the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010* such that the requirement under section 43 of that Act that a pharmacist be physically on premises while a pharmacy is operating is modified to permit the pharmacist to be on the premises via the internet or by other electronic means, and customers are able to consult the pharmacist using those means. The Authority, however, can limit the kinds of communications that may be utilised in such circumstances.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (12:08):** I rise to speak in relation to the COVID-19 Emergency Response (Further Measures) (No. 2) Amendment Bill 2020, which is something yet again that the government has introduced legislation on as part of the COVID-19 pandemic emergency. Once again, the opposition is providing its support to enable the speedy passage of this legislation to ensure that the powers and protections the government seeks and what needs to be put in place can be put in place. We are doing that on a bipartisan basis.

This is a piece of legislation that the opposition was advised the government intended to introduce on Tuesday, and we were advised of that fact late on Monday afternoon and provided a copy of the bill. We were then given the opportunity to be briefed on the bill on Tuesday morning, a few hours before it was introduced into the other place.

The bill that we are debating now, the bill that was introduced in the Legislative Council, is actually different from the bill that was originally proposed. It was originally circulated both to stakeholders and to the opposition on Monday afternoon. It differs in a very particular way in relation to the emergency worker protections to be provided under this legislation. What the government proposed on Monday afternoon, what they had briefed us about on Tuesday morning, was that they intended to provide protections as emergency workers for pharmacists.

What they are now seeking to do is provide emergency worker protections to pharmacists, pharmacy workers, GPs and nurses in GP clinics. We do not want to be too big-headed about these things, but that is entirely because this is what we had proposed to the government, and they have taken it on board. We welcome the fact that that has happened. This has happened on a number of occasions throughout this pandemic process.

Our approach from the beginning has been to offer support for measures to protect our state and, where there are areas that have been missed or could be added to further, we will constructively provide suggestions to make sure that we can go as far as possible. We welcome the fact that between Tuesday morning and Tuesday afternoon there was a change of heart from the government, in that they would protect those workers they originally had ignored in relation to pharmacy workers, GPs and nurses.

This is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, if you look at the legislation in which emergency worker protections are in place, this obviously creates a higher level of penalty for threats and attacks, particularly involving spitting and the like, against those front-line workers. Currently, it involves people who work in hospitals—obviously emergency workers in the portfolio of the member for Elizabeth—but also people who are in the healthcare industry. It particularly relates to hospitals, it particularly relates to GPs who might be providing after-hours care and it particularly relates to people who might be providing retrieval services.

The government raised a suggestion that they wanted to cover pharmacists, and that is a very good suggestion and one that we support. However, it seemed to deny the reality of how a community pharmacy works by the fact that it is not just pharmacists who work in pharmacies. It is not just pharmacists who are potentially threatened by an attack on them in their workplace. Through this pandemic, we collectively have really seen the fact that the front-line workers are not just the people who might be in ambulances or fire trucks or hospitals, but more and more we are seeing that front-line workers are people in your local chemist, are people in your local supermarket and are your cleaners. These are the people who, throughout the shutdown we had previously—and potentially is

further to come, just looking across the border at what is going on in Victoria—have to go to work no matter what. These people are essential workers in our community. They are also some of the lowest paid workers.

A community pharmacy needs to have a pharmacist present as part of the legislation. That is part of the clear healthcare role a community pharmacy provides—that is, having that trained expert advice from a pharmacist who is registered with the Health Practitioner Regulation Agency, but they are not the only people there. There are other people who work in pharmacies. They are not paid as much, and they are often even more exposed to people than those who work in those pharmacies as the pharmacists.

I am sure many of us know, certainly in my electorate and local neighbourhood, that when you go to pharmacies the pharmacist—it is a weird, historical thing that has been in place (and I notice more and more pharmacies are removing this)—is often at this elevated level behind a big counter. A lot of the time, you are interacting with the pharmacy workers, who are not behind a big counter at an elevated level but behind the counter and very exposed to people.

I think one of the key issues that pharmacies have had to work through is that they are not going to be able to close. We saw a lot of GP clinics through March and even April closing their doors, converting to online or converting to drive-through. Pharmacies cannot do that: they have to keep the doors open. How you protect those people in that situation in a pandemic is quite difficult, particularly when we are talking about the threat of being attacked.

I think it was quite a glaring oversight in what was being proposed that the pharmacy workers were not going to be protected in the same way that the pharmacists would be. This was something about which the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association (the SDA), which represents those pharmacy workers, raised a lot of concerns with the government from early on.

*The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:*

**Mr PICTON:** I think you only have to listen to the ignorant and petulant behaviour of the Minister for Innovation and Skills in his interjections just then to see that they do not actually care about these concerns that are raised by the representatives of these workers. Representatives of these workers have been raising issues on behalf of these front-line workers for months and months now and the government has continued to ignore them. The government just wants to play politics with unions. They do not actually want to listen to these suggestions in the middle of this pandemic.

Here we have a situation where there have been requests to provide additional protection for essential workers, including pharmacy workers, for some time. They have been ignored. We had this bill and they were ignored in it. We had a situation where, on Tuesday, the SDA put out a media release and raised concerns. They had, in fact, coincidentally written to the Attorney-General on the matter of the protection of their members, these workers, just the day before. We then had a rapid turnaround in the response from the government, and we welcome that.

Another issue we raised in the briefing on Tuesday morning was that if we are going to protect pharmacists, which we absolutely support—of course, they had at that stage ignored pharmacy workers but, following our advice and lobbying and SDA's lobbying, they are now doing that—what about GPs? What about the practice nurses who are in GP clinics? What about them? This is something I also raised with the AMA, and I believe they have raised it with the government, as well.

We welcome the fact that they have now changed the legislation to include those people as well. Clearly, GPs, practice nurses and GP staff are at the front line. They are potentially exposed to threats, intimidation and attacks and they should be given protection as essential emergency workers under this legislation.

I think there is a question that remains, though, in that these protections are being given in light of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act. This is a temporary piece of legislation. We all recall the very hurried way in which we passed this legislation to make sure that the government had the power that it needed, but it is obviously a piece of legislation that has an end date—as I recall, it is either six months or at the end of the emergency declaration period.

What the government is proposing in introducing this legislation right now is to say, 'We will support protections for these workers until the State Controller, via the Governor, decides that the emergency period is over.' Then, after that, they are going to go back to not having these protections, which I think is an odd scenario. It is an odd decision-making period for the government to think that the threats to these workers are only going to be temporary. It is certainly something I am keen to explore with the Attorney-General in the debate, as to why these are temporary measures and why the government did not consider whether these could be more permanent.

I think there is a question in terms of what the future of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act is generally. From what I can see, our latest emergency declaration, which the State Controller had advised the government to extend, expires on Saturday. So we might be passing a piece of legislation that only lasts for 2½ days. I presume that there will be another extension to that; however, to date there has been no notice of that occurring.

It will be interesting to know from the Attorney-General what future she sees in this act and what planning and consideration she is undertaking. Clearly, there are some parts of this legislation that are temporary and would need to expire, and clearly there are other parts where we should be considering whether we should be making them more permanent. We should be doing that as a parliament.

This has been a very stretched form of response under the Emergency Management Act, more than I think anybody had probably envisaged when that act was originally passed—that we would be dealing with an emergency declaration, effectively a state of emergency, lasting for so long. Previously, such declarations had only lasted for a few days. We will certainly be asking the Attorney about her intention to legislate some of these measures into more permanent ones. We clearly need to have a more lengthy consideration than we did.

This is a bit like the Chief Public Health Officer, who has said that these things come in very fast but that you need to be careful in how you retract them. I think the same is true for the emergency legislation: as a parliament, we brought it in very quickly, but we need to be very careful in considering what bits we are going to remove and what bits are going to stay. That is the proper consideration people would expect from their democratically elected representatives, going through that period.

Having these protections in place certainly has our support, but I think that there are questions in terms of what the process is going to be after the declaration because, as far as the statute book goes, we are about to embark upon a winter break. If the declaration were to end during the winter break, the protection for workers would end during the winter break, as I said, through this legislation. There is another part of this legislation, and it covers telepharmacy.

We have been advised that six pharmacies have been given special permission, special approvals, through the Pharmacy Regulation Authority in South Australia, to provide telepharmacy services. These are predominantly pharmacies that provide care, support and the filling of prescriptions in areas of regional and remote South Australia, where workforce issues are difficult and the sustainability of having more permanent pharmacy arrangements are difficult. I think that most people would agree that that is reasonably appropriate.

Apparently, there is some legal advice that the arrangement that has been in place for some time under the regulation authority is potentially coming up against the law, which states that attendance is required by pharmacists. Once again, the fix to this is in a temporary piece of legislation but appears to be in relation to a permanent problem.

If we have a legal question about the practice of providing that telepharmacy in those six locations, that legal issue is not going to disappear at the exhaustion of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act, which will exhaust either within six months or at the end of the emergency declaration. That legal question will still be there afterwards. Hence, we ask: why are we bringing this in as a temporary measure if there is a permanent fix to be sought here?

The government's response is that they are considering a permanent fix to this, and hopefully we will see that soon. I would encourage the government in that permanent fix to this issue to consider some further safeguards that could be put around how this is enacted. I think clearly there

is a risk if we allow this sort of practice to take place. We know at the moment that it is very limited circumstances in which it is taking place.

However, whenever there is a market manipulation in terms of the rules, there will be people who will try to take advantage of that. Clearly, this is a regulated market in terms of pharmacy, and this has been something that has been debated in this country for a long time. One of the reason it is important that this is regulated is that this is the provision of healthcare services.

Pharmacists are trained, registered and well-qualified healthcare professionals, and the public needs to be able to get the benefit of their advice. It is not very hard to imagine that there could be a scenario in which people might try to take advantage of a telepharmacy situation and provide a lot of pharmacy services out of a big box somewhere in Adelaide across regional South Australia by couriering out drugs.

That might be very convenient for some people who might have to travel some distance to get to their nearest pharmacy. It might be convenient for some people who have a regular script that they need to fill, but there is the potential that that could be quite detrimental in other ways, in that it would question the sustainability of many regional pharmacies. Deputy Speaker, I am sure in your community there are a lot of small towns that would have a pharmacy, but the throughput is not massive and the viability of those businesses sometimes would be teetering.

If you have a situation where people are trying to undercut them from Adelaide, that potentially threatens the viability of those services. It is not just a business question then; it becomes a question of the services and the health advice provision in that town or that regional area. I do not think any of us want to see a situation in which that occurs. That is why I would encourage the government to make sure, when this is properly legislated in the future, that we do have more protections in place. I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition.

What we have been told by the government is that there is a code of conduct in place that provides some certainty around this, but we do need to make sure, because codes of conduct can change. I think we were provided on Tuesday or maybe even Wednesday morning a copy of that code of conduct, and certainly we will be taking a close look at it and consulting with people on it before we get to the point of any permanent measures here.

I think the more protections we can have in law the better we safeguard this area. Clearly, there is a need for people in small areas to have access to these services, but we do not want to see that exploited in the future. We do not want to rush through something that is going to make the situation worse for others.

The last point I will make is in relation to consultation. I think all of us acknowledge that when it comes to emergency measures you cannot undertake the consultation you would normally undertake. These two particular measures are not necessarily what you would describe as 'emergency measures'; they have been under consideration for some time. As I said, they are two things that we should be legislating for in a permanent way, not just in a temporary way.

I think it was a bit disappointing that the government only provided copies of their legislation to some of the key stakeholders, including the Pharmacy Guild, on Monday afternoon. I understand some of the other stakeholders did not receive it until even later than that. I think if there had been a bit of discussion earlier, then some of these things, particularly around the protection of workers, could have been resolved earlier and a better legislative result could have come about.

I think the pharmacy stakeholders in particular have concerns around how those pharmacy provisions for telepharmacy are going to be enacted. It would have been good to work through those provisions with the stakeholders, rather than only giving them notice the night before it was due to be introduced into parliament. I would encourage the government to talk to those stakeholders.

One example of this we have seen in the past few days was an announcement the minister rushed out over the weekend in relation to testing taking place in pharmacies. This was certainly news to the Pharmacy Guild, which had not had any previous discussions with the government in relation to this. They have some serious concerns about what is being proposed, and I understand this project has now been put on hold so that consultation in working through those issues can be resolved.



I think it would have been much better if that discussion could have happened in the days leading up to the announcement so that we do not have uncertainty hanging over that measure. We know that testing is so important. Unfortunately, while we had an amazing testing rate in South Australia—great work led by SA Pathology, which, thank goodness, has saved them from privatisation, but in the past six weeks—

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

**Mr PICTON:** I think you were going to privatise this body.

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

**Mr PICTON:** The Deputy Premier was about to privatise SA Pathology. Thank goodness that is not happening now. If that had happened before this pandemic struck, we would have been in a much worse situation in South Australia. We would have been in a much more perilous situation if we were relying upon interstate testing laboratories rather than having that capacity here. We saw their ability to stand up quickly. It is a testament to why that service should be in public hands and should remain in public hands forever and a day.

The fact that this government contemplated—and put in the budget papers of their first budget—privatising SA Pathology is an absolute blight upon their judgement. There were many, many warnings before the pandemic struck that if you privatised this body, you would weaken our ability to respond to a pandemic. Then a pandemic struck. Luckily, the pandemic struck before SA Pathology had been privatised. I hate to think what would have happened if you had got around to privatising it before the pandemic hit. We would have been in a much worse situation in South Australia.

In relation to the testing issue in pharmacies, we saw this announcement made before the work had been done with the Pharmacy Guild. We know that it is important that testing rates improve. Even though we saw that great work early on in South Australia, over the past six weeks our testing rates have now fallen behind almost every other state. We were ahead of the pack but we are now at the bottom of the pack, unfortunately. We do need to increase that testing rate. We do need to make sure that rate continues to increase.

We have a situation here that, if you are in any other state and want to get access to drive-through clinics, certainly in the vast majority of states you do not need a doctor's referral to do that. Here in South Australia, the government has set a policy whereby a doctor's referral is needed to get access to a drive-through clinic. That is no doubt making it harder for many people to get access to a COVID test.

Sadly, that might be leading some people to think that it is all too hard because you need to phone around to get a doctor's appointments, get a doctor's appointment, go to the doctor's appointment and get a referral. They fax off the referral to SA Pathology. They book in a time with you. All of that process can take a few days, whereas in other states you are able to just go to a drive-through clinic. Why would you put this situation in place, you might ask?

One of the reasons is that, under the commonwealth Medical Benefits Scheme, if you have a pathology test with a doctor's referral the commonwealth will give you money for it. Off the top of my head, I think it is about \$70 the commonwealth will reimburse the state government for that test. If there is not a doctor's referral, they will not get the money. I would hate to think we are in a situation where it is harder for people to get a test here in South Australia because we are trying to get the commonwealth to pay for our testing rather than just trying to make it as easy as possible.

Hopefully, this testing issue can be resolved. Hopefully, what has now been put on hold can be restarted and we can work with the Pharmacy Guild and other stakeholders to resolve what I think are important safety issues in relation to the provision of those tests within a pharmacy because we do need to make sure that testing is as readily available as possible. We do need to have some safeguards to make sure that, if people are not getting tested—they are going to the pharmacy to get some cold and flu tablets, say—we have some ability to pick up any background issues that might be around in the community.

I hope that issue can be resolved. I hope the government can work with those pharmacy stakeholders, particularly the Pharmacy Guild and the Pharmaceutical Society of Australia, to resolve these issues beforehand. Certainly, this legislation has the opposition's support. We support increased penalties and increased protections for those front-line workers. We appreciate and thank the government for listening to the advice of the opposition and putting these in place.

We are happy to provide support on the basis of these temporary measures in relation to telepharmacy; however, we look forward to more detail as we get to a more permanent piece of legislation, which will hopefully be coming down the track.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:37):** I rise to make a couple of brief observations regarding the COVID-19 Emergency Response (Further Measures) (No 2) Amendment Bill 2020. The shadow minister for health, the member for Kurna, has more than adequately stated the position of the opposition to this bill, and that is unequivocal support for these measures, as indeed we have supported every measure coming into this place in regard to the COVID-19 pandemic, as indeed we have supported every sensible measure the government has brought into this place.

But what this bill does demonstrate, as has been demonstrated by the member for Kurna, is that this government is so often brought kicking and screaming to arrive at the position that the rest of the community and the opposition arrived at some time ago. It is leading from behind. It is leading from behind the opposition, and that is no way to govern. I want to go over some of the history of this bill because the measures in this bill essentially predate COVID.

The measures in this bill amend section 20AA of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Section 20AA was a measure inserted into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act by the opposition and against the wishes of the government of the day and against the wishes of the Attorney, the Premier and the Minister for Police. It was only inserted due to the insistence of members in the other place. The government eventually capitulated and accepted the measures in section 20AA and this bill builds on the measures that were brought in by section 20AA.

It is worth reflecting on how that happened because it demonstrates again that this government is often brought kicking and screaming to protect workers. The Police Association and others came to the government very early in its term and said, 'In light of recent court cases, we've had a look at the legislation governing particularly police assaults but also assaults on other emergency workers, and they are sadly lacking,' particularly, in their case, the assault provisions in the Summary Offences Act regarding police officers.

They wrote to the Attorney and they wrote to the opposition. The Attorney refused to support the measures the Police Association was suggesting. Admittedly, that changed over time. There was some discussion, certainly between me and the Police Association and, I assume, between the Attorney and the Police Association, about what those protections could look like. Eventually we landed on measures which we thought were thoroughly acceptable.

They increased penalties for assaults on certain emergency workers, assaults recklessly causing harm—all those sorts of assaults. Penalties were increased, but not just that: the offence was created as a separate offence. It was carved out from the rest of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act but, more importantly, from the Summary Offences Act, and created a whole new provision which protected emergency workers rather than having it as an aggravating factor in certain offences.

It created a whole new class of offences, and at the time the Attorney-General, the Minister for Police and the Premier voted against those measures in this place. Of course, it got to the upper house, and more sensible, cooler heads prevailed in the upper house—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: I note that there is a slight relevance to this issue, I suppose, to this aspect, but he is now reflecting on a vote in the house and I just ask him not to do that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you for the point of order, deputy.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** That bill has long gone.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Yes, I know, but you reflected on a vote of the parliament.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Keep that in mind, member for Elizabeth, but continue.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I withdraw my observation that the Premier and the Attorney-General voted against 20AA when it was first put to the house.

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

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I do apologise. I do not mean to remind you of these things. However, it does show, as indeed the shadow minister for health demonstrated, this government's attitude towards workers—workers generally but emergency workers, and 'front-line workers' I guess is the term we use in terms of the COVID emergency. Again, we support the measures in this bill. Pharmacists and pharmacy workers should indeed be protected. There are classes of workers who should be protected, and it is a very sensible measure to include them albeit on a temporary basis.

There is, of course, another bill in the house, which I will not reflect on. I will try not to reflect on it too specifically. Perhaps I will say that there are things the Attorney-General could have done on 8 April this year to protect pharmacy workers in light of the COVID response. I am trying very hard not to reflect on a bill which is currently before the house. The Attorney is looking at me quizzically.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, forget all about that. Just continue on with your contribution.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I'm just trying to help, sir. There have been measures available to the since 8 April to the Attorney-General, and indeed the Premier and the rest of the government, to protect pharmacy workers and indeed all retail workers from assaults related to COVID-19—so related to assaults that involve threats to transmit COVID-19 or actually transmitting COVID-19.

It extends to pharmacy workers, and it extends to all of the class of workers we have been talking about who are covered in 20AA and in the aggravated provisions of 5AA, but it also extends to a whole case of workers including pharmacy workers. There are things that the Attorney-General could have done back in April.

I will try not to reflect on the final vote of the house, but we tried to suspend standing orders in order for that bill to pass through all stages very quickly so that by presumably 10 April it could be the law of the land, going on how quickly these emergency measures have been put in place. The government decided not to do that, and now we are here on the last sitting day before the winter break talking about how we might protect pharmacists and pharmacy workers. Again, they are very good measures, but at least some of this could have been done in April.

I want to echo the sentiments of the member for Kaurua. We do support this bill. We have supported every measure that has come into this place, every sensible measure certainly on protecting workers, and every measure designed to combat the COVID-19 pandemic and protect workers in such an instance. However, it is worth remembering that on almost every occasion the government has been the last to act.

The community has spoken. The opposition comes to the government with suggestions. Days, weeks, months later we see action. I hope that over the winter break the government will reflect on the way it conducts itself in terms of the COVID-19 epidemic because this is about the government. This is in no way a reflection on the public health response that Nicola Spurrier is guiding, nor indeed on the actions of the police commissioner acting as the State Coordinator. They have behaved in an exemplary way. They have both suggested and put into place the measures that the government has implemented, so it is no criticism of them.

I hope that the government will reflect over the break on the time it takes for them to respond to community standards in protecting front-line workers particularly, but in all aspects of the COVID-19 response. I hope that after the break we see swifter responses to genuine emergencies. Having said that, I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:47):** I do thank the members of the opposition for indicating their support for the bill. In respect of one matter raised in relation to the continuation of the operation of this bill in relation to the expiration of the six-month COVID-19 provision on 9 October, I think it is, or at the end of the declaration, the lead speaker for the opposition raised the spectre of it expiring this weekend. I just want to indicate to him that His Excellency has signed the approval for the declaration to extend it this morning for another 28 days.

As he knows, that is the procedure under the act. I just want to let him know that. Who knows for how long that will be.

We will rely on the Coordinator indicating to the Premier whether he thinks an extension is required. There is a 28-day provision, and that has been extended on a number of occasions. It might go to the end of the year for all we know, but let's hope that we can extend all the legislative support that is necessary during that time.

Secondly, he indicated that it was news to the Pharmacy Guild in relation to the proposed utilisation of pharmacists to dispense testing in this way. I do not know the answer to that. I have assumed that our Minister for Health, the Hon. Stephen Wade, has had a number of consultations. There has certainly been some discussion publicly about it. In fact, even on the weekend I attended my own local pharmacy and asked them, 'How do you feel about this? You will be called upon to provide this service,' and they were looking forward to it. So I am assuming the pharmacy world know about it. They have probably been—

**Mr Picton:** Because they read it in the paper.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am talking about before. We are dealing with it, so I am assuming that their representative body has kept them informed and/or the minister. In any event, I do not know that. I know that minister Wade is a very diligent minister, and he has identified a preparedness for pharmacists to undertake this role, a willingness for them to assist in this regard, a need for it, and here we are with the legislation. I commend him for that.

If there are any examples of people in the pharmacy world who feel they are not able to provide this service, this is not a mandated obligation. Pharmacists do not have to do this; they do not have to provide this service, but I am sure that many who are available to do it will do it because it will provide a service to their clients. In respect of the remote areas, the six who have already been approved to do telepharmacy understand the significance of providing this service to our remote and regional communities, and I thank them in advance for doing it.

On the question of the extension of who this is to apply to, it is correct that pharmacists were identified to undertake this role. The discussion in the other place has led to the bill that we are presenting today, expanding to some extra health service professionals. That is a worthy contribution. I would not be presenting it here today if the government were not accommodating of that.

I place on the record in relation to the protection component of this that this is an additional group in that category, beyond what we argued in opposition for the protection in relation to biting and spitting and people who are front-line workers. When the previous government introduced that for police, we said, 'We need it for health professionals and we need it for people who assist at the side of the road, for doctors who come to assist, and we need it for emergency workers.' So, sure, we introduced that. It was accepted eventually, the parliament presented it and we have better laws for it.

Somehow or other the relevance of the request of the SDA for their support for retail workers is now being pursued. I received a copy of correspondence that the SDA sent to the Premier. I had correspondence with them on this issue. I have invited them to present any examples of where people have been assaulted or spat on in that environment. I did receive a collage of, 'Dear Premier, it's unacceptable that people in retail should be treated badly, etc.' I do not disagree with that. I have not been sent any examples. I am very happy to act on them.

I have advised the SDA to ensure that they let their members know that if they are in any way assaulted or treated in that way they should report it to the police—certainly if they are working in a supermarket or a store where there is some fight in the aisles over who gets the toilet paper or some abusive comment to some poor person who is standing at the till trying to take the heat out of a situation where someone is aggrieved at not being able to buy a certain quantity of a product. Of course, as to rudeness across to an assault, if it is in the former category I think it is the responsibility of the employer to act to ensure their staff are in a safe workplace. If there has been a crossing of the line, there has been a criminal offence and there has been an assault, then it should be referred to the police.

I am advised that during the course of this there has been a very significant increase in security in a number of premises that are operated for food and supply outlets. In the early days of there being a run on the buying of product, with almost rationing going on that was self-imposed by some of the food and supermarket outlets, they also introduced extra security. Good on them for doing that because we do not want a situation where either another customer is at risk or someone who is going about their lawful business in their workplace is at risk. Again, I invite the member, if he has examples of this situation in a retail outlet situation, to please let us know. We are happy to provide some assistance to support.

In relation to higher penalties and new offences for police officers, it is tangentially responsible to this, I suppose. Can I suggest that the member have some discussions in respect of how effective that legislation has been. We are supportive of it. Obviously the parliament has made a decision in relation to an increased offence, the removing of summary offences, the increasing penalties in relation to people who assault police officers, which is a very important matter. Can I put on the record that I am not sure that it has really helped the police, in the sense of higher penalties being achieved, because all that still relates to what the police refer for charging, and that is a matter for them. As a parliament or a government we do not have any control over that, for obvious reasons: it is an independent matter.

We sent a message to the courts, I think, by that type of legislation, but it is really going to rely on what happens at the police level when they are progressing a charge and a referral of that matter and ultimately, if it gets to the DPP, as to where it goes. We will keep an eye on that because the parliament sent a message, but it is really going to require a strength of will to prosecute matters by the police prosecutions in relation to what they do.

I do not think there is anything else I can add, other than to say that I found some arguments a little bit inconsistent. We are trying to move legislative reforms as we are advised by the health professionals and the Coordinator. Clearly, the situation in Victoria has deteriorated and, increasingly so it seems, in New South Wales. We have some very significant at present risk circumstances, and we have to deal with them within that envelope.

We thank the pharmacists for stepping up to become part of the management of this serious situation and for the work they will do with the passage of this bill. I confirm our appreciation of the opposition in supporting it being dealt with quickly. I think it has some merit, particularly in relation to remote telepharmacy, as we have said with telemedicine. I invite the member for Kaurana, if he would like to, to send us a list of things—out of the COVID-19 laws that we have passed to date—that he thinks have merit in continuing. We are already receiving that from other stakeholders.

We think a number do have merit, but I remind him that it was his side that supported a cancellation of all these laws as at the six-month time, as an alternate to the end of a declaration period. We have a hard-edge time anyway, so clearly in September, when we resume parliament, before we get to 9 October we will have an opportunity to identify areas we might need to continue and, secondly, whether we look at the permanent initiatives that are of merit.

There will be, as I have indicated to parliament before, a comprehensive review of the entire utilisation of the Emergency Management Act through this because it has been the first time that it has really been exercised for any extended period of time for a very significant emergency. Last time we used it was for 24 or 48 hours when we had the blackout. You might remember the parliament shut down at the request of the premier and they went off to try to deal with that matter, but it was a very temporary matter.

This is the first time this piece of legislation has really been put to the test, and we will need to identify how it can be better improved. Again, we welcome the opposition's indication of areas of reform that they think might be helpful to be included in a new approach to that legislation, and as to what we might then consider as a parliament. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

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

*Petitions*

### **BUS SERVICES**

**Mr DULUK (Waite):** Presented a petition signed by 403 residents of Blackwood, Belair, Glenalta, Hawthorndene and greater South Australia urging the house to reconsider proposed changes to the bus routes in the Waite electorate.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Ministerial Staff Report—2020

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Adelaide Youth Training Centre (Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre)—  
Great Responsibility: Report on the 2019 Pilot Inspection, 2020

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

Advance Care Directives Act 2013, Government Response to the Review of—2020

*Ministerial Statement*

### **PROVOCATION DEFENCE FOR MURDER**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:02):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The South Australian Law Reform Institute (SALRI) has released two reports examining the operation of the common law defence of provocation, which provides a partial defence to murder by reducing what would be conviction for murder down to manslaughter.

The SALRI reports recommend that the common law partial defence of provocation should be abolished. It is complex and difficult to understand, gender biased, encourages victim blaming, offensive in its application against victims who are gay, and is at odds with community expectations that, regardless of the provocation, ordinary people should not be driven to lethal violence.

However, there are circumstances where the defence has some limited usefulness—for example, in the case of a woman who, having been a victim of prolonged family violence, finally retaliates against her abuser. In such circumstances, the partial defence of provocation can mitigate the crime of murder to manslaughter.

The abolition of provocation, without further amendment to the criminal law, may mean women in this state who kill their abuser are charged with murder in circumstances where that would be inappropriate and unjust. A murder conviction carries a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment, with a mandatory minimum non-parole period of 20 years.

To address this, SALRI also recommended amendments to the defence of self-defence and provisions to ensure that courts are better able to take account of mitigating factors in sentencing for murder where these occur in circumstances of family violence. The Statutes Amendment (Provocation, Self Defence and Sentencing) Bill 2019 proposes amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, the Evidence Act and the Sentencing Act to give effect to the recommendations made by SALRI.

I reiterate my previous statements: the gay panic defence is offensive and unacceptable, and the government appreciates what the removal of this from the law means for many in the LGBTQ community. While the SALRI reports gave detailed consideration to various options and models, they did not go into the practical means or effect of changing the criminal law in this area. The drafting of this bill has been a complex process, requiring careful consideration and consultation with criminal law experts. However, I expect that further changes may be necessary.

I therefore invite, in tabling this bill, feedback from justice stakeholders and relevant interest groups to ensure that any changes to the law operate fairly, practically and without unintended consequences. I table the bill.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:07):** I bring up the 101<sup>st</sup> report of the committee, entitled Erratum to 95<sup>th</sup> Report of the Public Works Committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 102<sup>nd</sup> report of the committee, entitled 'Happy Valley water treatment plant health compliance upgrade'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 103<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Dublin Saleyard Access Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 104<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Blackwood High School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 105<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Naracoorte High School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 106<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Norwood Morialta High School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 107<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Seaford Secondary College Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 108<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Christies Beach High School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned. The member for Kaurana is also called to order for laughing audibly.

*Question Time*

**MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. Are the Remuneration Tribunal guidelines regarding the country members' allowance clear or ambiguous, and with your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Yesterday morning, the Premier told ABC Radio Adelaide that, in relation to the Remuneration Tribunal determination of 2018, and I quote:

What happened is there was a change. Direction that was made in November 2018 is ambiguous.

Yet today he told the media, who questioned him outside Parliament House about the appropriateness of claiming the allowance to attend a sporting event, 'I think the guidelines are very clear.' So which one is it?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** I think the Leader of the Opposition has not been following this matter too closely—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —or maybe—

**Mr Malinauskas:** What are we missing? What don't we know yet?

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

*Mr Boyer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Wright!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —or he's just a little bit slow. The reality is that country MPs who serve in this parliament and who represent their electorates are entitled to an allowance when they are away from their electorate provided it is more than 75 kilometres to do work here in Adelaide. In fact, for many years, sir, as you may or may not be aware, country MPs actually resided here in Parliament House, and as more and more members came down this became improbable going forward, so a decision was made to provide an allowance, and this is reasonably similar—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Playford!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to the way—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Primary Industries, I am trying to listen to the Premier.

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cheltenham!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** And this allowance was paid, and a per diem arrangement was put in place for an extended period of time. I think most people are aware of how the per diem arrangement operates. It is used not only here for members of the South Australian parliament but of other parliaments here in Australia and around the world. It is used for public servants. But there is some ambiguity with the direction that was made, with the determination that was made—

**Mr Malinauskas:** So, it's not clear?

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*



**The SPEAKER:** Member for Reynell!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —earlier in the year, but there are of course many aspects of the arrangements that have been clear and have been clear for an extended period of time. This is why I say that I have asked every member of my team to go through and check their records not only over the last couple of years since we have been in government but over the last decade. I have challenged the Leader of the Opposition to make that same determination for his own team to go through and to check to see whether there have been any inadvertent errors, and if they have they should be made very clear to the Clerk and there should be a rectification made.

To date, we haven't heard anything whatsoever from the Leader of the Opposition, so we are really not in a very clear picture as to whether there have been any—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —inadvertent errors. But one thing we are very clear on with regard to the former government in South Australia, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a cabinet minister, is their complete disregard for prudent spending of taxpayer dollars. They all love to pipe up.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Well, I note the member for Mawson's interjection.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mawson!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He actually booked up to the taxpayers a night staying in the CBD so he could go to the pageant the next morning. He had to repay that after he was found out, and the guilty parties over there are very, very clear—long boozy lunches, sneaky behaviour one after the other. We know some of them have a real taste for fine wine and fine dining over there all at the taxpayers' expense. It's been outrageous, and that's why, since coming to government, we have cleaned up the filthy mess.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The member for Lee should pipe down and so should the chap he is sitting next to. They are the guilty party and we are fixing up that mess.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morphett and the member for Cheltenham can both leave for half an hour—yes, you, one for one.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** I couldn't hear anything.

**The SPEAKER:** Neither could I. We will see you in half an hour.

*The honourable members for Morphett and Cheltenham having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** He's remembering those first three goals against Port Adelaide.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I never forget.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** It was an outstanding 15 minutes of footy.

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

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Is it acceptable for a minister to claim the country members' allowance to attend a birthday celebration, to attend a sporting event or to attend a concert?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** The guidelines on this are clear. Members are required—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to be in Adelaide on parliamentary business or issues to do with meeting with constituents or a part of the role as an MP.

**Mr Malinauskas:** Mum and dad aren't his constituents.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It doesn't state that every second that you are in Adelaide this is required. I'm sure this would be exactly the same arrangement for the member for Giles who would come down.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The member for Giles, for example, can be down in Adelaide and quite rightfully claim the country MPs' allowance, but he might actually pop to the shop while he is here.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Hurtle Vale!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** If the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting a new standard, then that's one thing and we look forward to seeing his submission to the Remuneration Tribunal—

*Ms Stinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Badcoe!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —hanging the member for Giles out because I don't think there is any way the member for Giles or the Hon. Clare Scriven, both of whom are from the—

**Mr Picton:** Don't drag them into it. They did the right thing.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurna!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —Australian Labor Party, could possibly claim that every second they are in Adelaide claiming that allowance they are on parliamentary business—

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Giles!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the entire time. The answer to that is no, and that has never been the position of the Remuneration Tribunal. So the Leader of the Opposition is being deliberately tricky with regard to this issue. He knows the way that this should operate, but he does get confused. For example, it was only last week—we don't even have to go back to his ministerial career to look at some of the atrocities this guy has inflicted—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. The Premier will be seated.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They don't want to hear it.

**The SPEAKER:** Be seated, please. The point of order is that a claim of that nature should be made by substantive motion—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** —and the Premier should probably not reflect on members when you start allegedly accusing them of being deliberately—whilst you didn't say 'misleading', you said 'tricky'. Some of those types of remarks are probably best left for a substantive motion if you are going to make them. I trust that has dealt with the member for West Torrens's grievance. I will listen to the Premier's—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** No, that's all I have.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has concluded his answer. I'm going to switch to the member for Colton.

#### **SCHOOL MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:18):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on how the government's \$32 million accelerated maintenance program—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** The interview continues.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Colton, sorry, I didn't hear the start of that. Member for West Torrens, you are warned. Can I have the question again?

**Mr COWDREY:** From the beginning, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Mr COWDREY:** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can he update the house on how the government's \$32 million accelerated maintenance program has been received by schools, preschools and others in the community, and how does the minister respond to claims that the funding should have been allocated differently?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:18):** I thank the member for this question very much. Members of the house would be aware, in many cases, that this government has allocated \$7.6 million to a maintenance program for preschools that sees every government preschool in South Australia get a grant of \$20,000 that they can spend this year on urgent maintenance works: painting, flooring, landscape, kitchen upgrades, storage replacements and shade structures.

I have visited a number of preschools in recent weeks, as I know many members of the government have who have seen the extreme joy on the faces of preschool directors, parents and governing councils to see that work rolled out, and the tradies and the small businesses who are doing that work at a time when they need it most. The government has also allocated \$25 million this year to an accelerated maintenance program for schools over and above the usual program.

Schools have an opportunity to do maintenance works with their own budgets. Then, if there are works that are important to do over and above what they can do themselves, there is a process whereby they get support every year, and there's in the order of \$10 million, \$12 million, \$13 million every year for that maintenance program support from head office. This year, we have put in an extra \$25 million, which has seen priority maintenance work at 116 schools, including structural repairs, roof sealing and gutters, bitumen, paving, external painting, floor coverings, air conditioning.

Schools were chosen for the program based on an assessment of existing asset performance assessments prepared and submitted by facilities managers and also required works identified from site visits undertaken by departmental staff. Asset performance assessments are an assessment of a particular asset or infrastructure that identifies its condition, the likelihood of failure and the consequences of its failing. Proposed projects were also cross-referenced against existing capital works projects to ensure they were not affected by these proposed works.

Maintenance programs have been approved within the department at the senior executive level in the past. They will continue to be in the future, in line with existing delegations. For the absolute clarity of the house, the only instruction I have ever given the department in relation to these matters is to do the work, make the decisions based on the needs of the schools without any political consideration or involvement at all, and I have reiterated that to them in recent times. A school's geographical location did not and does not form part of that selection process.

I have had to reiterate it, of course, because a claim has been made by the member for Wright that that is not the way we go about it. Indeed, he suggested that in relation to our maintenance and our infrastructure decisions there might be political interference. I make it very clear to the house that whatever was the case when they were in government, and when the member for Wright was an adviser in the former minister for education's office, that is not the way we do things now. If it assists the house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —if the member for Wright and those opposite think that infrastructure and maintenance should be given—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: this is not compare and contrast. This is debate, sir.

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

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** It's directly related to the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I am listening carefully. I have the point of order and I am taking it on board.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** If it assists the house—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —our maintenance and infrastructure budget includes \$1.3 billion worth of programs, of which \$690,934,000 is in seats held by the Labor Party, \$489,755,000 is in seats held by the Liberal Party and \$114 million is in seats held by the four Independents. If the Labor Party would like us to assign these values based on the seats that are held by parties, then which \$200 million worth of programs in your seats do you want to remove? At the moment, we assign the values where the schools need to work and we will continue to do so.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: Mr Speaker, I'm not sure which projects you should be demanding to cancel. I thought that was out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I remind the Minister for Education to direct his remarks through the Chair.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, before we move on, the minister was quoting from a table, and I wonder if he could table it before the house.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't believe he was, but I will check the footage from 2.23 or 2.22, and if he was I will make sure that I do something about it. I was a little bit harsh on the leader, and I would like to give him a few questions now if he is ready.

#### MINISTERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** Thank you, sir. My question is again to the Premier. What will it take for you to sack your ministers? How long will you continue to defend the indefensible?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: that question offends standing order 97. It's in no way an appropriate parliamentary question.

**The SPEAKER:** If there are going to be points of order for the Minister for Education saying 'you', the leader should also not say 'you'; he should say 'the Premier'. If the leader could slightly amend the question, I am willing to hear it.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is the Premier. What will it take for the Premier to sack his ministers? Why is the Premier continuing to defend the indefensible?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. There is no doubt in my mind that there have been errors here. They are unacceptable and I have made it very clear to my team from day one when this came to light that these errors are unacceptable.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Playford will cease shouting.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** But I do not believe there has been deliberate dishonesty. I do not believe that this is a government which is trying to sweep these problems under the mat. In fact, by contrast, what we are doing is shining a light on these issues. Every member of my team—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** No, sorry, that's not correct.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Every member of my team since this has come to light has gone through and checked 10 years' worth of records—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —10 years' worth of records.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurana!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** And all those errors have been identified to the Clerk—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Reynell!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and there have been actions taken.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** More than that—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —we have done what we have needed to do to put a better system in place, a better system than we have ever had in the history of South Australia and, quite frankly, a better system than exists in any other jurisdiction in the country. We replaced the system that was presided over by those opposite for their 16 years in government. They have not done the same as we have. They have not required their members of parliament to go through 10 years' worth of records to check every single one of those dates and to make amends if there is a problem. We have done that.

We have made a submission to the Remuneration Tribunal. We have made that public. We would like to have greater clarification in regard to the country MPs' accommodation allowances going forward. I am not going to be lectured by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, we don't need to go back and look at his performance—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there is a point of order. If the Premier could be seated please.

*The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: this is debate, sir, and personal reflections on the Leader of the Opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** I am listening carefully.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Well, the member for West Torrens raises this argument, but the question that was raised by his leader was: what would it take? So I think it is only fair to provide to the house the types of behaviours and standards that existed in the former government, which were completely and utterly ignored.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The way that they treated the taxpayers' dollars—the member for West Torrens once put in a claim for \$5 for car parking despite the fact that he had a ministerial driver, a taxpayer-funded vehicle for that driver, a subsidised vehicle for himself and a car park as a member of parliament, but he put in a claim for \$5 to the taxpayers. Then, of course, we don't need to look too far to really take a look at his love for fine dining and wine. There was virtually not a restaurant in Adelaide that the member for West Torrens, when he was a minister, wasn't out booking up a tab to the taxpayers in South Australia.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Point of order: this is debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the point the order. Can the Premier come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you, sir—I was just trying to. Let me just say this: there is plenty more to this story that will be rolled out because I think the taxpayers need to know how their money has been spent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Some people like fine wine; some people have a particular brand they like and support very significantly with the taxpayers' dollars. I think the taxpayers need to understand this. They have a right to know. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition could come clean. He was a member of cabinet for a long period of time. He's probably quite aware of some of the expenditures that he and his cabinet colleagues made over an extended period of time.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier's time has expired. The member for Playford, I cannot have you yelling in the chamber at that level. If this continues, you will be leaving. The member for West Torrens has the call.

#### **MEMBERS, TRAVEL ALLOWANCES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:29):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Did the minister travel to Melbourne on 26 April 2018 and were the costs of the trip met by his department?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29):** I think I will have to go back and have a look to make sure that the date that the member is referring to is indeed correct. I will make those inquiries.

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:29):** My question is to you, sir. Can you confirm that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure on 26 April 2018, when he was in Melbourne, certified to the parliament on the country members' allowance form that he was in Adelaide conducting parliamentary business and claimed \$225?

**The SPEAKER:** On a point of order.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** By using the term 'when he was in Melbourne' the member, without leave, seeks to introduce alleged fact and so therefore has not constructed a question in order with standing order 97. He has been here for 21,000 years, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order on the point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: that was an impromptu speech.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, as is this one.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** He was asking to establish a fact, not introducing a fact.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** No, he claimed that as a fact; that was a straightforward fact.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the alleged fact has been inserted. Is leave granted to insert the fact? Leave is granted. What I will do is—obviously I don't have the facts in front of me—I would ask the member for West Torrens, if he does have whatever relevant facts—

**Mr Malinauskas:** Why don't you go and ask Nicola or Grant Stevens what you should do?

**The SPEAKER:** Leader! Where was I?

**Ms Bedford:** Asking for the relevant facts to be presented.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Florey. If you could furnish the relevant information, I will obviously take it all on notice because I don't have the relevant info in front of me. I am going to switch to one on my right; we will come back to those on my left.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Oh, it's Christmas again!

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, you are on two warnings and you're lucky not to be leaving for the remainder of question time today.

#### PETROLEUM EXPLORATION

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:31):** My question is to—

**Mr Malinauskas:** A \$234 turkey.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is on two warnings.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** That was the glacé cherry.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is on two warnings.

**Mr Malinauskas:** There's a lot of Lions' Christmas puddings for 234 bucks.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, you can leave for 25 minutes under 137A. It was either him or you.

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

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** I will go.

**The SPEAKER:** No, he will be back.

**Mr PEDERICK:** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on how new petroleum exploration licences are driving investment by the South Australian exploration industry?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:32):** Thank you to the member for Hammond for that very important and sensible question. Our government supports the resources sector extremely strongly and we value it extremely highly. The member's question was specifically about the petroleum industry. As we all know, the member for Hammond has personal experience working in the petroleum industry.

It is a very important industry for us and we are seeing increases in commitments to exploration, which is incredibly important. Members would know the difficulties across the state with regard to COVID and the challenges economically. Members would know, I hope, that COVID across the world has had a very negative impact upon petroleum prices, so gas and oil prices. Yet in South Australia, thanks to our policies and, very importantly, the hard work of industry, we are seeing increased exploration.

Late in 2019, we put up new tenements for bids in South Australia, in the Cooper Basin and down in the South-East in the Otway Basin. Very happily, through that process we have received commitments for \$58.85 million in petroleum exploration expenditure. That is an enormous contribution to our economy. We made that announcement on 30 June. There are still some steps that need to be gone through with regard to native title rights and things like that before the work can actually start, but I am very optimistic that that will happen.

So \$58.85 million of expenditure, four tenements in the Cooper Basin and one tenement in the Otway Basin in the South-East are a massive contribution to our economy. But that's just the contribution from those organisations that have made these commitments. Very importantly, the

services sector, as it is in mining and minerals, in the petroleum industry is incredibly important, incredibly dynamic, and makes a massive contribution to our economy.

People often just think of the larger petroleum and mining companies—the names that we're all familiar with—as the ones that actually do the work, get the credit and make the investment. But they do that in partnership with literally thousands of small companies that contribute to this industry across the nation and, very importantly, here in South Australia. These commitments to exploration go a long, long way—much further than would be realised purely by that \$58.85 million number, which of course we are very pleased with.

It is a really massive contribution to what we are doing here. We are actually optimistic that we will see more of this in the future. Perhaps perversely, one of the positives that has come out of the coronavirus around the world is Australia's good handling of this pandemic—withstanding the fact that we have challenges in Victoria. By many other nations' standards, Victoria is actually still going pretty well. From an international perspective, Australia is managing this very well.

It is a place that people want to place their money. Places like Australia, Canada and others are more attractive destinations for investment from overseas organisations than they were before the virus. We were attractive before; we're even more attractive now. What we're seeing, even with low oil prices, is a lot of investment into exploration in the petroleum industry. We expect that to continue and we know how good that will be for our economy. We know we need to get more gas out of the ground so that gas is cheaper and electricity continues to be cheaper and cheaper into the future.

#### MEMBERS, TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:36):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Did the minister travel to the United States on 8 July 2018 on ministerial business and did his department meet the costs, including his hotel room, \$1,600 on limousine hire and the purchase of Apple AirPods?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:36):** I thank the member for his question. Yes, I did travel to the US in July 2018. It was a very, very important trip, with the government's agenda to look at the opportunities to adopt agtech. It was vitally important to go over there just to understand what the world is doing, particularly in horticulture with agtech, and what I saw at the UC Davis university with vintech.

What we saw over there were some of the world's leading scientists and researchers and some of the technology they are undertaking within that sector. Pleasing to see was that a lot of that adoption and a lot of the leadership in UC Davis was Australian. What we saw over there was that the leading researchers, being Australians, had given them the opportunity not only to look at the ability of the universities to have that bequeathed money, to be able to put into research, but it gave me the ability to come back and, as a government minister, look at the adoption of agtech, particularly in the wine industry.

Also while we were over there, we called in to the Texas university to look at the agtech sector within the red meat industry. That was a very, very important sector to South Australia. We know that it is about a \$4½ billion industry. Sadly, we have seen reduced numbers in recent years through the drought. The continuation of South Australia looking at how we could grow our herd and flock numbers is critically important for the sustainability of one of our key industries within the primary sector.

Also while I was there, I managed to call in to a business by the name of Ceres. That was even more eye-opening. It gave me the understanding that agtech mapping and data collection, through that model, was more important to the ag sector than ever. The other thing that really buoyed me, I guess, was that they were Australians undertaking this research. I think that was a real eye-opener. What we now see is that Ceres, after that visit, have set up an office here in South Australia in the Riverland. They were undertaking that imagery, that data collection, and it is now proving one of the vital tools in progressing the future of data collection for horticulture and viticulture.



What I would say is that that trip was extremely beneficial, not only to me but to the government's agtech agenda. While I was away, it gave me a much clearer understanding of how important the future of agriculture is with the adoption of ag tech.

In regard to being over in the US and also claiming through my department, upon the issue that has been raised with the country MPs' travel allowance, as I said, I have directed my office to undertake that full audit. I did find administrative errors and I have corrected them. I have offered to repay all incorrect claims to the parliament. They have since issued me with an invoice and I have paid that. So again, I have taken full responsibility. I have apologised to the parliament, I have apologised to the constituents of Chaffey and I have apologised to the people of South Australia. Again, all of that information is now publicly available. It has been released to the parliament, released to the public.

### MEMBERS, TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:40):** Mr Speaker, my question is to you. Can the Speaker confirm to the house that documents tabled indicate that the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, on the dates that he was in the United States, certified to the parliament on the country members' allowance form that he was in fact in Adelaide conducting parliamentary business and claimed \$3,000 for a 12-night stay in Adelaide?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: this is material that is now public and he can identify that himself.

**The SPEAKER (14:41):** What I will do is I will take on notice the question because I simply do not have the facts in front of me at this point in time, so if the member for Lee—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** They are just lazy. They could look at it themselves.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't need the commentary. I don't think that's helpful, but thank you. I will take it on notice and I will come back to the house if required. I also want to advise members that we do have accredited media in the gallery.

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

**The SPEAKER:** An accredited photographer.

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:41):** I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion of no confidence in the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, and the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development forthwith in lieu of the remaining time left for us in question time.

**The SPEAKER:** Evidently, an absolute majority is present; therefore, I accept the motion. Is the motion seconded?

**Honourable members:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** It has been seconded. Do you wish to speak? The member for West Torrens is speaking to the motion.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** First of all, the government has indicated they will not be supporting a suspension of standing orders to contemplate a no-confidence motion in two of their ministers—again, using the majority they were given at the last election to protect ministers who do not deserve the protection of this parliament or the Premier. The question that the government needs to answer is: why will they not debate a no-confidence motion in the parliament on these ministers? Why will they not stand up and be accounted for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —for their defence of two men who have made claims they are not entitled to? Making certifications to the parliament is the equivalent to misleading this place—ministers of the Crown taking money they are not entitled to, putting it in their pocket and only repaying it when they are caught. What a great set of rules if you are corrupt. What a great set of rules if you have a Premier prepared to cover up for you.

What this is is not so much a political party as a crime family, not so much a political party as a syndicate that is prepared to protect and cover up parliamentarians who are claiming that while they are here on Christmas Day they are doing parliamentary business. What a farce! Fancy thinking that you can defend that in this parliament and not allow this parliament to debate no confidence in a minister who claims expenses for staying with mum and dad. I lost my mother this year. I wish I could stay with her, but I would not be claiming any taxpayers' money for it. It is appalling that the minister has put his parents in this situation.

What was he thinking? What was he thinking, other than of enriching himself? What was he thinking, other than of trying to make some money? What was he thinking would happen when the public found out? What was he thinking when he thought it was okay to come to Adelaide to go to a Strikers game on Australia Day? What was he thinking?

He is the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, so he knows and understands that the Northern Expressway, the Northern Connector and the South Road Superway make travelling to and from the Barossa a lot more convenient, courtesy of Labor governments—a lot more convenient. His excuse? 'I had to come down and cancel the key election promise the Premier made at the last election of GlobeLink, so I had to take mum to a Strikers game for the first time in her life. Therefore, I was here on parliamentary business; therefore, pay me. Pay me. I deserve the money.'

When he gets caught, who defends him? The Premier. The Premier should be leading the chorus of outrage. The Premier should be leading the chorus of outrage for all the country members who do the right thing, for the country members who know how important this allowance is for regional representation. Instead, he runs a protection racket. He does not care—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: I seek to clarify, given the debate is on the suspension of standing orders, whether the scope of the member's speech is appropriate and, if that is the case, then I look forward to my opportunity.

**The SPEAKER:** It certainly started off on the straight and narrow—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** This is about whether we suspend standing orders.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I know what it is about, Premier, thank you. I ask the member for West Torrens to reflect on that and keep to that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** If the government had the courage to defend their ministers in a debate, we would not be having this now. The speech would have been over by now and we would be into the no-confidence motion. But this is the problem of the modern-day Liberal Party: the talent is on the backbench. The backbench are the ones who are watching ministers who cannot even defend themselves. The chief law officer of this state defends corruption—corruption and cover-up.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: that is offensive and inaccurate and I seek an apology from the member and a withdrawal of such a disgraceful allegation.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to ask the member for West Torrens to withdraw the corruption—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** It was a substantive motion, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** It is for the suspension of standing orders, so I would ask you to withdraw that, thank you.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I withdraw the term 'corruption'. I wish the substantive motion, the suspension, to be passed so I can debate a motion about the corruption of members opposite who have taken money they do not deserve and are not eligible for. What a disgrace that the Premier would defend this!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Why will he not get up and allow us to debate this?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: you have directed the member for West Torrens to withdraw the allegation that the Attorney-General had stood up for corruption and he has refused to do so.

**The SPEAKER:** No, he did withdraw it. He advised the house of what he wants to do, but I take the point. You are on thin ice, member for West Torrens. You know better.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I think what South Australians are seeing now is a Premier who is more interested in his own future than theirs. That is why he will not allow this debate. He will not allow this debate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I do ask the member to do that.

**The SPEAKER:** The allegation, whichever way it is framed, I ask you to withdraw it—

**An honourable member:** He did.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. But for the avoidance of any doubt, I am going to ask you to withdraw the allegation of corruption and what you are seeking to do to then pursue the allegation of corruption—that is what I am asking you to do, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I withdraw the allegation of corruption, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**An honourable member:** And apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I am going to ask you to apologise to the house.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** For what, sir? I withdrew it.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to ask you to apologise to the house.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I apologise to the house, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** This is indicative of a Premier who does not want transparency and does not want debate. He wants us to impose the rules of this parliament, just not the rules of fraud, the rules of making sure that you apply to parliament accurately—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: the disgraceful—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —and that you claim money honestly.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, you are now talking off the topic of the actual motion. If you continue to deviate, I will remove you.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Mr Speaker, I ask you to enforce your ruling that the member withdraw and apologise. His allegation that I and/or others are standing up for corruption is a disgraceful allegation and I want an apology.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I have the point of order. I am of the view that the member for West Torrens—there were significant interjections, but I believe that he did.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Playford, you are going to leave for the remainder of question time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford will leave for 24 minutes.

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

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** He said 'withdraw and apologise'.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, he did, and I heard it.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** What is it with your tin ear?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, be quiet. If members want to talk when I am talking, they will be named, so be quiet. Member for West Torrens, get on with it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir. The opposition seeks to suspend the rest of question time—the most important part of parliament when we seek to question the executive—because we believe there is a more important matter to discuss and debate, and that is whether or not two ministers should be removed from the cabinet. There is nothing more important to the integrity of this place and to the government of South Australia that everyone knows that their ministers are behaving appropriately and that they have claimed appropriately. Either the public have confidence in these institutions or they do not.

What they are seeing now is the government not even letting us debate this. We are not interrupting grievances. We are not interrupting time for bills. We are taking away the remainder of question time and the government still wish to refuse our request to debate of a no-confidence motion in two ministers. Do you know why? Because there is no defence. It is indefensible. It is better to use your numbers to shut down the debate than make the argument.

The Premier does not want to see himself on TV defending these men. Why? Because the public knows it is indefensible. You cannot defend a politician for claiming an allowance and staying with mum and dad. You cannot defend a politician for claiming an allowance while you are in Texas saying that you are in Adelaide. It is indefensible.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, I will sit you down now. You have crossed the line. Is there is a speaker on my right?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:51):** There is a process that this house well understands about no-confidence motions. If one wants to move it, one advises members an hour before question time and you get a time to have a no-confidence motion. That is the procedure. That is the consistent procedure that has been observed in the more than 10 years I have been here. It is the procedure that has been observed in the 20,000-odd years that the member for West Torrens has been here.

This is not a new procedure. This is something with which the member for West Torrens is familiar. It enables opposition parties, or presumably Independents if they wish, to make their claim about ministers or other officers. Instead of question time, they are given an hour to have that debate. If they were serious, if they were credible, if they were not disingenuous, then that is indeed the procedure to utilise.

The member for West Torrens would have us believe that the Labor Party came up with the idea as a result of the answers from the questions, presumably the one from the Minister for Primary Industries, in which he articulated clearly, over four minutes, what the purpose of his trip to the United States was and what he was doing while he was there. Indeed, he even reiterated the apology for the expenditure, given that he had had to fix the administrative error.

The member for West Torrens then asked the Speaker a question, which the Speaker took on notice. The member for West Torrens would have us believe that it is at this point, and not before, that he was so aggrieved with those two answers that it warranted a suspension of standing orders—the denial of the opportunity for crossbench members, one of whom I saw was on his feet seeking the call, obviously just slightly after the member for West Torrens, to ask questions of the executive,

denying the opportunity for government members to ask questions of the executive—government members with important issues—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —that they wish elucidated, issues to do with the coronavirus, issues to do with the expenditure of government funds, issues to do with jobs that are so sorely needed within our community and economy. The member for West Torrens would have us believe that the answers given by the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development and yourself, sir, were such to the point that it provoked him, not having previously thought that it would be necessary to move a motion of no confidence, to do so now.

Indeed, one, if one were cynical, might think that this was the plan all along, that having had two question times focused on one issue, with the exception of when they ran out of questions yesterday and moved onto another issue—two question times focused on an issue—that they would then on the third day, as potentially oppositions have done in the past when pursuing issues of this nature, move to a motion. But he could not help himself. He had to be trickier. He had to be smarter than everyone else because he is the Grandfather of the House and alleges that he is the smartest person in the room. He walks down the corridors alleging that he runs the place, getting journalists on the phone and abusing them if they print anything against his merits.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, I am also going to caution you because you are now starting to deviate.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Sir, I apologise to the house for so deviating from my comments. I was distracted and overwhelmed by the feelings of surprise indeed that it was those two answers that so provoked the member for West Torrens to think of a motion of no confidence at this time regardless of how these things are supposed to be run.

If the Labor Party were serious, if the member for West Torrens had been serious he would have sent an email, perhaps at 1 o'clock, perhaps at 12 o'clock or even earlier. They might have even flagged it in the media. They might have even called some journalists this morning to suggest it was coming to make sure people left some space in the newspaper for the journal of record to be able to report on their condemning critique of how ministers allegedly have let the team down, if that is indeed their critique.

But instead they proceeded with question time, which is of course an opportunity to question the executive about these issues, and we have been providing full answers to questions. I have many, many pieces of information here about the community and education and jobs that I would be happy to furnish the parliament with; instead, the member for West Torrens claims that he is provoked by the member for Chaffey's answers to his questions, by your answer to a question, sir, that that then leads to the necessity for a suspension of standing orders.

It is utterly disingenuous to say that is the case. If the Labor Party is serious, then give notice of the motion. One hour's notice, that is all that is required. That is all the convention expects—one hour, two hours. We used to give two hours, but I am told that it is just one that is required. So that is fine. We will give you your motion at an hour's notice, and that hour required the motion to be given about two hours ago.

It would not have been hard. The speeches were already written. Kevin Naughton had already sent his dot points from wherever he is now trailing. The fact is that this is not a serious motion. It is not worthy of the parliament's support. The parliament should get back to question time for the 17 minutes we have left and then we can get on with the serious business of running the state—supporting the people of South Australia in their economic recovery and future in the time of a pandemic, at a time when we are able to support the people of South Australia in their work.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens has four minutes left per standing order 405.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57):** In listening to the minister's reply about why we should not be debating a no-confidence motion, he pointed out that the government should get back to business. He is right: the government should get back to business, and that

business is the people's business—dealing with the highest unemployment rate in the nation, dealing with a stimulus package that has hardly gone out the door, dealing with, I think, one of the worst economic crises to face this country if not the world. Instead, the Premier is in a quagmire of scandal, and that scandal can be sorted out if we debate the no-confidence motion and, if it is successful, by cutting off the limb that is causing this scandal.

If we have this debate, the state can move on. We can get rid of these two members who are taking up so much of the people's time undeservedly—so much time. Rather than talking about the people who have lost their jobs or who are underemployed here in South Australia, people who would deserve all our attention, instead what we are dealing with are parliamentarians who are trying to enrich themselves. That is not the people's business. That is a shame on this parliament.

This parliament should debate this measure. This parliament should get on with the people's business. We should be talking about education, infrastructure, jobs, stimulus, but instead the government spends its entire time defending two men who cannot be defended and should not be defended. Are we really to believe that there is no-one on the backbench who can replace these two men? Are we really to believe that there is no-one else who can do their jobs? Is there no-one else in the Liberal Party who can do what the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The member is no longer speaking to the suspension.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, that is true.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** You didn't interrupt him. He went well off script.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, you can leave for 15 minutes under 137A—lucky not to be named.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will come back to the substance of the motion, please.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** There is nothing more important than us getting back to business quickly, and this scandal will go on. This will not go away after today. There are more and more revelations coming out by the day. The thing about this continuing and how we could end it with a debate is that it is not us who are calling journalists: it is them. It is blue on blue. There are Liberal MPs pulling hamstrings to cross the street to speak to me about the latest atrocity.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: the member for West Torrens continues to defy your ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, you are on your last warning, member for West Torrens. I will sit you down well and truly if you deviate again. You have one and a bit minutes.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I really hope we can get back to the business of the people and get back to what concerns them. A debate would have been short and quick. The Premier could have made his argument, if he wanted to, about why these members should stay. We would have made our argument and the parliament would have decided. The parliament, the people's house, would have chosen whether or not we have confidence in these two members.

I think it is indicative that this government does not want to vote to show confidence in these ministers. They would rather avoid a vote of no confidence—and does that not say it all? They will not show confidence in their ministers because they do not have it. Their time is numbered. Their days are numbered. Their time is limited. Everyone knows it. People are sharpening their knives.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 21  
Noes ..... 24

Majority ..... 3

## AYES

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. (teller)
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

## NOES

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.

Motion thus negatived.

*Question Time***RACING INDUSTRY**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:06):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's effort to revive the racing industry?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:06):** It is with great pleasure that we can turn our attention to delivering jobs for South Australia, and that's what we are about here: investing in industries that will grow jobs in our state. Those opposite didn't care for the racing industry when they were in government—they were disinterested—but we are very passionate about this industry because we know it employs lots of people. It generates \$400 million in economic benefits for South Australia.

The activities of the racing industry sustain employment for more than 3,600 South Australians. South Australia's racing industry generates \$303 million in direct expenditure per annum. Over 40 per cent of that expenditure occurs in the regional areas, which we very much support. The South Australian racing industry engages more than 1,240 volunteers and assists 160 charitable organisations—an industry that gives back to our community.

As part of the 2019 state budget, our government put \$24 million over five years into supporting the racing industry to grow jobs. Those on that side just wanted to tax the racing industry. We are reinvesting in this industry. We are reinvesting in this industry to grow jobs.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** They don't want to hear about it, but we are reinvesting in this industry. We are delivering for this industry, and the more we talk about jobs the more noise they make. They don't like it, but in these tough times it's great to be supporting the racing industry.

I'm proud to say that our government has been working hard to put the building blocks in place for a sustainable, thriving racing industry. We are investing in projects that drive jobs, improve

services and lower costs for all those involved. Some of the projects include on-course stabling at Morphettville to attract more horses and more trainers, an uphill sandtrack at Murray Bridge, an equine pool at Gawler, the racing surface refurbishment at Port Augusta—a wonderful track and a beautiful tourist attraction up there—a function centre and kitchen at Oakbank and a club complex refurbishment at Clare. This is a sign of what we are delivering for South Australia.

In fact, I was up at Gawler where we opened the equine pool just recently and it provides for rehab, for treatment and for recovery of horses. It's fantastic that this does help the Gawler and Barossa Jockey Club, but it also helps the entire community. Already, people have come across looking to ask how they can utilise this facility—be they vets, be they people in the local community who have horses in their local area—and this pool is a great facility and great for the equine industry. It's a massive boon for local trainers and will help to grow jobs in that community.

Our support goes beyond the thoroughbred racing industry and it goes to harness as well. Our investments there have brought on race day horse, vet and swabbing stalls at Gawler, a race caller and officials' tower also at Gawler, amateur drivers' initiative and on-course trainer stabling at the complex in Victor Harbor.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The member for Reynell doesn't like it. She is prattling away, but we are delivering for the racing industry. We put \$24 million in: they did nothing.

The greyhound racing industry as well are kickstarting projects and we are delivering infrastructure and delivering jobs, but they keep making noise. They don't want to know about it, but on this side we are very happy to be supporting the racing industry: day and overnight kennels for the use of the Greyhound Adoption Program, stage 1 of the Angle Park track redevelopment, construction of a new veterinary clinic at Angle Park, a new slipping track at Murray Bridge, the creation of a dedicated Greyhound Adoption Program assessment area at Murray Bridge as well, not to mention we brought a new equine welfare officer into the thoroughbred racing industry. We are supporting the industry here, growing jobs and they just want to shut it down.

#### MEMBERS, TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:10):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Did the minister travel to Mount Gambier on 8 May 2019 on ministerial business and did the department meet the costs of that trip? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Documents tabled by the Speaker show that, at the very same time the minister was in Mount Gambier, he certified to the parliament that he had claimed \$230 for conducting parliamentary business in Adelaide.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:11):** I do note the comments that I made in this house yesterday in relation to the three administrative errors that I have made in my claims. Those have been rectified and repaid at the earliest convenience. Any other matters raised in that question, the balance of which I am happy to make inquiries into.

#### VIRTUAL POWER PLANT

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:11):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister advise the house how many of the 1,100 Housing Trust homes that have participated in the virtual power plant scheme are located in regional South Australia and in particular the electorate of Frome? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Yesterday, in answer to a question from the member for Heysen, the minister indicated that 1,100 Housing Trust homes now have solar and batteries installed and they are achieving incredibly well for those people and that they are thrilled to be providing Housing



SA tenants directly cheaper electricity through these schemes. I would be interested to know how many of those are in regional South Australia and the electorate of Frome.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:12):** Thanks to my neighbour, the member for Frome. Yes, you're quite right and I also said yesterday that those people were receiving a 22 per cent discount on the default market offer, which by any point of view would be a very good electricity price to receive. I know that there are a lot, a significant number in regional South Australia. I would be very pleased to come back to the member with the specific number in Frome. I would be really pleased to do that.

I have certainly visited homes that have this equipment as part of the Tesla SA VPP around the state in regional areas, so I know they exist. It's working very well. Our government is very focused on making sure that everything that we do, wherever possible, benefits metropolitan and regional people across the state and remote people in the outback, something that we came to government very clearly with. We are going to reduce costs of living and we are going to increase jobs. All the things that we are going to do were to benefit the entire state, not just to focus on metropolitan Adelaide, as we all know we saw for the decade leading up to the last election.

For the member for Frome, I would be really pleased to get that breakdown. In fact, I can break it down into different communities within the electorate of Frome, which would help my friend and neighbour. This program is very important, so I am really pleased that he raised it because getting the cost of living down for all South Australians in as many ways as possible is incredibly important.

The people of Port Pirie and other people in Frome, under our government, have received cheaper NRM levies. They have received cheaper electricity. They have received cheaper water—in fact, approximately a 20 per cent reduction in the cost of water under the Marshall Liberal government for the people in Port Pirie. They have received a wide range of cost-of-living reductions across the entire electorate. I know that the people of Port Pirie are very thankful to the Marshall Liberal government for what we are doing for them, and there's a lot more to come.

We work every day to, among other things, try to get the cost of living down for the people across our state, not just in Adelaide, as was the case before the last election, but certainly for the people of Port Pirie, for the people of Port Augusta, for the people of Whyalla, for the people of the South-East, for the people of Eyre Peninsula, for the people of the Riverland. Every corner of this state is benefiting from the work of the Marshall Liberal government getting down the cost of living.

We are doing an enormous amount with regard to health services and other things as well. The people of Port Pirie would be very aware of what the Marshall Liberal government is doing for them, and it started on the day we were elected.

**The SPEAKER:** I will be as equitable as I can for the remaining question allocations. We are going to the member for West Torrens and then the member for Waite. I apologise; he was seeking the call before. The member for West Torrens.

#### MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:15):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Did the minister receive complimentary tickets on 1 February 2020 to attend a Fatboy Slim concert from an event organiser or a relevant department, and will the minister declare any such gift on his Register of Members' Interests? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** According to records released by the Speaker this week to the parliament, the minister lodged a claim for the country members' allowance for the same day as the Fatboy Slim concert on 1 February 2020.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:16):** I have no understanding of the basis of the claim that the member is making. I am happy to make inquiries, but again I am happy to have a look at the substance of what the member for West Torrens is claiming and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —to make those inquiries.

### **BELAIR PARK GOLF COURSE AND COUNTRY CLUB**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:16):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on the redevelopment of the Belair country club and golf course and provide a time for the release of the master plan for the site? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr DULUK:** It has now been over two years since the closure of the Belair country club and golf course. Since then, the country club has become a dilapidated shell, has attracted antisocial behaviour and the former golf course has been left unkept, especially during the bushfire season.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:17):** I thank the member for Waite for his question, a very valid question about an important asset under the care and control of my department within his electorate. We do know that the Belair National Park—in fact, the oldest national park in South Australia, proclaimed in 1891—is such an important recreational and environmental asset and destination within the Southern Hills location within metropolitan Adelaide.

It is a site which has proven to have some challenges in recent years. The member for Waite is absolutely correct to highlight that in March 2018, right around the time of the change of government, the golf course and country club operator, unfortunately and sadly, went into receivership. As a consequence, the property, being the country club itself, became vacant and the golf course operators withdrew from managing the golf course. That has posed my department and the National Parks and Wildlife Service some challenges, particularly with the need to maintain that golf course.

I think we have made every effort to maintain the golf course in a way that ensures there is an effective fire buffer. It does not need to have a cropped lawn through that area in order to be an effective fire buffer. What it does need to do is create a significant width of space between the trees which form part of Belair National Park and the housing around Glenalta and Hawthorndene, particularly along the Upper Sturt Road boundary of the national park.

That is exactly what the golf course does do and will continue to do. I have made it a priority and a priority of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to ensure that that grass is cropped appropriately to maintain that important firebreak because we know that gives those residents confidence that their homes are that little bit safer during a fire season.

Moving on from the fire risk, we are now moving towards a period of master planning the site. Master planning that site is important going forward. We undertook an expression of interest process to see if South Australian businesses were interested in the site in September 2018. That was a prolonged process and it resulted in a couple of businesses and community organisations coming forward. There's a mountain biking business operating from that site at the moment, or working through that, and should be operating shortly. Then there is also the Sturt Lions Football Club, which is also interested in operating from that site.

That site is more than just those two opportunities. There is clearly significant potential going forward for the former Belair golf course. That building, built in the 1990s—the Belair country club—has plenty of potential and we really do hope a private sector organisation puts its hand up in the very near future to be part of it.

We're forming a community reference group to work alongside my department to make sure that the masterplan is informed and guided by the community. There will be a range of community leaders, including Kurna representatives, representatives from local business, the local councils, young people involved in that Rotary Club and other active organisations.

I look forward to catching up with the inaugural meeting of that reference group to start shaping that master plan in the first week of August. The member for Waite will be there. I continue to work alongside him and rely on his advocacy, ideas and support for sorting out this situation once and for all.

*Grievance Debate*

**UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:21):** The South Australian parliamentary Labor Party commenced this week with a very deliberate and thoughtful effort to ensure that we were going to be shining a light, as a good opposition should, on the number one issue facing our state at the moment. There are 190,000 people currently looking for work in this state. We have the highest unemployment rate that we have seen in a very long time. We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation.

As I said, we currently have 190,000 people in this state who are currently either unemployed or underemployed. These are phenomenal statistics that represent an extraordinary amount of genuine heartache that South Australians are feeling at the moment. On this side of the house, we have a very deep concern that this government is not doing everything they possibly can to zero in on that effort, to stimulate the economy, to invest in infrastructure and to put people back to work.

This government inherited the third lowest unemployment rate in the nation; it is now the worst, at an extraordinarily difficult time. This should represent the sole focus of a government. This should represent every ounce of effort that is being deployed from the substantial resources of the state to make sure that we get people back to work. We have concluded the week with the exact opposite.

This Premier is not spending any effort or energy on trying to get South Australians back to work. The only jobs he is trying to protect are those of the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and the Minister for Primary Industries. And over what? Outrageous claims of those ministers using their energy and effort to put money in their pockets at the expense of taxpayers while they are staying at places like mum and dad's. That is the exact opposite of what South Australians are looking for at the moment.

The Premier was bailed up by the media outside parliament today, and as he walked in he was asked a series of legitimate questions, the sorts of questions I think South Australians would expect the Premier to be able to answer honestly and earnestly. And what did the Premier say? He said, 'Look, this isn't my focus. My focus is on coronavirus. My focus is on COVID-19,' yet he walked into the chamber today and throughout the entirety of question time he talked about what his office has really been working on in recent weeks.

They are working on excuses, trying to explain away what the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure has done. They are working through 16 years worth of documents, trying to find out what Labor MPs did or did not do during the course of government. He is not looking after anyone else's jobs apart from those of his own ministers, and that is a reflection upon him. That is—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: the leader is making unparliamentary and inappropriate reflections on members and impugning improper motives on them. He has just said that he is making a reflection on them.

**The SPEAKER:** It is a grievance debate. I will listen carefully. I thank the minister.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** So where to from here? We have a full-blown scandal to do with parliamentary allowances on behalf of their misuse by cabinet ministers—ministers of the Crown, leaders in our state, who are supposed to be representing the best of the best, particularly during the course of a crisis—completely engulfing the workings of the government. At the moment, that leaves literally no choice for the Premier but to start to exercise the function of leadership and dismiss these ministers because anything short of that deprives the government of the energy and the effort on the issues that it requires.

I do not believe that anyone in this place genuinely gets into the business to do things wrong. I wholeheartedly believe that all 47 members in this place enter it with the best of intentions. But

when people do the wrong thing, through a perverse human condition or palpably poor judgement, then they have to pay the consequences. This Premier expects public servants to be upheld to a standard. If they mispend their entitlements, if they mislead their employers, they are held to account accordingly.

The Premier must hold that same standard to his ministry. There are more than enough people inside this parliament who are capable of doing a minister's job, particularly the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure's, who seems to want to spend all his energy and effort cutting other people's services, rather than actually making sure that they are getting access to the things they need. Let's have a Premier who starts to show leadership during the course of a crisis. Let's have a Premier who starts focusing on South Australians' jobs rather than cabinet ministers' and takes the decisive action that South Australians are yearning for. Dismiss these ministers so that the government can get on with its job.

Time expired.

### TRAIN SERVICES

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:27):** It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak about a silent success my team and I have been able to achieve in our local community. On both sides of the chamber I believe we work very hard in our local communities and a lot of the work we do goes unnoticed. They are probably things that only a fellow local member would appreciate. But every now and then we do have some great successes that I think have a positive impact on our community.

One such example was the work we did to help out a young man in our community, Declan Lorenzin. Declan suffers from vision impairment, he uses a cane and he is a very active member of our community. I want to paint this picture for you, Mr Speaker. Imagine catching public transport without the use of your eyes. Catching a train in total darkness, you do not know where the door is going to stop on the platform, where the doors are going to open. It is quite a daunting thing to consider. But Declan is a remarkable young man who lives in Warradale and, despite his vision impairment, he lives a very independent life and catches public transport on the Seaford line to his parents' house.

But even getting on the train is challenging for him and it is difficult to know, as I said, where those carriage doors are. So his father got in touch and we reached out to the Minister for Transport, and I thank him very much for his engagement with this. We met at the Oaklands station with someone from DPTI and we had a look at the situation. When you get to a platform at a train station, as you do at Oaklands, if you have your sight you will notice on the edge the little round circles that indicate where the edge of the platform is, and that works wonderfully well for Declan. But as you can understand, when the train pulls up, he is not aware of where the doors are and where he should be.

Painted on the ground is a blue box with the wheelchair symbol so that people in a wheelchair can be there and the train can pull up, the doors will open and the platform will come out for them to get on. It is blue but, if Declan cannot see it, how does he know where to stand where those doors will be? With the great work of DPTI, we came together to find a solution. Some markings were put down right alongside the blue box which pointed in the direction of where the train doors will be and, when Declan goes to the station now he can find that position, find the markings with his cane that he uses so ably and know that he is standing in the right spot so that when the doors open he can get straight onto the train.

We are also working with some more advanced messages. In light of this ability or situation to help Declan, DPTI have asked him to be a part of a working group to help inform them of things that can be done and changes that can be made to make these facilities more accessible for people living with a disability. Using people like Declan, with that real-life experience, will be fantastic. It is one of the wonderful things we get to do in our community and I think that was a really great win with a great outcome.

Again, I want to thank Declan for getting involved, his dad for raising that issue and the team in my office for all working together to get such a great solution. While chatting with Declan, I found

out that he is a member of the Tutti Arts choir as well. It has been quite a big year for Tutti Arts. Earlier this year, they moved the staff into a new headquarters at Brighton—near the Brighton train station, coincidentally. Tutti was started at Minda way back in 1997 as a small singing group.

Around our community, the people from Minda do a wonderful job. They get out in our community and quite often you will see them at functions. Amy, who I would say is one of the lead singers in the Tutti ensemble, has been involved with them for ages. She shares the same name as my eldest daughter and we always have a laugh and a smile about that. She is a beautiful young person and has been there for a long time.

Tutti do a great job. As I said, they started in 1997 and have since grown. They now stretch into drama, music and other creative arts areas. It is a fantastic group of people, and, they have just moved into these new facilities, so it will be wonderful to see them grow even further. Tutti is a registered NDIS provider, too, so there is funding available for people with an NDIS plan to access services and achieve a whole range of individual goals, such as learning new skills or gaining confidence. They do an outstanding job in our community and they do a wonderful body of work helping people develop in the arts.

I commend Pat Rix, Tutti CEO, artistic director and founder, for building up such an amazing organisation and continuing to lead artists and audiences to exciting places. They are a great group of people. If you ever see them out, look out for Amy and Declan. They are a big part of that group and I thank them for the work they do in our community.

#### LOCAL SPORT AND RECREATION

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:32):** I am pleased to have an opportunity today to speak about how our local sporting clubs are dealing with this brave new world we live in and responding to the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. I think it is fair to say that the demands and pressures on administrators of amateur and local sporting clubs are not what they used to be. A lot has changed in a very short period of time.

What were once considered almost honorary roles that did not require what you would describe as onerous amounts of work now necessitate office bearers being experts in a whole range of different areas, including things like occupational health and safety, liquor licensing, grant applications and public liability insurance. Add this to the fact that those administrators, almost 100 per cent of the time now, are also working in full-time jobs and trying to manage the stresses of family and children themselves.

Without a doubt, it is a good thing to see our amateur sporting clubs change from being what was once largely the domain of men to what is now a far more family-friendly environment, but with this modernisation have come some pretty big demands on those selfless people who take up the roles year in and year out to keep their club on the pitch, field or court. Putting all those demands to one side, 2020 has brought a whole new and unforeseen complexity to the management of local sporting clubs.

Not only are our clubs now expected to run like professional sporting organisations but they are also required to navigate the complexities of complying with the very important COVID-19 restrictions that we have in place. Not for a second am I suggesting that any of those restrictions should be relaxed; I am merely using this opportunity today to thank all our local sporting clubs and the volunteers within them for all the amazing work they have done over the past months to keep their clubs afloat and ready to resume competitive matches.

Recently, I attended a number of local sporting events at clubs in the broad area in and around where I represent, including Brahma Lodge Football Club, Modbury Hawks Football Club, Modbury Vista Soccer Club, Modbury Jets Soccer Club, North East Hockey Club and, last but definitely not least, Para Hills West Soccer Club. I was incredibly impressed by the lengths to which these clubs had gone, not only to comply with all the relevant COVID-19 restrictions that we have in place but also to accommodate as many as possible of the spectators, who had waited very patiently for months to see their teams resume action.

Some of the measures taken by those clubs include fixing signage to the ground outside canteens and bars to ensure that social distancing was maintained when queuing for food and

drinks, roping off undercover areas and actively policing the number of people within each of those areas, making hand sanitiser readily available for all attendees and staggering the playing times to limit the number of spectators present in the area at any one time.

By way of highlighting the pressures that these clubs and volunteers are under, I share the following anecdote that was passed on to me by volunteers of one of the clubs that I visited. This club had gone to extraordinary efforts to meet all the COVID-19 preventative measures, but early in the afternoon they received an anonymous phone call from somebody who had attended a match earlier that day to complain that social distancing rules were not being observed because players who were sitting on the sidelines were too close together.

Yes, that is right, this anonymous complainer was untroubled by the fact that, just moments before, those players had been actively engaged in a contact sport on the field but still saw fit to call the volunteers of the club and give them a really big serve about the fact that social distancing had not necessarily been maintained when they had come off for a spell.

I want to use this opportunity today to offer my thanks to the volunteers, on behalf of all the local residents who were clearly thrilled to be able to get back out and watch their beloved local sporting clubs play again, for all the work and stress—and yes, sometimes criticism—that they endured over the past months to make this a reality.

My message today to all those spectators who have eagerly awaited the return of local sport is this: please have some patience and understanding for the tireless volunteers who are trying to manage all the pressures they already have of running a volunteer amateur sporting organisation—on top of that, it is in the midst of a global pandemic. Know that they are taking every precaution necessary and doing everything in their power to keep players and spectators safe, but acknowledge, too, that they are volunteers who have taken these roles on in addition to their own work and family commitments, which in many cases have already been severely disrupted by COVID-19.

We all want to see life return to normal and to prevent the spread of COVID that we are seeing across the border, but we need to show some understanding for the hardworking, selfless women and men who run our local sporting organisations we love so much, and know that they are doing everything in their power to keep us safe.

### REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:37):** It is an absolute pleasure to rise today and share with the house another exciting milestone in the reactivation of the Repat reached by this Marshall Liberal government. Last week, we launched into another construction milestone as part of our commitment to redevelop the site into a thriving health precinct. Construction has now begun on the new brain injury rehabilitation and spinal cord injury rehabilitation facility, with an \$80 million investment. The 48-bed, purpose-designed facilities will deliver a patient and family-centred service, offering research and therapy spaces, including a sports gymnasium designed to complement rehabilitation services.

With the reactivated Repat, it is our priority as a government to provide optimal facilities for best patient experience, promoting recovery and wellbeing. It is also important to ensure the Repat maintains a strong link with our veterans. With the support of \$5 million in commonwealth funding, thanks to the federal member for Boothby, Ms Nicolle Flint, the Repat will also be home to a new dedicated veterans' wellbeing centre. The centre will aim to strengthen relationships, improve service coordination and advocate for better health and wellbeing outcomes for veterans and their families.

This I know is of huge importance to our local veterans, as well as our broader community, and I am so pleased, as the local member, that we are maintaining the Repat spirit. With this latest work underway, up to 400 new jobs are in the pipeline, which is a much-needed jobs boost for our community and even more important with the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. This part of construction will require a large, highly skilled workforce providing exciting employment opportunities for locals and follow-on investment in other South Australian companies.

At the launch of the latest phase of construction last week, I had the pleasure of meeting Ryan Mann, who had unfortunately sustained a spinal injury. Mr Mann told us that the sports centre, the town square and community aspects of the new Repat are so important because if you are not

assisting patients to integrate back into the community after such a significant injury, in his exact words he said, 'What's the point?' And that is exactly what we are doing.

We are promoting independence and wellbeing with integrated community facilities. Mr Mann knows firsthand that patients will be more likely to achieve better recovery outcomes with these purpose-designed facilities and the complementary services at the Repat. He made the comment that he is not only excited about seeing the modern facilities but looking forward to improved services being offered for our community. This is everything that we set out to achieve in reactivating the Repat: better facilities, better services and better health outcomes for individuals and their families and for all South Australians.

Construction on the new brain injury rehabilitation and spinal cord injury rehabilitation facility is just one part of what we have already brought to life during the Repat journey. We have reopened the hydrotherapy pool and opened 10 new beds in addition to the 20 beds for long-stay patients opened in 2018. We have begun the construction on the Older Persons Mental Health Service facilities, which is relocating to the Repat. We have announced a South Australian partnership first to deliver innovative dementia care accommodation, including a new 78-bed dementia care facility with cottages and specialist care units.

We have helped to create more than 100 new jobs through this partnership, as well as the 400 jobs I mentioned earlier, and we have committed to a total investment in the project of reactivating the Repat from both the state and federal governments working together with \$110 million.

We are getting on with the job, ensuring that we deliver on our election promise, and it is so exciting to be reaching yet another significant milestone at the site. We went to the election with a strong plan for real change, and I have been firmly focused on delivering this change at the Repat for my wonderful residents, for our local communities and for all South Australians.

#### **NOARLUNGA STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:42):** Annually, and this year on Wednesday 20 May, we have celebrated Wear Orange Wednesday. This day recognises and highlights the importance of our State Emergency Service and, of course, its volunteers in units across all of our great state. It is an opportunity to make these acknowledgments and value all our volunteers who play such a vital role in protecting and keeping our community safe when they respond to emergencies, disasters and some everyday incidents.

I regularly have the pleasure of visiting the Noarlunga SES that really does service the seat of Hurtle Vale brilliantly. I say thank you for their commitment and I am proud to support the group and the hard work they do. The community also supports and appreciates this valued organisation. I know the community will continue to acknowledge and receive the benefits to all southern suburbs residents and beyond from this wonderful organisation.

The Noarlunga State Emergency Service has been located within the Lonsdale unit for about 45 years now, and they are most welcome members of our southern community. The facilities have been built by the hands of its own members, constructing a whole range of wonderful test sites and experiences where they can have practical exercises and undertake rescues and such. The towers and tunnels are particularly interesting to visit.

It is a special place that hundreds of volunteers have poured their blood, sweat and tears into to create this training facility to benefit the larger community. The unit manager, Peter Higgins, and the Noarlunga SES team have done their absolute best on this site for as long as they can to work with what they have. They hold their meetings in a tin shed. They conduct their own maintenance and development. They store trailers and equipment across multiple sheds and shipping containers. It really has been popped together and assembled like some kind of meccano set over the years as they have grown.

I have been supporting and continue to support the Noarlunga SES in finding a redevelopment outcome that allows them to both retain their specialist training facilities, which are of enormous benefit to them, and also maintain that connection in the community. I understand that development is scheduled for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 financial years, pending final plans and

subject to feasibility assessment and planning approval. It is one of the biggest and busiest SES units in the state.

The team is extremely dedicated, professional, passionate and driven. There is no chance of diminishing or wavering these values in the near future. In our community, where climate change is an issue and we are exposed to more frequent extreme weather events, it is really important for people who do have the knowledge and the training and requisite skills to be housed in the most up-to-date facilities we can afford. I know that the minister is aware and does support this, so I look forward to a good outcome.

Recently, on 25 June, I attended the soft launch of the Wilfred Taylor nature play space at Morphett Vale. The play space at Wilfred Taylor Reserve started with an idea over a cup of tea with the previous mayor, Lorraine Rosenberg, and this turned into a vision and is now a reality. I think that cup of tea happened more than three years ago. I do not think either of us could have imagined just how wonderful the opening was, with so many kids there just in time for the school holidays.

It was my privilege to secure funding towards this beautiful space—about \$1.3 million—just prior to the last state election, which thankfully was matched by a commitment by the then Liberal opposition. We have seen that, with an equal contribution by the City of Onkaparinga, turn into the most amazing place that is inclusive for all and able to be accessed by our whole community. Thank you to Mayor Erin Thompson for continuing with that vision, with construction partners and Allan Sumner. It really is an incredible space.

I would like to say a special thanks to my little mate Thomas, from Antonio Catholic School, who cut the ribbon; Bethany from Suneden Specialist School; Ayla from Morphett Vale Primary School; and Emilia from Emmaus Catholic School. Ayla attended on behalf of her brother, Levi, who was not well. All these children have challenges in their life, and it was really great to see that the Rotary Club of Noarlunga contributed by putting money in to have an accessible roundabout so this inclusive play space is for everyone. I would encourage you all to bring your dollars to the local shops and the local communities down south and have a day at the Wilfred Taylor Reserve.

### KEELTY REVIEW

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:47):** Today, I rise to discuss the recommendations provided to the state government in the independent bushfire review 2019-20.

I would like to begin by congratulating Mr Mick Keelty AO and the SA bushfire review team for their immense effort conducting the consultation and developing this important piece of work in a very tight time frame, especially during the COVID pandemic of the last couple of months. I was pleased to hear that the state government will commit \$20.3 million towards several initiatives outlined in that review and that \$16.7 million in federal and state funds are to be invested over five years into the South Australian Disaster Risk Reduction Grants Program.

Deputy Speaker, as you know bushfires are of immediate concern to all of us across South Australia but especially to residents in my electorate, many of whom are situated in peri-urban, high bushfire risk zones across the Mitcham Hills and Mount Lofty Ranges. I would again, as I always do, like to thank the amazing work of the Sturt CFS group and the brigades that make up that group, including Eden Hills, Cherry Gardens, Coromandel Valley, Blackwood and Belair Country Fire Service, for their efforts over the 2019-20 bushfire season, as well as, of course, the Sturt SES volunteers, whose home is at Coromandel Valley. These groups protect life and limb in my community, as well as so many important open spaces, such as Belair National Park, Sturt Gorge and Shepherds Hill Recreation Park.

You know, Deputy Speaker, that I regularly meet and converse with the hardworking and dedicated volunteers in my electorate to understand their concerns from a front-line perspective. In April, I was very pleased to submit a submission to the Keelty review on behalf of my community to reflect the information that I gathered in correspondence with them in the weeks before that. Indeed, I was delighted to see the review make appropriate and relevant recommendations that will help the determined and dedicated volunteers in their line of duty.

Some specific recommendations that were really pleasing in the report included equipping CFS trucks with automatic vehicle location systems—and I know this is something that the crew at



the Eden Hills station have raised with me many times—additional funding for volunteer training and improved land management and fuel reduction practices. We know this was a huge part of the review. A really big issue in my community is the fuel load that sits on the floor of places like Belair National Park and along arterial roads in and out of my electorate.

I would also like to draw attention to other areas that I believe worthy of exploring further as part of the review. These include increasing the number of paid CFS staff, upgrading country fire stations and developing a fleet of reserve volunteers for busy times, with more flexible leave arrangements for volunteers. One of the big issues across the fire season we saw in Australia was that volunteers from my community, for example, were fighting fires directly in our communities, such as Cudlee Creek and on Yorke Peninsula, and then, of course, teams were going over to New South Wales as well.

There was a period over Christmas when there were volunteers from my community who missed Christmas and missed spending time with family and friends. They had exhausted all their annual leave but were still out there volunteering for fighting fires. In extreme situations, as we have seen this bushfire season, I think we need to have a structure that looks after those volunteers and the employers who support them as well.

The CFS is powered by over 13,500 volunteers in 425 brigades. These brave men and women employ a vast array of equipment and expertise to ensure all the communities we represent stay safe. It is apparent from both my consultation and from reading the review that the relationship between the volunteers, salaried staff and the agencies themselves was clearly central to the operational successes and at times challenges of the disastrous fires that occurred over 2019-20.

During the Cudlee Creek fire in the Adelaide Hills, the Sturt CFS brigade provided eight full rotations of strike teams, which translated to 272 personnel, five appliances, one bulk water carrier and command vehicles. The group also sent 84 personnel to Kangaroo Island, three appliances and a specialist compressed air foam system. Once again, I would like to commend the entire Sturt CFS group for their bravery, selflessness and sacrifice. Their tireless work has saved countless lives, animals and bushland.

I note that the Keilty review outlines the psychological impacts of the bushfire season and level of psychological stress on the services. The review outlines the need for adequate mental health support for firefighters and bushfire-affected communities. These volunteers work day and night in times of disaster, and we depend on them in so many ways. It is only fair that the right level of support is available to them, and I would urge SAFECOM to increase resources to the stress prevention and management service to ensure it can provide support when needed.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:52):** I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 8 September 2020 at 11am

Motion carried.

#### *Bills*

### **DISABILITY INCLUSION (COMMUNITY VISITOR SCHEME) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### *Resolutions*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANIMAL WELFARE REFORMS) BILL**

The Legislative Council passed the following to which it desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

1. That, in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be established to consider and report on the Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill 2020;
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by two members, who shall also form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee; and
3. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.

The Legislative Council also informs the House of Assembly that it has resolved to suspend standing order 396 to enable strangers to be admitted when the joint committee is examining witnesses unless the joint committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the joint committee is deliberating.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:55):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) agrees with part 1 of the resolution of the Legislative Council contained in message No. 43 for the appointment of a joint committee on the Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill 2020;
- (b) concurs with the proposal for the committee to be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks, fit any evidence or documents being reported to the parliament; and
- (c) concurs with the proposal to enable strangers to be admitted when the committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but that they be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I move:

That this house be represented on the committee by two members who shall also form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee and that the members to represent the House of Assembly on the committee be Dr Susan Close MP, the member for Port Adelaide, and Dr Richard Harvey MP, the member for Newland.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **ROAD TRAFFIC (SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**Mr GEE:** Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

## **ELECTORAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:59):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985 and to make a related amendment to the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:59):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I am pleased to introduce the Electoral (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020, which amends the Electoral Act 1985 to improve administration, streamline and modernise processes and allow for more flexible pre-poll voting options. The bill also includes amendments to ban corflutes on public roads and introduces optional preferential voting in the House of Assembly.

Every election cycle, the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia reviews the previous election. The government of the day then considers these findings to determine whether any changes

are needed to the Electoral Act. The 2018 report was tabled in parliament on 28 February 2019. After considering the commissioner's report, the government is proposing a number of reforms, many of which directly meet recommendations of the commissioner and others which have been initiated by government.

Under this bill, the Electoral Commissioner will be able to establish pre-poll booths anywhere in South Australia up to 12 days before the election. This will replace the existing system, which provides for people to vote at declared institutions, such as nursing homes or hospitals, and only allows mobile polling booths to be established in regional areas. The bill provides that voters who attend a pre-polling booth established for their district will have the convenience of being able to cast an ordinary vote.

The counting of ordinary votes made at pre-poll booths will be able to occur before the close of polls in prescribed circumstances. This will help to ensure that the results of the election are known as soon as possible after the close of polls. These changes are possible because each voter will be marked off on an electronic electoral roll on a computer at each issuing point in every polling place. Electronic roll mark off will ensure that there is no risk of any person voting multiple times.

Previously in this parliament we have seen amendments to curb the availability of pre-polling. As I reflected in *Hansard* in 2017, many more people make themselves available for pre-poll voting, and they do so because it provides convenience. This is not unreasonable. We have seen a clear shift in both recent federal and state elections in 2019 and 2018 respectively. Why should they not be able to vote when they want to and when it is convenient to them, especially in the weeks prior to an election?

This flexibility is consistent with the right to have a choice about when you vote and your entitlement to be able to vote, which this bill is strengthening. Voting is a democratic right and, if you want to vote early, you frankly should be able to do so. I am pleased that this bill enables greater access to voting early and ensures that those votes, given their high numbers, can be counted expeditiously on polling day.

To further reduce red tape, the bill contains amendments so that both voters and candidates will have flexible options for lodging information with the Electoral Commission. The Electoral Commissioner will be able to allow candidates to lodge nomination information and how-to-vote tickets online. Regulations can be made allowing voters to apply for postal ballots by phone or online.

Amendments have also been made to the date of the close of rolls and the deadline to apply for postal votes. This allows for the earlier issue of voting papers and will maximise opportunities for postal voters to return postal votes in time to be counted in the election. However, as in the current act, voters will still be required to vote in person if not lodging a postal vote.

Postal votes have created, without doubt, their own challenges for all political parties and for the Electoral Commission. The time frame for postal votes is always a consideration to ensure voters have every opportunity to vote, despite their inability to attend a pre-poll or election day polling booth. The bill provides that both election information and public notices will be published on the internet rather than a newspaper in the first instance.

While we have seen this reform from previous governments in terms of other public notices, this government appreciates that regional newspapers play a vital role in notifications. The bill will keep it open to the Electoral Commissioner to consider which additional advertising should be used beyond the internet.

The act already provides voting options for a class of voters who do not have fixed addresses. The bill includes new protections for these itinerant electors. If itinerant electors fail to vote, or are outside of South Australia for more than one month, they will not lose their status. Itinerant electors will be exempt from compulsory voting. This is to avoid creating hardship for people experiencing homelessness and for travelling retirees.

A number of the amendments are drafted to allow regulations or the Electoral Commissioner to set out the detail of proposed processes. This will enable further changes to be made in the future as the technology evolves.

One major aspect of the bill is that it includes a ban on the use of corflutes on public roads. 'Corflute' is the name given to corrugated polypropylene, a fluted plastic which is lightweight yet rigid. Through election periods across the state, we see corflutes posted on Stobie poles advertising election candidates and being used as A-frames at shopping centres and the like.

Corflutes are without doubt detrimental to the environment as there are limited recycling options for them, as acknowledged by the Australian Greens on their website. Polypropylene is not widely recycled, with only two main recycling methods: mechanical recycling, which is complicated due to concerns around food contact and in separating types of plastic, and recycling through chemical methods to break down the corflute.

While all political parties encourage their candidates to reuse and recycle corflutes, or repurpose or donate, this is often difficult and sees a continual cycle of new corflutes being printed for each election. Some of our candidates have become quite innovative over the years. I have made old corflutes available for use in schools, in their artwork, for the purpose of having all of the primary resources to do that. I hope that other members are not sending them straight to landfill.

In any event, beyond the corflute issue, in order to suspend the advertising they require cable ties and other fixings which often get cut and left for local wildlife to likely consume. Beyond the environmental impact, local councils have further raised concerns about diminished roadside safety, distracting drivers and the preservation of roadside public amenity. I think this just means that some of them look ugly.

Corflutes are finally, without a doubt, costly to parties and do little to educate voters about a candidate or their platform beyond their name ID. The government appreciates voters will not all have access to the internet, or particularly social media, where great sums of political communication occurs about candidates and policies of the political parties of the day.

Importantly, this government appreciates that people may need to be reminded of election day and of polling booth locations. As such, the bill provides that exceptions to this ban are permitted by regulation. It may potentially be used to allow limited numbers of corflutes to be displayed adjacent to polling booths on election day, and potentially near polling places within the current advertising and electoral display guidelines in the act.

Finally, the bill provides for optional preferential voting in the House of Assembly. This is a purely optional system and voters wishing to cast a more comprehensive ballot will still be able to do so. The introduction of optional preferential voting for Legislative Council candidates, commenced in 2018, demonstrated that the system was an effective way of ensuring peoples' votes counted. It also gave voters a clearer understanding of where their vote was going and, in particular, not being forced to vote for someone they did not like.

Optional preferential voting was wholeheartedly supported by the former government and my predecessor, the Hon. John Rau SC, who moved the bill to enable this form of voting in the Legislative Council. It had the Liberal Party's support, then in opposition, for those amendments and we agreed that this was welcomed by the community and successful.

At the time, that reform was put in place in the Legislative Council to mirror the voting system of the federal Senate which required reworking and amendment in the other place before its passage. The reasons for this amendment are clear. South Australian voters deserve to understand where their votes are going and, should they wish, to simply vote for one party without backdoor deals diminishing their vote.

In *The Advertiser* this week South Australians were polled on their views around optional preferential voting and whether corflutes should be banned. As at 1pm today, in response to the question, 'Should ballot papers allow you to vote just one box?', of 1,479 voters 76 per cent voted yes. On that poll at least, there is overwhelming support. What is more overwhelming is the support on the same poll for the banning of corflutes. Of the 1,879 people polled, 90 per cent of people voted yes, that political posters or corflutes should be banned.

This bill makes a number of sweeping changes. It acts on the recommendations not only from the 2018 election report but also some from the 2014 election report which were failed to be implemented by the former government. For voters, the changes are simple. Less environmental

degradation through the production of corflutes, greater voter choice through being able to vote for the political party or candidate they desire, abolishing backdoor deals and more freedom to vote early.

These changes modernise the current electoral laws in South Australia and give South Australians the greatest flexibility and voter power they have had. This is important and timely reform and no doubt will receive great consideration by all members through the winter break. I commend the bill to members. I look forward to having discussions with members of the opposition and other representatives, Independents and other parties in this place.

Obviously, it is important electoral reform to members of parliament and, if they are a member of a political party, to those political parties. I would be interested to hear of any of the proposals that were to present an argument for abandoning what had been a very important and useful optional preferential voting policy in the upper house if it is to be denied for lower house members. In any event, that is where we are at. I commend the bill to the house. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary 1—Short title 2—Commencement 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Electoral Act 1985*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Certain definitions are amended for the purposes of the measure.

5—Amendment of section 8—Powers and functions of Electoral Commissioner

A function of the Electoral Commissioner to promote and encourage the casting of votes at a polling booth on polling day is deleted.

6—Amendment of section 15—Electoral subdivisions

Subsection (3) relating to remote subdivisions is deleted.

7—Amendment of section 18—Polling places

A requirement to advertise in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

8—Repeal of section 25

Section 25 relating to printing of rolls is repealed.

9—Amendment of section 26—Inspection and provision of rolls

This amendment is consequential.

10—Amendment of section 31A—Itinerant persons

2 grounds on which an itinerant elector ceases to be entitled to be enrolled are deleted.

11—Amendment of section 41—Publication of notice of application

A requirement to publish in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

12—Amendment of section 48—Contents of writ

The date for the close of rolls (currently, 6 days after the issue of the writ) is amended to the day that falls 2 days after the issue of the writ.

The requirement to publish the writ for an election in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

13—Amendment of section 49—Deferral of election

A requirement to publish notice of deferral of an election in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

14—Amendment of section 53—Nomination of candidates endorsed by political party

Various references in the section (such as to 'nomination paper') are removed to facilitate electronic nominations.

Another amendment is consequential on the removal of voting tickets.

15—Amendment of section 53A—Nomination of candidate by a person

Similar amendments to those to section 53 are made to this section.

16—Amendment of section 54—Declaration of nominations

This amendment is consequential.

17—Repeal of section 60A

The provision relating to voting tickets is repealed.

18—Amendment of section 65—Properly staffed polling booths to be provided

The reference to 'returning officer for the district' is replaced with 'Electoral Commissioner'. The other amendment requires polling booths to be established at polling places 'for' the district (rather than 'within' the district).

19—Amendment of section 66—Preparation of certain electoral material

The requirement to submit a quantity of how to vote cards is replaced with a requirement to submit them in a manner determined by the Electoral Commissioner (in accordance with any requirements of the Commissioner).

Another amendment is technical.

20—Amendment of section 71—Manner of voting

Voting by attending at a pre-polling booth and voting in the manner prescribed by this Act (not by declaration vote) is authorised. A change is made to section 71(2)(a) that is connected to the amendment to section 65(1)(a). The distance from a polling booth that a voter must be in order to be entitled to make a declaration vote is increased to 20 km. Another amendment relates to residents of a declared institutions.

21—Amendment of section 72—Questions to be put to person claiming to vote

The words 'and the address of the principal place of residence of the claimant' are deleted from the questions to be put to a voter before an authorised officer issues voting papers.

22—Amendment of section 73—Issue of voting papers

A reference to 'written' is deleted. Another amendment proposes relocating certain requirements to the regulations.

23—Amendment of section 74—Issue of declaration voting papers by post or other means

Section 74(1)(b) is amended to remove a reference to 'letter' and to allow certain requirements to be prescribed by regulations. A definition of *designated time* is inserted for the purposes of this amendment. The substitution of subsection (2) is related. A reference to 'mobile polling booth' is substituted with 'pre-polling booth'.

24—Amendment of section 76—Method of voting at elections

Optional preferential voting in a House of Assembly election is provided for.

25—Amendment of section 77—Times and places for polling

A reference to determining 'mobile polling booths' as places for voting in remote subdivisions is substituted with 'pre-polling booth' for any places determined by the Electoral Commissioner. Other amendments are consequential.

26—Repeal of section 83

The provision relating to taking declaration votes at a declared institution is deleted.

27—Amendment of section 85—Compulsory voting

Being an itinerant elector is added to the list of sufficient reasons for failing to vote at an election.

28—Amendment of section 89—Scrutiny

These amendments relate to the commencement of the scrutiny of ordinary votes taken at pre-polling booths before polling day at such times and places and in such manner before the close of poll determined by the Electoral Commissioner.

29—Amendment of section 91—Preliminary scrutiny

Section 91(1)(b)(i)(A) is substituted so that the relevant officer conducting the scrutiny is required to be satisfied of the identity of the elector (which must be verified in a manner prescribed by the regulations).

## 30—Repeal of section 93

Section 93, which relates to the interpretation of ballot papers in House of Assembly elections by use of voting tickets (which are proposed to be abolished), is consequentially repealed.

## 31—Amendment of section 94—Informal ballot papers

The amendment to section 94(1)(b) is consequential on the introduction of optional preferential voting in a House of Assembly election. The substitution of subsection (3) (in place of existing subsections (3) and (4)) relates to both the introduction of optional preferential voting and the abolition of voting tickets.

## 32—Amendment of section 96—Scrutiny of votes in House of Assembly election

This amendment is consequential on the introduction of optional preferential voting in a House of Assembly election

## 33—Amendment of section 115—Limitations on display of electoral advertisements

An offence of exhibiting an electoral advertising poster on a public road (including any structure, fixture or vegetation on a public road) during an election period, except in circumstances prescribed by the regulations, is provided for.

## 34—Amendment of section 125—Prohibition of canvassing near polling booths

This amendment is consequential on the amendments relating to declared institutions.

## 35—Insertion of section 129A

New section 129A is inserted:

## 129A—False or misleading information

An offence is prescribed that a person must not, in giving any information under the Act, make a statement knowing it to be false or misleading or omit any matter from a statement knowing that without that matter the statement is false or misleading.

## 36—Amendment of section 132—Injunctions

Subsection (2), which prevents an injunction from being granted under section 132 in relation to a contravention of, or non-compliance with, Division 2 of Part 13 of the Act (which sets out offences relating to electoral advertisements, commentaries and other material), is deleted.

Schedule 1—Related amendment to *Local Government Act 1999*

## 1—Amendment of section 226—Moveable signs

Currently, a sign related to a State election may be placed and maintained on a road during an election period without an authorisation or permit under Chapter 11 Part 2 of the *Local Government Act 1999*. That general exemption in relation to State elections is deleted as a consequence of the insertion of the offence into section 115 of the *Electoral Act 1985* by the measure.

New paragraph (caa) then includes in the list of exempt signs a sign that relates to a State election and is an electoral advertising poster that is authorised to be exhibited under section 115(2a) of the *Electoral Act 1985* (during an election period under that Act) (so that such a sign may be placed and maintained on a road during an election period without an authorisation or permit under Chapter 11 Part 2).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

*Motions***ONLINE GAMBLING**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:13):** I move:

1. That, in the opinion of this house, a joint committee be appointed to investigate and report on online gambling, having regard to:
  - (a) the prevalence of online gambling and sports betting in South Australia;
  - (b) the social and economic impacts of online gambling and sports betting in South Australia;
  - (c) the impact of online gambling and sports betting on South Australian gambling licences, licensed venues and racing industry;
  - (d) the regulation of online gambling and sports betting in South Australia;
  - (e) mechanisms available to control or prevent access to online gambling by vulnerable gamblers in South Australia;

- (f) mechanisms available to prevent access to online gambling and sports betting by minors, including any barriers to achieving robust age verification requirements;
  - (g) the prevalence and impacts of online betting agencies advertising across different media platforms;
  - (h) the regulation of advertising by online gambling and sports betting agencies in Australia and South Australia;
  - (i) gambling markets on local sporting fixtures in South Australia, particularly amateur and semiprofessional matches;
  - (j) online markets in local sport and its relationship with potential match fixing;
  - (k) marketing and inducement schemes provided by online betting agencies;
  - (l) what legislative or regulatory changes may be required to control or restrict access to online gambling and sports betting in South Australia; and
  - (m) any other matter.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
  3. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting concurrence thereto.

The question of online gambling and the difficulties surrounding it have already been the subject of national reports and of inquiry by our independent gaming authority, the provision for which has now been repealed. Indeed, it was also the subject in similar terms of reference referred to one of our state parliament committees for its consideration, but that had not commenced.

When we debated the gambling reforms in this parliament, which are now operational and for which regulations are on the way to being published, it was very clear that the incidence of online gambling, its lack of regulatory management and protection capacity for those who might be vulnerable in the use of it, was growing and concerning.

During the course of our discussions on that matter, it was agreed with the opposition, particularly in discussions with the member for Lee, who had general carriage of this matter on behalf of the opposition in relation to the reforms, that it was worth having a joint standing committee to investigate this matter and that the terms of reference, broad as they were in our parliamentary committee as they had not embarked on their inquiry, needed to be expanded and needed to be undertaken.

I thank the member for Lee for his contribution in assisting with the further extension of these terms of reference. I understand that they are consistent with all the aspects that he seeks to have involved. It has also been under scrutiny and drafting through the consumer and business affairs division under Commissioner Dini Soulio, who of course has general control in relation to regulation of gambling in this state, in that it is necessary that we advance this undertaking of work. More critical has been in evidence the extent to which there has been a transfer to online gambling during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We are yet to see the outcome in relation to the transfer of who the players are in this and who has been more adversely affected if there are going to be more and more people looking to online services to facilitate their gambling option. There has already been this transition, and I should point out that it has been in a circumstance where there has been a restriction, as you might be aware, in relation to the availability of hospitality services in the closure of hotels, Casino services and racing.

Horsereading was under significant restriction for quite some time, but I am pleased to say that has now been restored. Of course, the Casino is now open with limited gathering restrictions and placement of the patrons. However, even with hotels, which are the large accommodators of poker machines, together with the sporting clubs, there is still a very significant restriction on access to gambling options on site, and online continues to be a support.

A number of stakeholders have already raised with us their concern with that on the effect on employment, on the effect of their revenue, on the effect of their profitability, etc. I do not think I



need to go into that today, but I make the point that, if we are going to see this transition and it is going to be permanent and continue to grow, we need to make sure that we are protecting the vulnerable under the general principle that when it is in the wrong hands—in the hands of children, etc.—we need to have protective mechanisms wrapped around it, and then we are going to have to move to have this inquiry.

I am aware also that some of the industry are starting to look at new ways in which they have the developed products in their own organisations, and therefore it is important and timely that we progress this. I commend the motion to the house. I understand the procedure is that the matter will go to the Legislative Council, if passed here, that they will then indicate their support and that then each party will make nominations from each of the houses.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:20):** I rise to speak to the Attorney-General's motion on the establishment of a joint committee to investigate and report on online gambling.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are the lead speaker, member for Lee?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, thank you. I will not go through the tedium of repeating the terms of reference the Attorney-General included in her motion and briefly read to the house. We have all been focused on a pandemic over the last few months, and that has almost entirely exhausted and drawn the focus and attention of the community away from other matters that, in another time and in another context, would be considered to be very important as well.

I put it to the house that an epidemic is underway in South Australia and across the country that involves online gambling and sports betting. The Deputy Premier is correct: this is in part being facilitated by a growing shift away from the forms of gambling we have been more or less used to for some time in the community, whether it is gambling at horseracing tracks, whether it is gambling at local pubs on TAB facilities, whether it is gambling at pubs—for example, on poker machines—or even going across the way, close to where we are, to the Casino, to use either poker machines or table gaming.

It would be incorrect to think that the amount of reduction of those more traditional forms of gambling, those forms of gambling we have been more used to in recent years, is consistent with the uptick in online gambling and sports betting, because that is not the case. The growth in online gambling and sports betting each year in Australia is exponential, as far as we can tell. The growth in this is extraordinary, and the changes to what we are seeing in society as a result are there to see.

It is impossible now to look at a fixture of professional sport across Australia by virtue of a media platform without being bombarded by advertisements for odds on those fixtures. There is an enormous swathe, every day and particularly on Saturdays, in the local paper here in Adelaide, which is entirely sponsored by an online gambling company. There are entire television channels, both on free-to-air TV and also on pay TV, which are entirely financed by online gambling and sports betting. The extraordinary amount of advertising which occurs on social media, whether it is on Facebook, on Twitter or on other platforms, and which is promoting the opportunities to gamble online or to place bets on sport, is extraordinary.

We know that year on year there is an exponential increase not just in the level of gambling and the amount of gambling but also in the amount of advertising to attract gamblers to this activity. What it means in effect is that we now have this enormous operation and activity across Australia which, unlike those other traditional forms of gambling I have just mentioned, is largely unregulated. It does not have the levels of disclosure and reporting that those other forms of gambling require.

So what we see is very little information that is publicly available on the incidence of online gambling and sports betting by the community and by particular demographics within the community, but you can get a fair indication of who is being targeted by this advertising and who is participating in this activity by looking at the nature of the advertising itself.

When it comes to sports betting, the focus of the advertising and the vast majority of the activity is being done by young men, and you might characterise those young men as commencing in age from teenage years up through their 20s and perhaps into their 30s. I have had work colleagues, somewhat younger than me, of course, make the comment to me that they cannot

remember the last time they watched a professional sporting fixture on television without seeing a gambling ad or indeed placing a bet or checking odds, and so on.

What it means is that these predominantly young men at the early years in their lives, at the beginning of their working lives and often at the beginning of their careers, are being encouraged in an almost completely unrestricted and unregulated way to part with their money to engage in these activities. As the saying goes: overall, the house always wins.

There is a reason why these companies are so large, so wealthy and so successful, and that is because the odds are always stacked in favour of the house; that is because these companies have refined their business models, refined their operations and more to the point refined their odds and the betting markets that they provide to the community so well that they know they will make tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars a year from Australians and South Australians who participate in these activities—and that is just from sports betting.

When it comes to online gambling, a far bigger field of engaging is perhaps casino-type table games replicated in an online game format. Well, of course, the figures are even larger, as far as we understand. The impacts are, unfortunately, not accurately known, but certainly the inducements and the encouragements are there.

Unfortunately, early on when I was at that early and relatively naive stage of parenting (although I admit that I am still in a naive stage in many ways) and I allowed our older child to start using an iPad and the crack cocaine that is YouTube Kids was looked at, it did not take long until there were ads for other apps that popped up in the middle of so-called children's programs that were promoting online gambling. It is very easy for a young child under the age of five to be tempted to click whichever button is being promoted to start engaging in that activity. That is why, perhaps like some other parents in this place, we have had to enforce the rule of keeping children away from YouTube Kids and trying to keep them on more traditional platforms like ABC iview and—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Bluey.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —Bluey, of course, and so on. This is the insidious entry of online gambling into all of our lives. It starts at such a young age and is done in a way to try to condition people to think that it is normal, reasonable and not harmful and that its impacts on those people are not harmful.

Since they have been introduced, there has been an enormous amount of effort in this state and in other jurisdictions around the country to recognise the sometimes devastating impacts that addictive gambling on poker machines can wreak on someone's life and the livelihoods and lives of those around them. Measure after measure has been introduced. Risk reduction regimes, or harm minimisation regimes, have been trialled. They have been implemented. They have been cancelled in favour of newer and more effective ones and so on over a long period of time.

Largely, none of that applies when it comes to sports betting. Unlike a young bloke going down the pub with his mates and watching a game of footy on TV and placing a couple of bets through the TAB at the end of the bar, or even unlike someone a little bit older who chooses to go into a pokie room at a hotel, online gambling and sports betting are completely unsupervised. I suspect that particularly online gambling and other forms of online gambling, as opposed to sports betting, are largely conducted by people who are on their own at home and without any means of intervention if their gambling starts to become a problem for them.

If you are interested, Deputy Speaker, it is worth reading a terrific book that was released about 18 months ago by someone we know from another endeavour. Titus O'Reilly has written a book called *Please Gamble Irresponsibly*. It is a great book about the history of sports betting in Australia. It is mostly about the origins of the tote in Australia and how the totes were regulated, brought into government control and eventually privatised around the country. The Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place could probably tell us how not to privatise a tote, with his sale of the TAB here in South Australia.

This book also touches very briefly on how a forward-thinking company got their toe in the door to a territory government in Australia to establish permission to conduct online sports betting operations in Australia. That was Sportsbet up in the Northern Territory. They did so on the promise

by the then Northern Territory government of favourable taxation and other treatments from the government. It instantly became clear to Sportsbet what the market appetite for these activities would be and it became clear to the Northern Territory government how lucrative this would be if only there was to be more of it, and then the race was on. Other jurisdictions around the country progressively allowed online gambling and sports betting to occur.

There are slightly different regimes of course when it comes to the regulation of online gambling versus sports betting. This is perhaps something that will be better fleshed out by the joint committee, should it be agreed to by the house and by the other place. What we have seen in South Australia over time under this government and also the previous government is the approval of what are called contingencies. These are, in effect, approvals to allow gambling on certain sports with some conditions. That condition usually is that a sporting event must be sanctioned by a national governing body, but those sporting events that come under that umbrella—if I can put it like that—are then available with some limited restrictions for gambling to occur on them.

I became interested in this when my electorate boundaries were significantly redrawn for the 2018 election. I was fortunate enough in some regards (I will not make any remarks about the areas that I lost in that boundary redraw) to take on the area of Royal Park at the 2018 election. I am perhaps not the person who should be extolling the virtues of Royal Park—we have another member, the member for Cheltenham, who knows the area very intimately and can speak very proudly about it—but within Royal Park there is the Western Strikers football club, and in the expansion of my electorate through to Seaton another very proud football club, White City, is resident right on the edge, right on the boundary, of my electorate. In fact, I think it is shared with the member for Cheltenham.

**Mr Szakacs:** There are two local members.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** They get two local members, that's right. Also, both of them are well served of course by the member for West Torrens, the former treasurer, who made the unprecedented support available for football in South Australia. When I say 'football'—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** The real football.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That's right, the real football: people skilful enough just to play with their feet I think is the definition. That is why it is called football, not ambidextrous hand and foot ball.

It became clear to me—both of these clubs having junior programs; the clubs are now looking to expand or are now having involvement in teams for girls and for women—that from time to time betting markets were appearing on these online sports betting apps for matches that those clubs were participating in. You might think that this would be restricted to the fixtures that would involve either the senior men's team or the senior women's team but, no, that is not always the case.

It became clear to me that from time to time odds were being offered on the junior fixtures those clubs were participating in, which raises a few serious questions. One is: is it moral or ethical for bets to be placed on junior amateur sport? Also, whether it is junior or merely amateur, what sort of inducement does it provide to the clubs participating in those fixtures, and to the players participating in those fixtures, as to whether there should be any consideration of providing inside information to those companies about the likelihood of who may win and by how much, and might there even be the temptation for some form of match fixing?

That might sound like an extreme allegation, but this is something that has been reported at a national level about junior tennis. In fact, there has been a conviction for match fixing in junior tennis interstate. The more I learnt about this the more concerned about it I became. It was drawn to my attention that odds were being offered on junior basketball matches amongst the amateur clubs in metropolitan Adelaide, and it also became clear to me that odds were being offered for junior and senior netball games, particularly involving the Hills leagues.

To my mind, there is no justification for allowing odds to be placed on these matches. I do not believe it is the intent of any government in South Australia, Labour or Liberal, or any minister responsible for consumer affairs who has ultimate carriage and responsibility of these matters, that in approving contingencies it would enable betting to occur at such a junior and amateur level,

because when you approve a contingency, indeed if you read the contingency, it is written as if it applies to fixtures sanctioned by the national body. For the example I gave about football, for those fixtures sanctioned by Football South Australia, you would probably think that that refers to Adelaide United or maybe the Premier League, not at that level.

After the state election, I became a member of the parliament's Economic and Finance Committee. Of course, the Economic and Finance Committee has a bit of work to do from time to time considering the tax introduced by Rob Lucas when he was last in government, the emergency services levy. We have to think about that. We also look at, for example, the grants which are provided by the Office for Recreation and Sport, which has been interesting since the recent whiteboard scandal of those opposite. But, by and large, we are free to look at other things at the committee's volition.

So I came up with a set of terms of reference to consider this epidemic of online gambling and sports betting. Of course, the Labor opposition only has a minority of members on the committee. Despite moving that this inquiry be established, successfully mind you, the committee decided to proceed with other inquiries first and repeatedly voted not to commence this inquiry. I put up this motion 13 times only to be voted down by the Liberal members. I thought, 'Why would the Liberal Party have anything against looking at online gambling and sports betting?' I came into this place and started raising my concerns about online gambling and sports betting.

In fact, I put out a press release in June 2018 calling for a parliamentary inquiry into this. Shortly afterwards, only eight days afterwards, there was a further approval of contingencies for snooker, Gaelic football, handball, volleyball and gridiron—not the US gridiron but the local gridiron—which would enable, for the first time, online sports betting onto these South Australian fixtures and sports, not with any restrictions for junior fixtures or amateur fixtures.

I again raised this in the context that the parliament needed to have a look at this. The Deputy Premier, in her contribution on the Budget Measures Bill, raised that the Independent Gambling Authority (IGA), which was the regulator for gambling in South Australia, which was being abolished by the Deputy Premier, had done some work looking into this, but had not yet completed that. We then had a ministerial statement by the Deputy Premier on Thursday 28 November 2018 explaining to the parliament why these contingencies for new amateur sports in South Australia had been allowed. Throughout this time, my criticism of online gambling and sports betting continued.

In April 2019, the Deputy Premier updated the house on what the commonwealth government was doing about online gambling and sports betting, which, as you can imagine, given the size and cashed-up nature of the lobby group that they employ, was not much. Again, a press release was issued in May by the Deputy Premier about some changes being made at the national level that prevented integrative wagering providers sending direct marketing promotions to consumers in South Australia unless the consumer has given prior consent. That is not tackling the key issue of online gambling and sports betting.

The Deputy Premier raised with the opposition the prospect of reforming the regulatory environment for gambling in South Australia with a particular focus on poker machines—not just poker machines but on poker machines. The opposition made it very clear that in order for Labor to support those bills a range of changes would need to be made to the legislation, and in addition a parliamentary inquiry into online gambling and sports betting would need to be established. This is now the motion that seeks to establish this committee.

Given this was a Labor initiative, it is not unreasonable to expect that the Labor Party would have some interest on how the committee is composed. It would not be unreasonable to think that we would have some interest in who will be chairing the committee. I had made it clear—in fact, on instruction from my parliamentary colleagues I had made it clear—that it was our side's very strong desire that we would be chairing this committee and that, if we were not to be chairing this committee, certainly we would like sufficient and necessary control over our membership of the committee.

It is with some frustration that I report to the house, in speaking to this motion, that we are yet to agree on the number of members of this committee, from which houses those members will come and in what proportions. It has been an enormous frustration to me that, despite repeated requests either to the Attorney or to her office, I am yet to have the opportunity to sit down in a

meeting and canvass these matters. It is a great frustration to me that we are speaking to this motion without an understanding or an agreement between the government and the opposition on how the opposition's initiative is to be progressed.

I made it clear to the Attorney what the opposition's preference is, and the Attorney insists on proceeding in another way. Of course, I am aware that, rather than working out with us how the government's membership priorities and the opposition's membership priorities can both be accommodated, there has instead been a series of entreaties to the crossbench down here about how to make sure the Deputy Premier gets her way and the Labor opposition does not.

What that means to us is that we had given a commitment, that we had made an agreement in good faith with the Deputy Premier about the support of the passage of her legislation and that we are seeing that agreement not being honoured in full by her.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Really?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, really. And now I start to get an understanding about why so many in this place find such frustration with the deputy—I am not just talking about people on my side who are frustrated with the Deputy Premier; I am talking about people on all sides.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** You are just frustrated because you are not in government. Get over it!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** She says I am frustrated because I am not in government, but get over it. Do you know what I am very happy about? I am very happy to have the opportunity to represent my electorate of Lee. I am very happy to be able to do that, and I am very happy to have the opportunity to be here in parliament and represent them in the issues that mean the most to them.

She might think that online gambling and sports betting is not a big issue in the western suburbs—well, it is. I have been contacted by a lot of people, mostly parents, who are concerned about their children's online gambling and sports betting habits. I have been very concerned that now the Deputy Premier opposite is seeking to curtail my opportunity and the opportunity of the Labor Party to pursue these issues.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Yes—control yourself.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is late on a Thursday just before the winter break—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Control yourself. Get it under control.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, that is enough.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The interjections will cease. The member for Lee was alluding to the fact that his opportunity to argue these points was being somehow stifled—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister for agriculture—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I would ask that the Minister for Primary Industries apologise and withdraw.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Everybody sit down. I was speaking during that interjection; I have no idea what the minister said—I have no idea.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Why don't you get up and tell us, Tim?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Yes, sir. I referred to the member for Lee. I said: does he always speak to women like he just spoke to the Attorney-General? He should stand up and apologise.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I demand a withdrawal and an apology.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I think, minister for agriculture, it would be best, given that it is late on a Thursday before the winter break and there was no real need to aggravate the member for Lee—I was actually talking to the member for Lee about his contribution. Minister for agriculture, could you withdraw and apologise, please.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I withdraw and apologise.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you. Member for Lee, in your contribution you were talking about your opportunity to argue points for your electorate was somehow attempting to be curtailed in this place. That is in fact not the case, because you are the lead speaker. You have been on your feet for quite some time and I have a feeling that you might be there for some time yet, so we are not curtailing your opportunity. You have the call.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. In fact, I was referring to paragraph 2 of the motion, which seeks to establish the number of House of Assembly members that will be nominated to this joint committee. There is a lack of agreement between the government and Deputy Premier and the opposition and me about the composition of that membership, despite plenty of opportunity and entreaties from me.

I find that regrettable because it might mean, for example, that I or other people from our side—it might be the member for Enfield, or it might be the member for Cheltenham—who are particularly interested in this issue may not have the opportunity to participate on this committee. Indeed, after the entreaties from the Deputy Premier (member for Bragg) it might also thwart the opportunity the member for Frome thought he may or may not have to participate in this committee.

When it comes to paragraph 2 of this motion, yes, I am very frustrated about that. There are those two soccer clubs in my electorate, which I spoke about earlier. Those are two of dozens in the metropolitan area of South Australia. You, sir, would perhaps know much better than I about whether this sort of activity is occurring out in the regions, including in your electorate of Flinders.

Those clubs would like some answers about why on some game days, for example, they see a furtive-looking pair of people with a laptop standing at the far side of the sporting field, tapping away. They are not related to any person within the club or any person from either side. It is their supposition that they are perhaps logging ground conditions or working out whether Joe or Jane Bloggs from either team, who usually performs well, is warming up okay.

This is an extraordinarily important issue for us to be able to canvass. We will be supporting the motion because, of course, it is a Labor initiative. We will be looking forward to having the opportunity to serve on this committee. However, as I have an insistence from the Deputy Premier that the Labor opposition in this house is only able to be represented by one member on this committee, I will be moving to amend the motion. I move to amend the motion as follows:

2. After 'appointed', delete 'three members' and insert 'five members'

Five members is well over the odds. Five members is way more than should be required. All I am trying to do is make sure that those of us who are interested in this, and also the member for Frome, can now try to make good not only on our interest in these matters but have an opportunity to serve.

If the Deputy Premier were to come over or even get up on her feet and tell the house that she is willing to talk further with the opposition, as requested on 29 June to discuss these matters, then that might obviate the need for an amendment. If the Deputy Premier were to indicate that she remained open and willing to have a discussion with the opposition, then that would be gratefully received. On this side, we are always happy to be collegial and work with those across the chamber.

I understand some entreaties have been made about membership. I understand it has been bandied around, for example, that the member for Heysen might serve on the committee if the committee is successfully established. To my mind, that would be terrific because he strikes me as not only a fair-minded and balanced person but he also strikes me as someone with—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens and the Attorney-General will cease interjecting across the chamber. I get the sense that the member for Lee is winding up his comments.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Good, thank you.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am winding up the member for Unley as well.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, you are winding up your comments. You have the call.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We are open for discussion with the Deputy Premier. I know that she knows that we are passionate about this. I know that she would like to be thought of as someone who can be seen to be relied upon when it comes to reaching an agreement with the opposition about a piece of her legislation. Far be it from us to want to be in the position where we would have to think that the Deputy Premier is not someone who could be relied upon when it comes to this sort of matter.

I know, for example, that she has a strong reputation on her side of the chamber with her party as someone who can work openly, cross-factionally, collegially with all her colleagues. All we ask is that she extends the same thing to us because we have done what she wanted. We have passed her legislation. All we ask is for something which surely cannot be political.

This is not a committee which seeks to have a dig at Labor or have a dig at Liberals or have a dig at some other political party. This is a motion which seeks to improve the environments under which amateur sporting fixtures at the very least can be conducted to have a full understanding of how much betting is going on in South Australia, who is doing that betting, who is taking those bets, what is happening with that money.

I think we should all be alarmed that there are some insidious multinational corporate behemoths which are diddling South Australians out of their livelihoods under our very noses, and because of the recent nature of the rapid expansion of this industry, because of the difficulty in regulating this environment and because of the toxic impacts of the media advertising campaigns that these organisations run and the addictive nature of that advertising revenue to sporting bodies and media organisations, this is something that needs to be looked into.

These people, who are poisoning members of our community, should front this parliament and they should answer for their behaviour. We deserve a thorough understanding of what is going on amongst our community and we also should have a think about what we can do to make sure that the worst impacts of this can be curtailed so that we can improve the livelihoods of South Australians going forward.

*Matter of Privilege*

#### **MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:59):** I rise on a matter of privilege. Today, the ICAC commissioner released a statement regarding the investigation of the country members' accommodation allowance by any member of parliament over the last 10 years. The ICAC commissioner claims, and I quote:

I have discussed with the Auditor-General any activities he may be conducting relevant to the matter to avoid duplication.

The ICAC commissioner then goes on to say:

The Auditor-General has advised me that he does not intend at this time to investigate the matter in light of his office's statutory responsibilities to audit the financial statements of all statutory public authorities.

That statement is dated 23 July 2020. In parliament, the Premier stated to the house in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Is this today?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** On 21 July. I quote:

My question is to the Premier. If members of the Premier's cabinet have made errors that the Premier believes are unacceptable, what recourse or what reprimand has the Premier imposed upon his ministers for wrongful claims of the country members' allowance?

The Premier rose at 14:31 on 21 July to answer that question. He goes on to say that in addition to his answer:

...the government has written to the Auditor-General, and let's not forget for one second that it is indeed the Auditor-General who provides oversight of this parliamentary allowance. It's not a government allowance: it's a parliamentary allowance, and it's the Auditor-General who has responsibility for making sure that members act in accordance with those guidelines.

Members interjected and the Speaker brought the house to order. The Premier goes on to say:

We have asked the Auditor-General to provide a greater level of scrutiny; in fact, we have suggested to the Auditor-General that he may choose—we cannot direct him, but he may choose—to conduct random audits of country MPs' accommodation allowance claims. This will assure the people of South Australia that, when we spend a cent of their money, it is done in accordance with those strict guidelines.

In response to a question from me on 1 July 2020—the question was to the Premier:

My question is to the Premier. Why hasn't the Premier instructed his party room colleague Terry Stephens to stand aside to allow a thorough, independent investigation of his country members' allowance claims?

The Premier, on 1 July, answered with the following:

I thank the member for West Torrens for his question. This is a matter, of course, for the Legislative Council, but what I can say is that I am very supportive of the fact that the President there has referred the country member accommodation entitlements to the Auditor-General. He will look at all members' returns with regard to that matter. More than that, the President has also referred his specific taxation issues to the commissioner for taxation in South Australia.

There have been questions and there have been issues raised. We now have two eminently qualified people looking into this issue. My understanding is that the President has asked for a swift response from the Auditor-General so that we can clarify this matter. I just repeat that if there are issues that are identified in that report, either from the Auditor-General or from RevenueSA and the commissioner for taxation, then we will take the appropriate action.

I believe that the Premier wilfully and intentionally misled the House of Assembly to divert from the scandal at hand, to avoid having to answer questions, and to imply to the house that the Auditor-General was investigating it. Given the statements by His Honour Bruce Lander QC that the Auditor-General is not investigating these matters, I ask that you report this matter to the Speaker to investigate whether a prima facie case exists to establish a privileges committee into the Premier, to conduct a privileges committee, assemble it and investigate the actions of the Premier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I wish to speak on this matter to the extent of informing the Speaker that when he reviews the whole of the statement—

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, it is my time to speak. Sit down.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, Attorney, there is a point of order and my understanding is that you are not able to speak.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** My point of order is that I am making a point of order as to the matter that is to be presented to the Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** What is your point of order, Attorney?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** My point of order is that the whole of the statement of Mr Bruce Lander be presented to the Deputy Speaker—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Of course it will.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** What do you mean, 'of course you will'?

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** He is about to ask for it. I've got to give it to him.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am about to tell you—



**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Attorney, enough.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** My point of order is—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, Attorney, I am not going to accept the point of order. I am sure all of that will come out in due course, and I am going to ask the member for West Torrens to hand to me relevant documentation, which I will pass on to the Speaker for his consideration.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: I now also seek that the documents be identified as to what has been presented for consideration by the Speaker. If it does not include the whole of Mr Lander's ICAC statement today, outlining his discussions with the Auditor-General, that should be brought to the attention of the Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It appears to me, Attorney, that the member for West Torrens has handed to me a one-page public statement by the Hon. Bruce Lander QC.

### *Motions*

### **ONLINE GAMBLING**

Debate resumed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We are still dealing with the motion. The member for Lee is on his feet. Have you finished, member for Lee?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, I have concluded my remarks.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Attorney-General.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:06):** In relation to the motion that is before the house, I thank the member for his contribution—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** So you are closing the debate, Attorney?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you, yes. I thank the member for his indication to support the establishment of a joint parliamentary committee with the Legislative Council. I confirm that, for all the reasons that he has outlined as to the merits of why we—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, sir: we have to deal with the amendment before we close off the—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You will have to speak up, member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We have to deal with the amendment.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I do not have the amendment.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I have given it to the people who need it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You can speak to the amendment.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I would like to know what it says because I have heard the ramble. I just need to know what it said.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Do we have a copy of the amendment?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, I have given it to the attendant, sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** A copy of the amendment is available here at the attendant's desk.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you, I have read the amendment. Just for the record, it tells us:

2. After 'appointed', delete 'three members' and insert 'five members'

I will deal with both matters: firstly, that the amendment that is proposed will be opposed. Secondly, although I welcome the indication of the member's contribution in support of having an online inquiry in respect of online gambling, the concept of having simply a circumstance of what is effectively five

members from the House of Assembly and five members from the Legislative Council would not be orderly. It would be completely unprecedented, as far as I am concerned.

In any event, the proposal of the government is very clear in having this online committee: that we have three from each house and that we have two from the government of this house. At all material times I have invited the member for Lee, who has been quite a strong advocate in dealing with online gambling and the concerns that he has raised about it, to be the nominee from the House of Assembly. If he does not wish to be—because of his insistence to be the chairman of this committee—he could certainly nominate someone else. He has nominated one of his colleagues on the basis that he now insists that there be two from his party.

I have had conversations with the member for Frome because he also has been a longstanding member of the house and is interested in this topic. His indication to be available to be a third representative from this house in the event that, for whatever reason, the member for Lee or the Labor Party generally, the opposition generally, do not wish to nominate a person, or will not stand unless their terms and conditions insisted on are complied with, then he is available to—this is not a tactic that is acceptable.

It is certainly an affront to the parliament that somehow or other now we are going to change the rules. We are going to sort of minimise in some way the decisions and the usual practice, I understand, of the Legislative Council. They run their own affairs in relation to who they put on these things. My understanding from the Hon. Mr Lucas, who has been around for quite some time, is that he says that, on joint standing committees, we have three each.

Our practice in our house is that we have one from the government, one from the opposition and one nominee from the crossbench whoever they decide amongst themselves would like to be on it. That is the offer in relation to this proposal consistent with precedent. That is precisely what we propose.

I have made it clear at all material times that the nominees for the House of Assembly from the government will be the member for Heysen and the member for Narungga, both very interested, studious and acknowledged to be competent already—the member for Heysen in particular, but I add into that the member for Narungga. I would not be putting them forward unless I thought they had an important interest and a capacity to contribute, as well as the member for Heysen providing valuable leadership for that purpose.

If it is the intent of the opposition that it is the whole spit the dummy, 'Unless we get our terms we're not going to participate,' well, so be it. We think this issue is important enough and we need to get on with it. If it turns out that we end up with a scenario where they walk away, which is not the first time they have done this—they just walk away and say, 'Well, we just refuse to be part of a committee of the parliament.' I remember premier Weatherill doing this, saying, 'Well, we're just not going to be part of it. We're just not even going to put anybody up.' That is the disrespect that would be shown to the parliament.

That would be very, very concerning if that is the approach this opposition is going to have. Nevertheless, we can refer the matter back to the Economic and Finance Committee, which is under the chairmanship of the member for Colton. It can go back to that committee or it can go to other committees in the Legislative Council, but we thought, and I think the opposition thought during the course of the gambling reforms, that it would be meritorious to have this as a group representative of both houses of the parliament that it be a joint standing committee.

That is still the position of the government. We still maintain that position. That proposal is on the table. If they spit the dummy, walk away, kick the stumps over and say, 'We're not playing games. We're walking away,' well, so be it. We will get on with an inquiry in relation to this matter one way or another, but the proposal is on the table. I put the motion for consideration.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am going to put the amendment to the motion. The amendment is standing in the name of the member for Lee. The amendment is to part 2 of the motion. The amendment reads:

2. After 'appointed', delete 'three members' and insert 'five members'

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes ..... 21  
 Noes ..... 24  
 Majority ..... 3

AYES

Bedford, F.E.	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.

NOES

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

Amendment thus negated; motion carried.

*Bills*

**COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE (FURTHER MEASURES) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 1.

**Mr PICTON:** There was some discussion before the lunch break in regard to how the COVID Emergency Management Act legislation operates. This is obviously a time-limited piece of legislation that does rely upon an emergency declaration, otherwise known as a state of emergency, under the Emergency Management Act. We are having a number of rolling 28-day extensions by the State Controller advising the Governor.

As I mentioned in my contribution earlier, it appears as though the latest extension was expiring on Saturday. The Attorney has provided advice hot off the press that had not yet even been put on the website for the public to see that the Governor had approved another 28-day extension. However, there is obviously a great deal of uncertainty for some people in terms of whether these provisions exist in the long term and, if those extensions were not to apply, then obviously that act would cease.

These provisions we are about to enact, but all the other provisions in the act, would end as well. Can the Attorney outline the process by which that decision is made? Is this something where the government is getting a bit of lead time in terms of being able to plan for those extensions to make sure that if it was not to be extended we have enough time to put in place things that would enable those elements of the act to continue that need to continue.

One of the things I am concerned about is that, if the emergency management direction was to end during our winter break, we might need to bring back parliament to deal with some of the things that should continue during that period. What is that decision-making process inside the government and how much time do you have between knowing that it might be extended or not and being able to put things in place?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is not specifically relevant to the COVID-19 Emergency Response Bill before us, but I am happy to explain what has happened here. I think the request is to identify the process in relation to the extension of time based on the Coordinator's recommendations.

In the first instance, you might recall that in March the first step was for the head of the Department for Health to be appointed under the Public Health Act and the rules and obligations that sit within that, including the responsibility of the Chief Executive of the Department for Health, who under that law takes on a certain role in the public health issue that was clearly in existence.

The circumstances deteriorated internationally, and it was determined in March (I cannot remember the exact date now) that there would be the establishment of a state emergency, and the Emergency Management Act then comes into play and in a circumstance of there being an emergency—as distinct from a catastrophe, because there are catastrophic provisions separately—stage 2 is the state emergency, and under that act, the coordinator general is appointed. The coordinator general is defined in that act to be the police commissioner. A period of declaration of his responsibility under that act can be made for up to 28 days.

That has been periodically continued—rolled over, extended, however you want to describe it—to have a continuous period of a state of emergency since that time. The reference of the matter from cabinet to the Governor today to extend that has been based on a request by the Coordinator, who makes an assessment about whether that is necessary to continue. He presents that for cabinet approval, and then as a member of Executive Council the Governor signs that. That is the process and that is what has continued.

We have no idea yet how long that process might continue to be sought by the Coordinator. We have not denied him any request for there to be an extension of declaration when he has asked for it and it has been done in monthly instalments. As I understand it, the Coordinator meets almost daily, at least on the phone, with the Premier and others, including the health advisers on these issues, together with their liaison through various federal bodies. There is almost daily communication, and they are obviously significant contributors to the decision on whether or not the police commissioner asks the cabinet to declare that provision under the Emergency Management Act.

I hope you understand that is what the process is. I cannot predict how much further it will go. All the way through this, though, as we have made these COVID orders or COVID laws, and the commissioner has made all sorts of directions with the support and advice through the Crown Solicitor's Office and the Solicitor General—particularly because of the cross-border directions and the fact that we have High Court proceedings underway to which we are a party as a state (we intervened in those proceedings in the middle of June)—we have been keeping a bit of a tally of what has been successful and what might be useful to continue on a permanent basis, and obviously we have a number of our agencies working to bring that together.

We are mindful that after today the parliament does not come back until 8 September. We then have about a month to make a decision about anything that might need to be extended to support a COVID emergency and, secondly, to have done some more work, which we plan to continue during the winter break, to consult with people about these initiatives and others that are coming forward. One of them is to deal with more electronic conveyancing options. All these are matters that are under consideration for continuation.

Again, I place on the table the invitation to the opposition that if there are particular views they have on any of the COVID laws currently operating, good or bad, then we would be pleased to hear them. But, if there are other initiatives they want us to consider or they have stakeholders who have an interest in considering or people who are concerned about aspects of the interim COVID laws, please let us know. We are happy to include all of those in the collation of the twofold exercise: what do we need to continue if there is a continued emergency, and what can we continue as substantive law down the track?

**Mr PICTON:** I thank the Attorney for her response. I think it is interesting from the Attorney's answer that it seems as though what has happened at least this month is that today there has been a recommendation through cabinet to the Governor to extend it for another 28 days; however, that is only two days before it was due to expire.

I think that leads to some concern as to whether, if that were not to happen after a particular 28-day period, there would be enough time to put in place provisions to put laws in place, if need be, to deal with those matters expiring. Therefore, I wonder if the Attorney has turned her mind to any provisions or had drafted any provisions that could be enacted swiftly if that was to become the case.

It would seem sensible to me to do that ahead of time rather than waiting, if there was to be the event that that decision was made. I note that police commissioner Grant Stevens said that one of his factors in thinking about the extension of time and needing to keep that in place—and I got the impression from his radio interview that it is quite a significant burden being the State Controller for such a period of time—is obviously the laws that attach to it.

So does the Attorney have a plan B lined up? Is there drafting done? Is there work prepared that would enable either regulations to be put in place or a bill to be introduced to parliament to carry things over in the event that a state emergency was no longer extended for another 28 days?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Can I try to dissuade any concern that the member might have as to there being an alarming situation where just suddenly a day or so before there might be a cancellation of the whole emergency status and we would all be left in limbo. The reality is that for this month, for example, at least a week before, that is, before this week, the Coordinator—you called him the Controller, but is he the Coordinator or the Controller?

**Mr PICTON:** Coordinator. Sorry, did I say Controller? My mistake.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** State Coordinator, yes. That is alright. He has already determined his view of that and that it needs to be extended. Cabinet met on Monday, so that is the normal process. As I say, His Excellency has been very accommodating. We often see him more than a couple of times a week, and I know that time has been set aside for me to meet with him tomorrow in light of these COVID laws that we have been dealing with in the parliament this week. Of course, we also have a deputy governor, so we have got plenty of backup to deal with the situation.

**Mr PICTON:** I am not worried about the Governor.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I want to allay any concern of the parliament that we are going to expire in time and that suddenly we are all going to be left in limbo. At the moment, the working arrangements are very cooperative. The police commissioner, as the Coordinator, gives plenty of notice and is in regular contact with the Premier. I can say that for this last term it was confirmed at the cabinet on Monday that there should be a further declaration a week early to cover it. So the fact that the Governor signed it this morning, I want to reassure the parliament, should not in any way leave members with any concern that we are going to suddenly be in no-man's-land when it comes to a declaration.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you very much, Chair. This section has the guts, essentially, of the bill in it—

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

**Mr PICTON:** I am from down south, not Burnside; we call it the guts. This is where the substantive sections of the legislation are. As we have discussed, there are two parts: one is about telepharmacy; the other is about the protection of particular workers.

We had a debate through the second reading in relation to the categories of workers who would receive protection under this legislation, the amount of time that they would receive protection and also which categories they would be. Originally, the government only intended to protect pharmacists. They have now extended that to cover pharmacy workers and a range of health practitioners when they are involved in testing, such as GPs or staff at COVID testing centres.

There has been an issue in relation to threats against pharmacy workers and, by extension, threats against retail workers. I was very surprised to hear the Attorney-General say that the Shop,

Distributive and Allied Employees Association (the SDA) had not provided her with examples of threats against retail workers, when they have repeatedly raised with issues about threats to workers, including pharmacy workers.

In the break between our last debate on this, I obtained some of the correspondence. In fact, the SDA did write to the Attorney on Monday, setting out some of those stories from front-line retail workers who were concerned about threats against them and concerned about how vulnerable they are. They have been subjected to physical and verbal assault throughout the pandemic.

We have all seen some of the pictures from here and around the country of retail workers being attacked and threatened during the course of this pandemic. It is completely unacceptable. For the Attorney to say that she has not been provided with any evidence of that, I think, would be shocking for people who work in retail, where there are daily examples of that.

One of the examples that the Attorney was provided with on Monday was a story from Savannah, who works at Priceline—a pharmacy worker who originally was not going to be covered by this legislation. In her message to the Attorney-General, she said:

During this pandemic I had items thrown at me (because we weren't accepting cash). I have been spat at (because I asked the customer to respect social distancing. I have been called [an 'effing b'] (because I would not let a customer use my personal hand sanitiser that I had to purchase with my own money despite the fact that we had stock for the customer to purchase). Retail workers have been abused during this pandemic by others who have had the luxury of working at home! Something needs to be done!

There are countless examples like Savannah's. A number of others have been raised in the correspondence to the Attorney-General, including that of another retail worker, Jamie, who said:

My store is limiting customers to 15 and for a busy store this can be difficult to handle. I've had customers abuse me, threaten me and also received a jab to the rib as I asked a customer to wait in line. All because I was trying to follow the government restrictions.

There are more examples that have been provided. Morag from Woolworths said:

I'm a customer service manager at Woolworths. I have been punched in the face clawed on the arm. Spat at coughed at and get abused on a weekly [basis]. I have worked for Woolworths for 30 years and it is getting [worse].

The Deputy Premier has been provided with example after example of abuse, threats and violence against retail workers. It is very surprising that the Attorney-General would come to this house and say that she has not been provided with those examples and has not been provided with evidence of threats and attacks against retail workers. My questions to the Deputy Premier are: if these stories from these front-line retail workers are not enough for you, exactly what are you looking for? What evidence do you need to take this issue seriously?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I hope I have made it clear in the contribution I have already made in relation to correspondence exchanged between the Premier, the SDA and me and the concern they have raised about people who have been vulnerable in the circumstances as have been identified in those three. I have referred to a letter that went to the Premier with an attachment of photocopies of sticky notes from different persons who had recorded their concern, and they may well be three of those that have been read out.

Again, there is no information as to what has happened with those inquiries. Of course, in receiving information like that, I consider each one of those to be very serious. I would hope that the secretary of the shop distributors union would have immediately assisted that person, especially if they are a member, to go to the police to give a statement and follow it up with the employer because the employer's obligation is to provide a safe workplace as well. That is what I have been asking the SDA to let me know.

I have recently written back to them. This week I have signed a letter to say, 'This is my advice on this matter so that immediate support can be given to those of your members, or any complainants, who are in this situation.' It is not satisfactory for someone to be treated at their workplace in a rude and offensive manner, let alone the spitting and assaults to the ribs and things that have been described in those comments. I totally agree with that.

But what I say to the SDA is that it is important that these matters are reported and/or recorded when they happen in order to assist the police to be able to prosecute these matters. It

does not matter how many times we make laws down here. We have to have people prepared to step forward as a witness to say, 'I have seen the most appalling thing happen to someone who works with me at the local Coles or Woolworths,' and/or the victim, to be able to record that and support the police to be able to do something about it.

Clearly, that is why there has been this call from the SDA that there be some attention given to law reform in more criminal offences. I do not have an issue with that. We have already been dealing with those who provide front-line services in a health or emergency situation. If we are going to go to retail shops or to people who might be providing a service in any other forum, not to be enforcing a circumstance or withdrawing from a customer as a result of a direction of a particular thing they want that might draw an angry response, in a situation like this, we all have to be responsible and supportive to those around us.

People are fragile, angry, distressed and frightened; our own neighbours might be living on their own. We all have an obligation to try to understand that a number of people going through this are quite frightened. They are certainly fearful for themselves or others in the sense of getting this condition. They are irritated at the very least about restrictions around them that might affect their access to certain food products or toilet paper or anything else, and then of course you have the alarm of those who are wanting to provide for their family. So there are a lot of people in our community who are under the duress of the consequences of this situation we are in.

Again, I think we all have an obligation to assist in this regard. But in respect of a union, which has members who need protection, our government will look at any matters we think are worthy of bringing into the parliament or adding amendments to bills, all those sorts of things. I have urged them to be clear about what actions are currently being taken because one of the other things we have to look at as a government is, if there is a situation prevailing in our food outlets or supermarkets, for example, where there is no security, which is what we are being told has been employed, to ensure that we do protect workers from angry customers, then we need to know about that.

A general letter in this regard is not really enough. I have asked for it and I am hoping that they will come forward with that. I am hoping that they will say to me, 'We have referred a number of these and we have supported people to be able to get to a police interview and take a statement, etc.' That is great because we do want to send a message, as we often say in this parliament, to those who breach that circumstance. I hope I have made that clear.

Can I also identify another matter that has been raised during the debate, that is, the question of consultation. The criticism of the opposition and, purportedly, following a small statement made by one of the journalists in *The Advertiser* today, is to the lack of consultation with the Pharmacy Guild, that it 'came as news to them', I think were the words used by the member for Kaurana when this bill was to be introduced. I am advised as follows:

In March 2020, the Chief Pharmacist established a working group with the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA, the Pharmacy Guild of Australia and the Pharmaceutical Society of Australia to discuss how the operation of the community pharmacy premises might be maintained during the pandemic.

The first meeting was held on 17 March and the group met up to three times a week for a number of months during the first phase of the COVID-19 pandemic in South Australia. Discussions included consideration of the pharmacy of telepharmacy in order to maintain the provision of professional pharmacy services to the community members in these settings. The Chief Pharmacist continues to work closely with pharmacists, pharmacy organisations and regulators.

The Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA wrote to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing on 18 June 2020 to bring their concerns around current legislative ambiguity within the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 as it applies to the provision of telepharmacy services. The Pharmacy Guild has a nominee on the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA. The minister also met with the Pharmacy Guild—

I repeat: the minister also met with the Pharmacy Guild—

in June 2020, where the guild discussed the issues of pharmacists being assaulted.

Further, the minister spoke with a representative of the Pharmacy Guild as recently as Sunday before the matter went to cabinet. The Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA has also advised the Chief Pharmacist of recent consultation with the pharmacy organisations, including the Pharmacy Guild, in this context.

The following stakeholders were provided with a copy of the bill on Monday in advance of its introduction: the Pharmaceutical Society of SA, SA Pharmacy, The Society of Hospital Pharmacists of Australia, the Pharmacy Guild, the Pharmacy Board (AHPRA), the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA and National Pharmacies.

I hope that information to the committee averts any concern or fear there may have been arising out of either the questioning of the member for Kaurana or some article I read in *The Advertiser* today.

They then come to the question of those who are to be in the trial, and I confirm there are currently six community pharmacies with approval to provide telepharmacy under the Pharmacy Regulations Authority of South Australia code of conduct and guidelines for the telepharmacy dispensing from registered remote pharmacy locations. I repeat that the Pharmacy Guild, of course, is a member of that body.

I think it is fair to say, as I am advised by the minister, that there is still some work to be done in relation to the application of this, but I think it is a nationwide first to actually bring in the pharmacies in this way and to have them assist us—us, here in the public—to actually have the benefit of testing and the convenience of it locally at pharmacies. This pilot is being established. I am just reminded by my adviser that the information I am providing you is in relation to telepharmacy, not in relation to the pilot.

We appreciate the Minister for Health's contribution to making sure that he is listening carefully to this industry—that is very important during this pandemic—not the least to make sure that we get medications out. Goodness knows what is going to happen when we finally get a vaccine for this condition. We are going to be relying on the pharmacy world big time. We are probably going to need their round-the-clock support in being able to distribute and administer vaccines, all these types of things, to support other health industries during that part. The sooner it comes the better, but when it does come I do not think there is any question that we are going to have a very strong appetite from the public to have access to this as quickly as possible.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** I hope you are planning for that now.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am sure the Minister for Health is cognisant of that. At the moment, we are trying to have all these brilliant minds around the world work to try to come up with a vaccine to do that. I understand, and as we all know from the international press, that there are various trials now going on around the world. Thank goodness for those intelligent people who know what to do in this field, but in the meantime we have to keep preparing.

We have gone through areas of providing for accommodation, equipment, personal protection masks and the like, all these things as we go. At the moment, there is a very high risk of a problem build-up in Victoria. Everyone knows about it. New South Wales is not doing so well, and we know that it is a long way from being over, but we have health professionals working on how to keep us protected here in South Australia.

As I said the other day, I think there are very different challenges—for example, South Australians who live along the Victorian border—for whatever circumstance you are in and wherever you are living. In some ways, we are in the comfort of living within the City of Adelaide, with all the protections and services that go with city living. It is not the same for everyone out in the rest of the community. We do have to be cognisant of that.

Be assured that our minister is working diligently to ensure that we bring the people who provide the administration of medications to help support us in the pilot of allowing them to do the testing. As soon as we can get that going, we will.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I want to clarify some comments the Attorney made in her response to the first part of the member for Kaurana's question. I do think there is room within this legislation, particularly during COVID, to include retail workers, which is why earlier on I mentioned the bill that I should not have mentioned.

We have heard from the member for Kaurana about assaults of varying degrees occurring in retail environments on retail workers. We have heard that the Attorney is aware of these assaults. We have had them detailed, so we are aware that the Attorney is aware of these assaults. She is also aware that they have been exacerbated and have come about within an environment of COVID. These are COVID-related assaults on workers. The Attorney is aware of them, and very rightly she



says that the union, the employer or the victims themselves should have contacted the police and let the process run its course. That is absolutely right.

What it appears the Attorney is saying, then, is that the current provisions within the CLCA or the Summary Offences Act are sufficient to protect these retail workers by law. If that is the case, why do we need any of this legislation at all? If there are victims out there of COVID-related assaults in retail environments who are, according to your logic, protected by the current provisions of the CLCA, why do these workers need particular attention at the expense of retail workers?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** What we have done is establish a regime of protection of people who work in emergency circumstances, and that has been happening over the last few years, with penalties for assault on them in those circumstances—emergency departments and the like—as they are vulnerable to that. In this circumstance, the Legislative Council has said, 'Once we have started the employment of people who are going to be managing the distribution of drugs and the testing,' which is what we are dealing with in the pharmacy world and the workers who work in the chemist's shop and everyone else, 'there is going to be a risk in the administration of these duties that is the same as other health workers have'. That is why they have been accommodated and that argument has been persuasive in the Legislative Council and it is with us in this bill and the government is happy to employ that in its presentation today.

What we are asking for here is in relation to retail outlets. What I was trying to illustrate before is that it might be that there was an issue in relation to the restriction on product and there seemed to be a run on supermarkets. That issue, on the information we were given, was being dealt with by limiting people in supermarkets, and some of that came with social distancing, having extra CCTV and having security people involved. The information coming to us was that that had managed the initial problem. If it continues, though, clearly we need to know about it.

The correspondence that has gone to the Premier with this schedule of sticky notes of people's stories, or their pleas I suppose, alerts us to the fact that (assuming they are all genuine of course and that there is something that is breaking the law) we have to try to deal with it further if it is still happening. At this stage, we do not know when this happened or the detail of it, so what we are asking the SDA is to help us in dealing with that. Do we have a current problem and, if so, where it is happening and what is happening? Give us the detail of what is happening. If this is happening, are people taking photographs with their phone? Are they keeping a record of their bruises? There are lots of things that happen around this space.

Obviously, we have not had anything come to us from the police at this stage to say that this is a particular area of vulnerability, but you can imagine where there are others. For example, somebody turns up to get the rent, you have not paid your rent, it has not been electronically transferred, somebody says, 'I've lost my job. I've been sacked from the hotel,' and they smash the door in the rent collector's face. This is the type of situation that can arise when people are under pressure.

We could try to make all sorts of criminal laws with more penalties and so on for everybody who acts in a totally offensive unacceptable way and/or illegal way during a pandemic, but there are lots of people in this category who are frightened, angry, frustrated, etc. We will have debt collectors coming to us saying, 'We think we are in the firing line,' or people who have to give notice for somebody to comply with a certain direction or the local hotelier who says, 'I'm sorry, you guys. You look like you are having a good time, but you've got seven here at the table and you're only allowed to have six.'

All these situations are ones that can commonly occur. They may start with a rude or offensive comment and may transfer into something that is quite unacceptable as an offence, and we need to be able to manage it. We are happy to hear from the SDA. I have sent back some further correspondence to them this week. If it gets to a situation where we have an ongoing problem here, clearly that will be one other area we have to look at. I need contemporary data, including what has happened with them, and I am happy to look at it further.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. V.A. Chapman.*

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (18:00):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**FAIR TRADING (FUEL PRICING INFORMATION) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

No. 1. Clause 3, page 3, line 22 [clause 3, inserted section 45F(3)]—Delete '\$315' and substitute '\$550'

No. 2. Clause 3, page 3, line 28 [clause 3, inserted section 45F(4)]—Delete '\$315' and substitute '\$550'

No. 3. Clause 3, page 3, line 34 [clause 3, inserted section 45F(5)]—Delete '\$315' and substitute '\$550'

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3 of the Treasurer in the other place be dealt with en bloc and accepted by the government. I indicate that they are all to simply increase a \$315 on-the-spot fine penalty to \$550—wise consideration in the Legislative Council. We thank them for it and consent to the same.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I would like to ask the Attorney: why is there a change of this nature? Why did she not pick this up before it went to the other learned place as she has just referred to?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Quite simply, member for Florey, this was raised in the House of Assembly as an amount by the opposition suggesting that the recommended \$315, which was recommended in consultation with parliamentary counsel as to what was commensurate with an appropriate amount for an on-the-spot fine still was not enough, and I undertook to discuss that with the advisers that we had on this matter. After that conversation, it was considered that an amount up to about this amount was appropriate.

There was some discussion with the opposition in relation to that. I am not sure who actually finally determined that amount but it was within the parameters of what we had approved for consideration, and so that amendment, therefore, had to be made in the other place. We could not do that on the spot because the advice we had from the assessment of the on-the-spot fine research had been limited to what we had up to that date.

You might recall this was a very late request of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, Mr Soulio, to be added in so that if he had the responsibility, ultimately, of this program he would have the capacity to be able to issue on-the-spot fines, but it was very late in the process. So we agreed with the opposition that we go away and have a look to see whether there could be some other figure provided, and this was within the limit, so that was what was negotiated. There was no attempt for it to be delayed or anything of that nature. I hope that makes it clear.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Yes, it makes it a little bit clearer when you consider \$315 is less than you are charged if you take a pear or an apple across the border in South Australia and are in contravention of the fruit fly act. What I am getting at, though, I think, is why is \$550 going to be appropriate and how on earth are we going to enforce this regime of catching people out, because this is what we are talking about?

We are talking about the same set of circumstances we have now where my staff and I have done the legwork around the area and we can tell that the apps are not accurate compared with the

price being displayed at the service station. So how are you and Mr Soulio going to be able to pick these up and enforce these fines, even at the meagre rate of \$550, which you might say is barely a slap on the wrist for a retailer who makes that sort of money in half an hour by selling petrol at an inflated price?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The actual fine is up to \$10,000. There is a capacity for the commissioner, not me. The Attorney-General has nothing to do with making decisions about who gets fined and in what way. It may be that it turns out that there is a failure to provide information multiple times by a second. They come along and say 'our technicians, a computer glitch' and all the other excuses that come out with those things.

There are suddenly multiple breaches, thousands of them, and the commissioner might take the view that it was a very minor breach in itself but there were multiple of them and we are going to issue an on-the-spot fine to deal with each of those breaches so that it works out a just and equitable outcome. That is a matter for him.

Quite often we get asked by the investigative authorities, like the police, for an on-the-spot fine to deal with people who breach his directions under COVID and he has been using that very effectively for people who gather too much together and go to places they should not and go across borders they should not, etc. It is a useful tool. It is not the principle of penalty, but it is a useful tool. If there is a minor breach, and it can easily be dealt with as an on-the-spot fine, then it is something he would consider and have that in his toolkit. I do not have anything to do with it.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I put it to you, Attorney, it is going to be really hard for Mr Soulio to be able to pick these sorts of administrative errors—is that a word or a phrase I can use in this place?—because it is happening so often these days. If someone is in breach of this and they are not caught and my constituents are going to be paying through the nose, what are you going to do about that? How are you going to make sure that this is actually going to be enforced when this sort of behaviour has happened now and is happening now? While all the good intent in the world might be there, a 30-minute window is not going to be enough to let everybody understand the depth and breadth of the breaches that may take place.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I hope this assists the member.

**Ms Bedford:** I doubt it will, but have a go.

**The CHAIR:** Let's just wait and see, member for Florey.

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** No, member for Florey. You have asked the question and now we are about to hear the answer from the Attorney. We will listen to that.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Firstly, we do not have a system at the moment to enforce this and so that is exactly what we are trying to do. I appreciate the member for Florey had a different model as to how we might do that but, nevertheless, this is the model that the parliament has accepted in the other place. It will be a model.

At the moment we do not have anything, so I think you are absolutely right: our constituency does not have any protection at the moment in being able to have a reliable way to go and teach bad operators a lesson and go to the places that actually provide them with the cheapest petrol. The other thing is there is an audit process. I will read this and I hope this assists as well. In the Consumer and Business Services information, I am advised:

To assist with compliance and enforcement, Queensland also contracts with another provider who can access fuel card data. This data shows the price paid in real time transactions. The Queensland Government pays for this organisation to match this against the prices provided to the data aggregator. A report is then provided to the Government outlining any price mismatches that require investigation. A similar approach will be taken here in South Australia to assist compliance and enforcement activities undertaken by Consumer and Business Services.

I am sure that Mr Soulio will be listening with interest to this debate and he will be alerted to the fact that you are concerned about compliance. I am sure he will apply it with diligence in relation to consumer protection and enforcement, as he does in other areas. But, if there is a weakness in that

as it turns out in this two-year trial, we will be more than happy to hear from the member for Florey or her constituents.

Motion carried.

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (QUARANTINE FEES AND PENALTY) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS) (ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY) BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:14 the house adjourned until Tuesday 8 September 2020 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE**

**44 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 April 2020). As at 28 April 2020, has all of the \$350 million announced as an economic stimulus on 11 March 2020 been allocated to specific initiatives?

1. Please provide a list of the initiatives, along with an estimated cost for each initiative, that have been approved as at 28 April 2020.
2. Which initiatives that have so far been approved were already budgeted for expenditure across the state budget's forward estimates period?
3. As at 28 April 2020, how much of the \$350 million has been expended by the government, on which initiatives and what amount per initiative?

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

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 78.

**ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE**

**45 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 April 2020). What are the criteria for projects to be funded by the government's economic stimulus package, as set out in the Premier's press release of 11 March 2020?

1. What is considered to be 'as short period of time', as stated in the Premier's press release of 11 March 2020?
2. What determines whether a project is 'labour-intensive' as stated in the Premier's press release of 11 March 2020? Is there a threshold of labour cost or hours that a project must meet, or some other requirement?
3. What determines whether a project requires 'significant local purchasing of materials, services or supplies' as stated in the Premier's press release of 11 March 2020? Is there a threshold of local purchasing that a project must meet, or some other requirement?

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

Project commencement dates for measures included in the government's stimulus package will vary depending on the nature of the project. It is the case that some projects have already commenced and others will commence in the coming months as they move from the planning to implementation phase.

It is intended that projects will support employment in the state. However the extent to which this is the case will vary depending on the nature of the project. There is no specified threshold.

In terms of local purchasing requirements, all government projects are subject to the requirements of the South Australian Industry Participation Policy.

**ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE**

**46 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 April 2020). As at 28 April 2020, has all of the \$650 million announced as an additional economic stimulus been allocated to specific initiatives?

1. Please provide a list of the initiatives, along with an estimated cost for each initiative, that have been approved as at 28 April 2020.
2. Which initiatives were already budgeted for expenditure across the state budget's forward estimates period?
3. As at 28 April 2020, how much of the \$650 million has been expended by the government, on which initiatives and what amount per initiative?

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

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 79.

**BUSINESS AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND**

**47 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 April 2020). What are the criteria that an initiative is required to meet in order to qualify for funding under the \$300million Business and Jobs Support Fund?

1. Will applications to the fund be accepted?
2. How do businesses and other organisations apply to the fund?
3. Are there criteria that applications must meet to access the fund?
4. As at 28 April 2020, what initiatives have already been approved to be funded from the fund?
5. As at 28 April 2020, how much has already been expended from the fund?

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

Submissions/applications to the Business and Jobs Support Fund are being accepted. Industry groups and businesses that have been adversely impacted by COVID-19 restrictions are able to lodge a submission to the fund seeking government assistance.

To apply, businesses and organisations can email their submissions to a dedicated inbox set up for the fund: [businessandjobssupportfund@sa.gov.au](mailto:businessandjobssupportfund@sa.gov.au).

The top priority for the Business and Jobs Support Fund is the ongoing survival of entities and minimising job losses. There are no fixed criteria for submissions.

Where possible, businesses are encouraged to work with their representative bodies and associations to provide submissions that represent the needs of the industry as a whole. This enables the government to consider how it can provide tailored support that is consistent across their sector.

Where it is not possible for businesses and organisations to work with a representative body that covers their sector, they have been asked to provide the following information:

- Information on how the current restrictions are affecting their operation and the steps taken to minimise the impact.
- Information on how existing commonwealth and state support packages already announced assist their operations (eg JobKeeper, Boosting Cashflow for Employers Program).
- Details on specific issues they are concerned about or areas where assistance is being sought.
- Detailed cashflow projections that take account and identify actions an organisation has undertaken to protect their immediate solvency, as well as factoring in any additional financial support an organisation is likely to receive.

The government has provided a response to parts (d) and (e) of this question in Question on Notice 80.

#### **COMMUNITY AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND**

**48 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 April 2020). What are the criteria that an initiative is required to meet in order to qualify for funding under the \$250 million Community and Jobs Support fund?

1. Will applications to the fund be accepted?
2. How do businesses and other organisations apply to the fund?
3. Are there criteria that applications must meet to access the fund?
4. As at 28 April 2020, what initiatives have already been approved to be funded from the fund?
5. As at 28 April 2020, how much has already been expended from the fund?

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

Submissions/applications to the Community and Jobs Support Fund are being accepted. Industry representative groups and organisations that have been adversely impacted by COVID-19 restrictions are able to lodge a submission to the fund seeking government assistance.

To apply, organisations can email their submissions to a dedicated inbox set up for the fund: [communityandjobssupportfund@sa.gov.au](mailto:communityandjobssupportfund@sa.gov.au).

The top priority for the Community and Jobs Support Fund is the ongoing survival of entities and minimising job losses. There is no fixed criteria for submissions.

Where possible, organisations are encouraged to work with their representative bodies and associations to provide submissions that represent the needs of the industry/sector as a whole. This enables the government to consider how it can provide tailored support that is consistent across the sectors.

Where it is not possible for organisations to work with a representative body that covers their sector, they have been asked to provide the following information:

- Information on how the current restrictions are affecting an organisations operation and the steps taken to minimise the impact on the organisation.
- Information on how existing commonwealth and state support packages already announced assist the operations of the organisation (eg JobKeeper, Boosting Cashflow for Employers Program).
- Details on specific issues that the organisation is concerned about or areas where assistance is being sought.
- Detailed cashflow projections to at least 30 June 2020 that take account and identify actions an organisation has undertaken to protect their immediate solvency, as well as factoring in any additional financial support an organisation is likely to receive.

The government has provided a response to parts (d) and (e) of this question in Question on Notice 81.

#### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

**53 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (13 May 2020). As at the close of business Friday 8 May, how much of the \$650 million allocated as part of the state government's economic stimulus package has been expended, and on which initiatives?

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

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 79.

#### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

**54 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (13 May 2020). As at the close of business Friday 8 May, how much of the \$350 million allocated as part of the state government's economic stimulus package has been expended, and on which initiatives?

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

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 78.

#### TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

**63 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (13 May 2020). How many targeted voluntary separation packages have been accepted across the public sector since 19 March 2018?

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

Information on TVSPs is based on data collected from agencies by the Department of Treasury and Finance.

For 2017-18, agencies advised that a total of 436.7 FTEs accepted a TVSP at a cost of \$37.6 million. Unless otherwise approved by the government, in 2017-18 agencies were responsible for managing costs associated with TVSPs. Detailed information on TVSPs funded by agencies during the year was not collected by Treasury and Finance and as such the additional information requested, including date of separation and position title, is not readily available. The only exceptions related to TVSPs associated with the previous government's transforming health initiative and rationalisation of the TAFE structure which were centrally funded. Of these 260 TVSPs (212 FTE) were paid during 2017-18, with 3 (2.8 FTE) being in the period 19 March to 30 June at a cost of \$257,988.

In 2018-19, 1,554 TVSPs were accepted representing 1,431.2 FTEs for a total TVSP cost of \$128,421,059.03.

In the 2019-20 financial year to 30 April 2020, 703 TVSPs have been accepted representing 617.2 FTEs for a total TVSP cost of \$57,980,202.26.

Details of the agency, number of positions and total TVSP cost for 2018-19 and 2019-20 are provided in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

Table 1: 2018-19 TVSPs by Agency

	Totals by Agency		
	Headcount	FTEs	\$
General Government Sector			
Arts SA	20	16.9	1,835,694.57
Art Gallery Board	3	3.0	265,573.80
Attorney-General's Department	105	93.8	8,914,753.37
Carrick Hill Trust	1	1.0	35,195.20
Child Protection	62	56.9	4,683,592.58
Correctional Services	135	130.8	9,117,556.98
Courts Administration Authority	17	14.5	1,201,959.17
Education	145	134.6	12,703,427.66
Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board	1	1.0	61,564.00
Energy and Mining	29	25.8	2,612,812.97
Environment and Water	119	108.2	9,995,056.59
Environmental Protection Authority	24	21.3	2,051,891.61
Green Industries	1	1.0	101,763.56
Health and Wellbeing	16	15.1	1,713,093.23
Human Services	340	309.0	27,007,646.22

	Totals by Agency		
	Headcount	FTEs	\$
Innovation and Skills	56	51.5	5,314,982.51
Libraries Board of South Australia	1	1.0	95,306.72
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	1	0.8	82,815.54
Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment	5	4.0	430,057.00
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	73	72.1	6,730,730.61
Premier and Cabinet	19	18.8	1,683,578.49
Primary Industries and Regions	50	47.5	4,500,910.33
South Australia Police	21	19.0	1,368,764.36
TAFE SA	99	83.4	7,506,869.89
Tourism	2	2.0	198,448.56
Trade and Innovation	21	20.4	2,055,178.22
Treasury and Finance	89	83.9	8,102,943.08
<b>Public Non-Financial Corporations</b>			
Public Trustee	4	3.6	311,069.23
South Australian Housing Authority	94	89.5	7,659,858.04
Urban Renewal Authority	1	0.8	77,964.94
<b>Total Payments to Employees (Excluding Accrued Leave)</b>	<b>1554</b>	<b>1431.2</b>	<b>128,421,059.03</b>

Table 2: 2019-20 TVSPs by Agency (to 30 April) 2020

	Totals by Agency		
	Headcount	FTEs	\$
<b>General Government Sector</b>			
Arts SA	3	3.0	303,160.76
Art Gallery Board	1	1.0	111,378.36
Attorney-General's Department	19	17.5	1,858,912.63
Human Services	121	102.5	9,287,859.18
Child Protection	37	34.3	3,161,984.50
Correctional Services	87	85.7	5,871,885.78
Courts Administration Authority	2	2.0	174,288.62
Education	22	21.2	2,160,394.07
Environment and Water	11	10.4	853,559.37
Innovation and Skills	24	22.4	2,341,119.29
Health and Wellbeing	181	148.3	16,286,684.05
Libraries Board of South Australia	3	2.1	231,824.96
Trade and Investment	10	9.7	1,093,926.40
Energy and Mining	1	1.0	158,327.76
Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment	2	2.0	91,820.46
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	1	1.0	103,182.12
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	33	31.3	2,821,315.27
Premier and Cabinet	4	3.5	596,780.25
Primary Industries and Regions	4	3.4	368,937.28
South Australian Museum Board	3	3.0	232,934.50
State Governor's Establishment	1	0.9	52,382.15
South Australia Police	8	7.8	484,046.34
TAFE SA	113	92.2	8,334,795.60
Tourism	3	2.2	206,971.37
Treasury and Finance	6	5.8	529,296.73



		Totals by Agency		
		Headcount	FTEs	\$
Public Non-Financial Corporations				
	South Australian Housing Authority	2	2.0	159,057.86
	Urban Renewal Authority	1	1.0	103,376.60
Total Payments to Employees (Excluding Accrued Leave)		703	617.2	57,980,202.26

#### TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

**64 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (13 May 2020). How many targeted voluntary separation packages have been accepted across the public sector in the 2019-20 financial year so far?

(a) What is the total estimated cost of targeted voluntary separation packages accepted in the 2019-20 financial year so far?

(b) What is the department or agency, position title, and total employment cost of each position in which a TVSP offer was accepted?

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

The government has provided a response in Question on Notice 63.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

**69 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (13 May 2020). What is the number of ministerial advisers funded for each minister in the government as at 12 May 2020?

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

The number of ministerial advisers<sup>1</sup> funded for each minister in the government, as at 12 May 2020, was:

Minister	Ministerial Advisers (FTE)
The Hon. S Marshall	23
The Hon. VA Chapman	4
The Hon. RI Lucas	5
The Hon. JAW Gardner	5
The Hon. DW Ridgway	4
The Hon. JMA Lensink	4
The Hon. DG Pisoni	4
The Hon. SG Wade	8
The Hon. DC Van Holst Pellekaan	3
The Hon. R Sanderson	4
The Hon. TJ Whetstone	4
The Hon. CL Wingard	4
The Hon. DJ Speirs	4
The Hon. SK Knoll	6
Total Ministerial Advisers	82

<sup>1</sup>Ministerial advisers includes any ministerial appointments such as chief of staff, media advisers etc.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

**70 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (13 May 2020). What is the total employment cost for each ministerial adviser funded for each minister as at 12 May 2020?

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

The salary and total annual employment cost for each ministerial staff member employed under Section 71 of the Public Sector Act 2009 as at 5 July 2019 was provided in the *Government Gazette*, dated 18 July 2019. The gazette also outlined the additional entitlements of section 71 ministerial staff.

Section 71 ministerial staff received an annual remuneration adjustment of 2 per cent per annum operative from the first full pay period commencing on or after 1 July 2019.

In addition to their salary, ministerial staff receive superannuation which is 9.5 per cent of their annual salary. Section 71 ministerial staff are also entitled to the same recreation leave, personal leave, maternity leave, paternity leave, long service leave, retention leave and special leave as persons employed in the South Australian Public Service, but are not entitled to any recreation leave loading.

#### MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE

**71 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (13 May 2020). As at 12 May 2020 what is the ministerial office budget for 2019-20 for each minister?

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

The ministerial office budget for 2019-20 for each minister, as at 12 May 2020, is provided in the following table.

Ministerial Office Resources – 2019-20 Budget	
Minister	(\$'000)
The Hon. S Marshall	7,447
The Hon. VA Chapman	2,560
The Hon. RI Lucas	2,492
The Hon. JAW Gardner	2,160
The Hon. DW Ridgway	2,240
The Hon. JMA Lensink	2,321
The Hon. DG Pisoni	2,259
The Hon. SG Wade	2,821
The Hon. DC Van Holst Pellekaan	1,988
The Hon. R Sanderson	2,265
The Hon. TJ Whetstone	2,197
The Hon. CL Wingard	2,263
The Hon. DJ Speirs	2,211
The Hon. SK Knoll	2,488
Total Ministerial Office Resources	37,712

#### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

**78 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (3 June 2020). As at 3 June 2020, has all of the \$350 million announced as an economic stimulus on 11 March 2020 been allocated to specific initiatives?

(a) Please provide a list of the initiatives, along with an estimated cost for each initiative, that have been approved as at 3 June 2020?

(b) Which initiatives that have so far been approved were already budgeted for expenditure across the state budget's forward estimates period?

(c) As at 3 June 2020, how much of the \$350 million has been expended by the government, on which initiatives and what amount per initiative?

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

(a) The attached table lists for each initiative, the amount estimated to be spent as at 30 June 2020, which is still subject to year-end audit processes, and an estimated profile of the remaining cost.

(b) Around \$40 million relates to projects brought forward from future years (\$38 million from the period up to 2023-24 and \$2 million that would otherwise have been spent in 2024-25). This includes the \$15 million for country hospital upgrades and \$10 million in social housing maintenance. In addition, \$15 million was brought forward from the Planning and Development Fund as part of the government's commitment to work with local councils to deliver \$50 million of shovel ready projects to support local jobs.

(c) This is included in the response to part (a).

First Stimulus Package	Estimated expenditure to	Estimated cost profile from 2020-21				Total
		30 June 2020	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
(\$'000s)						
Bushfire response and recovery	-1 312	-19 894	-7 080	-1 011	- 333	-29 630

First Stimulus Package (\$000s)	Estimated expenditure to 30 June 2020	Estimated cost profile from 2020-21				Total
		2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	
Accelerate Nature-based Tourism Investment	- 47	-9 000	-5 953	—	—	-15 000
Roads Infrastructure and Safety Stimulus Package	-7 330	-102 500	-34 670	—	—	-144 500
Economic and Business Growth Fund	—	-10 000	-10 000	-25 000	-25 000	-70 000
Planning and Development Fund (bringforward)	-15 000	—	—	—	—	-15 000
Acceleration of country health sustainment works (bringforward)	—	-15 000	—	—	—	-15 000
Social Housing maintenance (bringforward)	-6 021	-3 979	—	—	—	-10 000
Grassroots sports program	-5 000	—	—	—	—	-5 000
Flinders Chase Kangaroo Island rebuild (estimate only)	-1 346	-43 654	—	—	—	-45 000
	-36 056	-204 027	-57 703	-26 011	-25 333	-349 130

### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

**79 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (3 June 2020). As at 3 June 2020, has all of the \$650 million announced as an additional economic stimulus been allocated to specific initiatives?

(a) Please provide a list of the initiatives, along with an estimated cost for each initiative, that have been approved as at 3 June 2020?

(b) Which initiatives were already budgeted for expenditure across the state budget's forward estimates period?

(c) As at 3 June 2020, how much of the \$650 million has been expended by the government, on which initiatives and what amount per initiative?

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

The attached table provides detail on the \$650 million Jobs Rescue Package.

While numbers are still subject to year-end audit processes, it is estimated that as at 30 June 2020, around \$256 million had been expended from the \$650 million Jobs Rescue Package.

With relevant agencies administering some relief measures, support under the Business and Jobs Support Fund and Community and Jobs Support Fund may be reimbursed in arrears. DTF does not record actual expenditure of all agencies for all initiatives approved from the funds on a daily basis. In addition, \$180 million of funding for non-government schools has been brought forward and paid in 2019-20.

Two initiatives outlined in the table were budgeted for across the forward estimates. These are reflected in the table below.

- The bring-forward of the 2020-21 Cost of Living Concession for households who are receiving the Centrelink JobSeeker Payment;
- The Jobs Accelerator Grant funding was already provisioned for in 2019-20. The expenditure is to recognise the ongoing payment of Job Accelerator Grants to grant recipients during COVID-19 pandemic restrictions, irrespective of whether an eligible employee was stood-down or released. It has been assumed that the cost of the Job Accelerator Grant Scheme would have reduced significantly in the event that the continuous employment criteria was upheld during COVID-19.

A number of approvals for organisations made from the Business and Community Jobs Support Funds focused on the immediate needs of those organisations to 30 June 2020. These and other organisations are able to seek further assistance in 2020-21 if required, with the government recognising that the easing of restrictions will impact businesses and community organisations differently. There is capacity in these funds to provide that support in 2020-21 if required.

Second Stimulus Package (\$000s)	Estimated expenditure to 30 June 2020	estimated cost 2020-21	Total
Second Stimulus package			
Payroll tax relief	-21 970 (a)	-40 030	-62 000
Land tax package (b)	—	-15 000	-15 000

Second Stimulus Package (\$000s)	Estimated expenditure to 30 June 2020	estimated cost 2020-21	Total
Waiver of liquor licence fees for 2020-21	-4 856	—	-4 856
Business and Jobs Support Fund	-183 506	-186 494	-370 000 (c)
Community and Jobs Support Fund	-33 013	-146 987	-180 000 (c)
Cost of Living Concession	-12 596	-14 904	-27 500
Access of accrued leave for public servants	n.a	Net debt impact only (impact dependant on take-up)	
Job Accelerator grants	n.a (d)	-3 000	-3 000
Business Advisory Group	- 51	- 159	- 210
	-255 992	-406 574	-662 566

(a) Businesses are not required to lodge their annual payroll tax returns until 14 August 2020, which may impact the total amount of relief expenditure recognised in 2019-20.

(b) Provides for an increase in relief under the land tax transition fund to eligible taxpayers whose land tax bill will increase as a result of the changes in aggregation of land ownerships commencing from 1 July 2020, and a deferral of outstanding 2019-20 land tax liabilities for up to six months. The estimated \$50 million cost of the 25 per cent waiver of 2019-20 land tax liabilities for properties leased to eligible tenants that have been significantly impacted by COVID-19 is funded from the Business and Jobs Support Fund.

(c) \$70 million of budget has been transferred from the Community and Jobs Support Fund to the Business and Jobs Support Fund.

(d) Relaxation of existing Job Accelerator Grant criteria. \$3 million budget is to recognise the ongoing payment of Job Accelerator Grants to grant recipients during COVID-19 pandemic restrictions, irrespective of whether an eligible employee was stood-down or released. It has been assumed that the cost of the Job Accelerator Grant Scheme would have reduced significantly in the event that the continuous employment criteria was upheld during COVID-19.

#### BUSINESS AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND

**80 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (3 June 2020). As at 3 June 2020, what initiatives have already been approved to be funded from the \$300 million business and jobs support fund?

(a) How much has been allocated to each initiative?

(b) As at 3 June 2020, how much has already been expended from the fund?

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

As part of the government's second economic stimulus package valued at \$650 million, \$550 million was allocated to two new funds (business and jobs support fund and community and jobs support fund) established to support business, jobs and community organisations.

Initiatives with an estimated total value of around \$265 million have been allocated against the business and jobs support fund. These are estimates only and the final cost of some measures may vary.

#### Business and Jobs Support Fund

Business	Total \$'000
Budget (a)	370,000
Less:	
Small Business Grants (\$10,000)	184,000
Land Tax Relief for Landlords and Tenants	50,000
\$4,300 to the Operators of SA's Licenced Taxis	4,900
Waive Full Year Operator Fees for all Taxi Operators for 2020-21	300
Rent Relief for Commercial Tenants of Government Agencies	4,500
6 Month Rent Relief Crown Land Leased Tourism Properties	805
6 Month Waiver Commercial Tour Operator Fees	46
Other various nominal allocations (b)	20,675
Total	265,226
Remaining Balance	104,774

(a) Originally \$300 million was budgeted for this fund, and \$250 million for the community and jobs support fund. Based on experience since the funds were established, \$70 million of budget has been transferred from the community to the business fund.

(b) Includes provisions for rent relief for commercial tenants of government agencies, and support for regional airline and bus operations.

While numbers are still subject to year-end audit processes, it is estimated that as at 30 June 2020, \$184 million had been expended from the fund.

A number of approvals for organisations made from the business and community jobs support funds focused on the immediate needs of those organisations to 30 June 2020. These and other organisations are able to seek further assistance in 2020-21 if required, with the government recognising that the easing of restrictions will impact businesses and community organisations differently. There is capacity in these funds to provide that support in 2020-21 if required.

#### COMMUNITY AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND

**81 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (3 June 2020). As at 3 June 2020, what initiatives have already been approved to be funded from the \$250 million Community and Jobs Support Fund?

- (a) How much has been allocated to each initiative?  
 (b) As at 3 June 2020, how much has already been expended from the fund?

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

As part of the government's second economic stimulus package valued at \$650 million, \$550 million was allocated to two new funds (Business and Jobs Support Fund and Community and Jobs Support Fund) established to support business, jobs and community organisations.

Initiatives with an estimated total value of around \$134 million had been allocated against the Community and Jobs Support Fund. These are estimates only and the final cost of some measures may vary.

Community and Jobs Support Fund

	Total \$'000
Budget (a)	180,000
Less:	
Small Business Grants (\$10,000)	9,000
Residential Rent Relief \$1000 grants	10,000
International Students—Matching Grant Program Funding to Universities	10,000
International Students—\$500 Emergency Cash Grant to Non-Uni Students	3,600
International Students—\$200 Homestay Payment	252
Sporting Clubs—Water and Sewerage Grant Program	2,200
Ex-Gratia Relief of \$1.0 Million To SMA	1,000
LGA—South Australian Council Owned Childcare Services	700
Football Federation South Australia	490
Other various nominal allocations (b)	96,948
Total	134,190
Remaining Balance	45,810

(a) Originally \$250 million was budgeted for this fund, and \$300 million for the Business and Jobs Support Fund. Based on experience since the funds were established, \$70 million of budget has been transferred from the Community to the Business Fund.

(b) Includes provisions for support for various sporting associations, assistance to SAHA for Homelessness, Return to Country and Street to Home schemes, and various other initiatives which have been agreed in principle but are not yet announced.

While numbers are still subject to year-end audit processes, as at 30 June 2020, around \$33 million had been expended from the fund.

A number of approvals for organisations made from the Business and Community Jobs Support Funds focused on the immediate needs of those organisations to 30 June 2020. These and other organisations are able to seek further assistance in 2020-21 if required, with the government recognising that the easing of restrictions will impact businesses and community organisations differently. There is capacity in these funds to provide that support in 2020-21 if required.

#### LAND TAX

**83 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (3 June 2020). How many property owners are estimated to have increased land tax liabilities in 2020-21 as a result of the government's new aggregation measures?

(a) How many letters were sent to property owners requesting they update their details with RevenueSA?

- (b) What was the cost of these letters being sent out?  
 (c) How much was spent on other preparations for this mail-out campaign?

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

As a result of the total land tax reforms introduced by the government, it is estimated that around 92 per cent of individuals (47,800) and 75 per cent (7,900) of company groups will pay less tax.

As at 24 June 2020, 366,019 letters were sent to land owners. The correspondence requests land owners provide updated information if required on their land holdings to ensure property details, including trusts, are appropriately recorded on RevenueSA's system. The cost of the letters being sent out is around \$439,600.

The 2019-20 budget included additional funding for RevenueSA to implement the necessary changes and assist taxpayers transition to the new land tax arrangements. This included funding for printing and mail outs to taxpayers.

#### LOBBYISTS

**89 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). Since 30 June 2019, which lobbyists (listed on the Register of Lobbyists) had contact with the Treasurer or a member of the Treasurer's staff?

1. For those occasions when the minister or a member of his staff had face-to-face meetings with the lobbyists
- (a) What is the name of the lobbyist?  
 (b) What was the date of the meeting(s)?  
 (c) What is the name of the third party for whom the lobbyist has provided paid or unpaid services?  
 (d) What was the nature of that third party's issue?

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

The responsibility for reporting this information rests with lobbyists registered under the Lobbyists Act 2015 (the Act). The information is reported by lobbyists annually as required by section 8 of the act and published on Department of the Premier and Cabinet's website.

#### FEES AND CHARGES

**92 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). Can the Treasurer detail the increase to fees and charges in 2020-21 by each individual fee and charge?

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

The 2020-21 fees and charges were published in the *Government Gazette* and tabled in both houses of parliament on 16 June 2020.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

**101 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). As 1 June 2020, how many public sector FTE positions were funded in Simpler Regulation Unit branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

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

The Simpler Regulation Unit of DTF no longer exists. The staff and budget of the Simpler Regulation Unit were transferred from DTF to DPC to help establish the South Australia Productivity Commission as part of the machinery of government changes in 2018-19.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

**105 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). As at 1 June 2020, how many total public-sector FTE positions were funded in the Office of the Valuer General branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

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

1. As at 1 June 2020, the Office of the Valuer-General section within the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has 21 funded public sector positions (excluding the Valuer-General). This is made up of 15 ongoing salaried positions, and six temporary-term project based positions.

2. The classification level of the 21 funded FTE are:

Classification	Ongoing	Temporary-Term
PO-5	1	

Classification	Ongoing	Temporary-Term
PO-4	2	
PO-3	5	1
PO-2	1	2
ASO-7		1
ASO-6	1	1
ASO-5	3	
ASO-4	1	1
ASO-3	1	
Total	15	6

#### JOB ACCELERATOR GRANT

**110 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). How much of the budgeted funds for the Job Accelerator Grant remains unspent as at 1 June 2020?

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

The Job Accelerator Grant is closed to new applications, but businesses that hired eligible employees between 1 July 2016 and 30 June 2018 are still able to submit claims under the program. At 1 June 2020, the Job Accelerator Grant program had a remaining budget of around \$6 million.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**116 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

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

1. The government provided a response to this question in 2019 Question on Notice 803, which was tabled in parliament on 6 June 2019.

2. The below capital works projects as at the 2019-20 budget, include expenditure budgeted over the associated forward estimates relevant to this question and questions with notice 118-129 and 131.

South Australian Government Capital Program with Budgeted Expenditure in 2019-20 as at the 2019-20 Budget (\$000s)

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Premier					
	Premier and Cabinet				
	Major Project				
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—AFC Upgrade	1,700	3,600	—	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—AFC Technical Equipment	2,326	—	—	—
	Arts Storage	1,612	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	1,390	882	904	927
	Capital Investment Program—Arts SA	848	743	762	780
	Government Information and Communication Technology Services	6,362	6,625	6,791	6,960
	Annual Program—DPC	2,027	1,997	2,047	2,098
	State Governor's Establishment	128	131	134	137
	Adelaide Festival Centre Trust				
	Major Project				
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Technical Equipment	2,247	—	—	—

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Premier					
	Her Majesty's Theatre Redevelopment	6,666	—	—	—
	Tourism				
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	649	702	720	738

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Attorney-General					
Attorney-General					
	Major Project				
	SA Computer Aided Dispatch System	3,516	—	—	—
	SA Government Radio Network	18,482	—	—	—
	Ombudsman SA office accommodation—fit out	1,200	—	—	—
	GPO Tower – 10 Franklin Street—office fit out	26,608	—	—	—
	Liquor Licensing full fee structure	60	—	—	—
	Response Unit for the Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety	150	—	—	—
	Forensic Science SA—CT Scanner	2,050	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	655	1,486	1,523	1,561
	State and Public Safety Communications Infrastructure	244	250	256	262
Courts					
	Major Project				
	Electronic Court Management System	4,686	3,509	—	—
	Higher Courts Redevelopment	20,585	—	—	—
	Judge View	591	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,177	2,249	2,323	2,399
Electoral Commission					
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	51	52	148	100
Public Trustee					
	Annual Program				
	Hardware	60	550	75	80
	Machines and Equipment	28	46	—	—
	Furniture and Fittings	54	56	57	60
	Software	174	123	154	130

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Treasurer					
Treasury and Finance					
	Major Project				



Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Treasurer					
	RevenueSA—Revenue Information Online (RIO) Land Tax system update	2,623	875	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,532	1,639	1,679	1,721
	Revenue Information Online system (RIO)	3,479	337	345	354
Lotteries Commission of SA					
	Annual Program				
	Minor Works—Plant and Equipment	10	10	10	10

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Education					
Education					
	Major Project				
	Sustainable enrolment growth and Other School projects				
	Aberfoyle Park High School	1,670	4,991	2,942	203
	Adelaide High School	1,144	9,302	7,502	—
	Brighton Secondary School	936	7,139	5,716	—
	Charles Campbell College	4,794	6,008	—	—
	Craigmore High School	1,488	5,580	4,141	674
	Fregon Anangu School	5,000	8,300	2,200	100
	Gawler and District College B-12	1,613	4,880	3,049	271
	Glenunga International High School	1,812	15,025	12,127	122
	Glossop High School Redevelopment	3,500	10,000	3,462	120
	Golden Grove High School	2,140	5,160	4,147	300
	Hallett Cove School	1,706	5,020	2,874	206
	Henley High School	2,236	5,501	3,521	565
	John Pirie Secondary School	1,700	5,000	2,900	200
	Kapunda High School	3,091	5,606	4,666	1,480
	Murray Bridge High School	5,700	9,700	4,300	200
	Norwood Morialta High School	3,398	12,289	20,099	3,866
	Parafield Gardens High School	1,700	5,000	2,900	200
	Paralowie School	3,968	4,049	3,396	—
	Port Lincoln High School	1,138	5,257	8,016	553
	Reynella East College	1,690	4,997	2,914	201
	Salisbury High School	1,663	4,989	2,952	204
	Seaton High School	5,628	8,818	4,809	703
	The Heights School	1,670	4,991	2,942	203
	Underdale High School	5,700	9,700	4,300	200
	Unley High School	9,016	14,507	7,834	1,054
	Urrbrae Agricultural High School	1,668	4,989	2,945	204
	Wirreanda Secondary School	2,347	5,484	3,030	—

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Education					
	Woodville High School	1,655	4,952	2,973	227
	Other School Projects	51,509	170,544	104,839	17,431
	Other investment Projects				
	Children's Centres—Stage 2	500	1,240	—	—
	National Quality Agenda—Compliance	2,300	—	—	—
	Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics Facilities in Schools (STEM)	6,422	—	—	—
	Whyalla Secondary Education Renewal	17,000	60,000	22,000	—
	Small Projects	18,082	—	—	—
	SACE Modernisation	1,781	1,460	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Capital Works Assistance Scheme	3,004	3,081	3,517	3,605
	Major Feasibility Studies	494	506	519	532
	Purchase of Land and Property	1,241	1,272	1,304	1,337
	School Bus Replacement	1,240	1,271	1,303	1,336
	SACE Board	121	124	127	130
	Emergency Repairs—Investing	225	—	—	—
TAFE SA					
	Major Project				
	Purchase of TAFE Sites	619,293	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Purchase of Plant and Equipment—TAFE SA	1,583	1,714	1,757	1,801
	IT Systems and Infrastructure—TAFE SA	970	1,051	1,077	1,104
	Campus Maintenance	7,101	8,436	8,649	8,866

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Trade and Investment					
Adelaide Venue Management Corporation					
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	7,000	7,175	7,354	7,538

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Human Services					
Human Services					
	Major Project				
	Riverside Building—Office fitout	5,381	3,458	3,161	—
	Annual Program				
	Adelaide Youth Training Centre—Sustainment	522	535	548	562
	Equipment Services	1,249	1,280	1,312	1,345
South Australian Housing Authority					
	Major Project				

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Human Services					
	Remote Indigenous Housing	17,709	6,982	7,157	7,338
	Playford North Urban Renewal	9,285	8,474	6,737	7,055
	Minor Projects—SAHT	3,391	3,240	3,240	3,240
	Better Neighbourhoods Program	43,516	14,377	15,000	15,000
	Land Development at Sheffield Crescent, Blair Athol	289	—	—	—
	Public Housing Stimulus	1,403	—	—	—
	Economic Stimulus—construction of social housing	13,678	—	—	—
	Morphettville Neighbourhood Renewal Project	6,372	11,759	—	—
	Business Systems Transformation	12,881	9,272	—	—
	Pleasant Avenue Apartments, South Plympton	5,500	3,456	—	—
	Domestic Violence Package – Forty new crisis accommodation rooms	2,000	—	—	—
	Housing Stimulus Package – Preventative maintenance and upgrade	21,118	—	—	—
	Housing Stimulus Package – affordable housing construction	17,139	4,285	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Public Housing Capital Maintenance	13,550	13,550	13,550	13,550
	Aboriginal Housing Capital Program	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
	Public Housing Construction and Acquisition	6,241	6,000	6,000	6,000
	SAHT Management Capital	2,401	3,350	3,400	3,450
	Community Housing Capital Program	2,792	6,000	6,000	6,000

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Innovation and Skills					
Innovation and Skills					
	Annual Program				
	Annual Investing Programs	7,389	6,289	6,444	6,604
	IT Systems and Infrastructure	940	975	1,001	1,025

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Health and Wellbeing					
Health and Wellbeing					
	Major Project				
	New Women's and Children's Hospital	10,000	12,000	130,000	400,000
	Upgrade to existing Women's and Children's Hospital	23,000	20,100	3,809	—
	Flinders Medical Centre—Neonatal Unit	819	—	—	—
	SA Health Supply Distribution Centre	7,320	—	—	—
	Flinders Medical Centre Redevelopment	100	—	—	—
	Modbury Hospital Redevelopment	6,210	—	—	—
	Lyell McEwin Hospital Redevelopment	71	—	—	—

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Health and Wellbeing					
	Lyell McEwin Hospital Emergency Department Expansion	12,000	26,842	14,500	—
	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment Stage 3	63,158	91,700	85,080	2,052
	SA Pathology consolidation into Frome Rd	14,073	—	—	—
	Country Health SA Sustainment and Compliance	15,960	14,200	14,000	14,000
	Modbury Hospital—Upgrades and Additional Services	31,791	39,668	18,000	—
	SAAS Headquarters Internal Fitout	1,380	—	—	—
	Mount Gambier Renal Dialysis	1,650	—	—	—
	Yorketown Surgical Services	100	—	—	—
	Lighthouse Lodge Kingston—Safety Upgrades	600	—	—	—
	Murray Bridge Emergency Department	4,000	3,250	—	—
	Strathalbyn Aged Care	10,500	2,100	—	—
	Enterprise Cancer Prescribing System	9,512	4,000	5,034	—
	Real Time Monitoring of Prescription Medicine	4,000	—	—	—
	SAAS Volunteer Training Infrastructure	871	—	—	—
	Repatriation Health Precinct Reactivation	26,075	20,000	21,000	2,000
	Annual Program				
	SA Ambulance Service—Medical Equipment Replacement	3,002	3,077	3,154	3,233
	SA Ambulance Service—Vehicle Replacement	9,003	6,399	6,559	6,723
	Hospitals and Health Units—Minor Works	14,058	17,548	16,645	20,736
	Bio-Medical Equipment	17,674	18,166	18,153	21,187
	SA Ambulance Service—Plant and Equipment	948	972	996	1,021
	Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Capital Grants	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
	Volunteer Ambulance Stations	3,160	2,624	2,690	2,757
	Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Other	81	—	—	—

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Energy and Mining					
Energy and Mining					
	Major Project				
	Remote Area Energy Supply – Future Sustainability	2,403	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	RAES scheme power generation and distribution equipment	1,873	1,942	1,992	2,042
	Minerals Asset Upgrade and Replacement	191	250	255	262

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Child Protection					
Child Protection					
	Major Project				

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Child Protection					
	Residential Care Facilities	2,252	—	—	—
	Leasehold, ICT Equipment and Furniture	1,318	—	—	—

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Primary Industries and Regional Development					
Primary Industries and Regions					
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	5,429	5,657	5,534	5,647
Forestry SA					
	Annual Program		260	—	—
	Plant and Equipment, Roadworks	195	—	—	—
	Annual Program Forestry SA	65	—	—	—

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Police, Emergency Services and Corrections					
Correctional Services					
	Major Project				
	Adelaide Women's Prison- Additional Prisoner Accommodation – 40 beds and Infrastructure Upgrade	3,800	—	—	—
	Adelaide Remand Centre—Cell Upgrade	3,200	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,812	3,044	3,120	3,198
Emergency Services—CFS					
	Major Project				
	Station Upgrades	2,500	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—CFS	15,593	15,983	16,383	16,793
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—CFS	1,882	1,929	1,977	2,026
Emergency Services—MFS					
	Annual Program				
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—MFS	6,117	9,551	7,996	8,196
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—MFS	221	227	233	238
Emergency Services—SAFECOM					
	Major Project				
	Alert SA Replacement	144	147	151	155
Emergency Services—SES					
	Annual Program				
	Capital Works, Vehicles, Vessels and Rescue Equipment—SES	4,341	4,443	4,548	4,656
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—SES	427	438	449	460

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Police, Emergency Services and Corrections					
Police					
	Major Project				
	Hi-tech Crime Fighting Equipment	200	—	—	—
	Police Records Management System—Stages 2 to 4	4,153	—	—	—
	Crime Tracking App	214	—	—	—
	Data Entry Devices	547	—	—	—
	Continuous Monitoring of Screening	414	—	—	—
	Umuwa Police Station—Multi Agency Facility	1,712	856	—	—
	Firearms Control System	3,903	968	—	—
	Expiation Notice Branch System Replacement	579	2,653	2,595	1,898
	Fitout for Angas Street HQ	1,000	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment	9,496	10,360	10,621	11,654
Sport, Recreation and Racing					
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing					
	Major Projects				
	Womens Memorial Playing Fields	4,000	—	—	—
	Adelaide Superdrome Upgrades	4,100	—	—	—
	Home of Football at State Sports Park	10,000	4,000	—	—
	Annual Programs				
	Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	1,334	1,183	1,213	1,243

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Environment and Water					
Environment and Water					
	Major Project				
	South Australian Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure Program (SARFIIP)	57,447	—	—	—
	Monarto Land	293	—	—	—
	Glenthorne National Park	3,200	3,200	1,600	—
	Waterfall Gully Summit Trail	2,030	—	—	—
	Opening Up SA's Reservoirs	4,000	—	—	—
	Water Management Solutions	4,200	800	—	—
	Flows for the Future	1,056	—	—	—
	Great Southern Ocean Walk	228	2,558	2,214	1,000
	Park renewal investment	200	938	1,162	1,000
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	4,815	5,885	6,008	5,141
	Water Monitoring Equipment	2,030	2,086	2,143	2,196
	Fire Management on Public Land—Enhanced Capabilities	1,057	1,086	1,116	1,144

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Environment and Water					
	South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board	484	496	509	522
	Adelaide & Mt Lofty Ranges NRMB	150	—	—	—
Environment Protection Authority					
	Major Project				
	Material flow and levy information system	1,239	100	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	576	623	639	655
SA Water					
	Major Project				
	North Lefevre Peninsula Waste Water Diversion	336	—	—	—
	Aldinga Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade Stage 2	69	—	—	—
	Warooka and Point Turton Water Supply Upgrade	12	—	—	—
	Kangaroo Creek Dam Safety	16,229	—	—	—
	Tailem Bend Keith Pipeline Coomandook Tank Additional Storage	26	—	—	—
	Mount Bold Dam Safety	1,296	22,823	23,394	23,978
	Purchase water entitlements to the minister and the River Murray	900	—	—	—
	Mt Barker Development Water Supply Scheme—Stage 1	60	950	950	950
	Murray Bridge Wastewater Treatment Plant Relocation	12,131	105	179	220
	Hahndorf Wastewater Treatment Plant Inlet Screen Upgrade	55	—	—	—
	Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant	12,450	284	485	—
	Orroroo Water Quality Improvement	50	—	—	—
	Hope Valley EL170 Tank Structure Renewal	50	—	—	—
	Myponga Trunk Main	1,452	—	—	—
	Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Upgrade	50	3,717	6,349	7,810
	Bolivar ASR SCADA Controls Upgrade Stage 2	627	—	—	—
	Baroota Dam Safety	2,929	—	—	—
	Bolivar Dissolved Air Floated Filtration Plant Controls Upgrade	1,911	—	—	—
	Northern Connector Project	274	—	—	—
	Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme	49,597	1,000	912	—
	Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant Clarifier Upgrade	5,693	—	—	—
	Zero Cost Energy Future	289,179	52,076	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Water Quality Management	12,333	13,432	13,724	14,066
	Environmental Improvement	6,017	18,000	13,464	13,268
	Information Technology	34,404	40,670	34,856	34,856
	Safety	25,832	27,692	28,311	29,020
	Mechanical and Electrical Renewal	21,913	42,666	43,711	44,805
	Pipe Network Renewal	28,462	35,756	36,669	37,587

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Environment and Water					
	Structures	30,884	58,093	59,550	61,039
	Asset Renewal	10,863	10,660	10,921	11,193
	Network Extension	33,248	39,013	39,794	42,983
	Networks Growth	10,002	9,114	9,760	10,004
	Treatment Plant Growth	2,992	3,735	3,727	3,820
	Service Reliability Management	2,694	4,792	4,906	5,028
	Water Resource Sustainability	92	592	607	622
	Major and Minor Plant	5,201	4,767	4,884	5,007

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Transport, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning					
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure					
	Major Project				
	Bus Fleet Replacement Program	18,765	19,234	19,715	20,208
	Northern Expressway	400	422	—	—
	Upgrading the Sturt Highway	470	—	—	—
	Increased Detection of Unregistered/Uninsured Vehicles	1,091	623	639	655
	South Road Superway	2,000	5,073	—	—
	Adelaide Oval—Redevelopment	900	—	—	—
	Public Transport Park'n'Ride Interchanges	900	—	—	—
	South Road Upgrade from Torrens Road to River Torrens	4,500	—	—	—
	Managed Motorways on the South Eastern Freeway	11,894	919	—	—
	Adelaide Hills Priority Program	500	377	—	—
	Gawler Line Electrification Project	296,750	93,077	45,000	—
	North–South Corridor Darlington Upgrade	96,805	—	—	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Plaza & Integration	5,000	25,000	30,000	10,360
	Improving critical road infrastructure	1,700	—	—	—
	Gawler East Collector Link	4,668	—	—	—
	Northern Connector	129,346	—	—	—
	Port Stanvac Wharf and Foreshore	6,407	—	—	—
	Extension of the Tonsley rail line to the Flinders Medical Centre	89,882	—	—	—
	Planning Reform Implementation	7,735	554	—	—
	Leigh Creek Capital Program	300	300	400	—
	10 New Safety Cameras	849	—	—	—
	Oaklands Crossing	35,515	—	—	—
	Mitcham Hills Road Corridor	5,000	5,000	3,000	—
	Main South Road Duplication from Seaford to Aldinga.	23,000	75,000	164,000	41,000
	Golden Grove Road Upgrade	14,800	3,000	—	—



Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Transport, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning					
	Port Road / West Lakes Boulevard/Cheltenham Parade intersection upgrade	5,598	—	—	—
	Main North Road with Tulloch Road intersection upgrade	5,324	—	—	—
	North East Road and South Para Left Turn Slip Lane	980	—	—	—
	Duplication of Joy Baluch AM Bridge	40,000	108,000	49,785	—
	Overpass at Port Wakefield Road	15,000	66,500	6,500	—
	Fix Candy Road and South Road Intersection	5,130	—	—	—
	Penola Bypass	14,100	200	—	—
	Torrens Street and Crozier Road roundabout	540	—	—	—
	North-South Corridor Regency Road to Pym Street	38,200	141,100	118,800	—
	Cape Jervis Breakwater Extension	1,920	—	—	—
	Southern Expressway Throw Screens	2,000	—	—	—
	City South Tramline Replacement Project	11,570	—	—	—
	Goodwood, Springbank and Daws Roads Intersection Upgrade	5,000	22,000	8,000	—
	Portrush and Magill Roads Intersection Upgrade	2,000	16,000	45,000	35,000
	Fullarton and Cross Roads Intersection Upgrades	1,000	20,000	30,000	10,000
	Torrens Road, Ovingham level crossing upgrade	11,000	110,000	110,000	—
	Main North, Kings and McIntyre Roads intersection upgrade	2,000	11,000	—	—
	Main North Road and Nottage Terrace intersection upgrade	2,000	5,000	12,000	—
	Glen Osmond and Fullarton Roads intersection upgrade	1,000	15,000	19,000	—
	Grand Junction, Hampstead and Briens Roads intersection upgrade	2,000	7,000	10,000	—
	North South Corridor Torrens River to Darlington	30,000	60,000	132,000	30,000
	Granite Island Causeway refurbishment	5,000	15,000	—	—
	Thomas Foods International Facility	7,000	—	—	—
	Dublin Saleyards Access	7,000	—	—	—
	Naracoorte Roundabouts	8,000	—	—	—
	Kroemers Crossing Roundabout	6,000	—	—	—
	New Tonsley Railway Station	8,000	—	—	—
	Park n Ride Projects	30,371	—	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Outback Communities Authority	712	1,393	497	502
	DPTI Annual Program	138,784	128,068	129,688	130,314
South Australian Government Employee Residential Properties					
	Annual Program				
	Residential Properties	7,011	7,186	7,366	7,550
West Beach Trust					
	Major Project				
	Roads and Car Parks	800	—	—	—

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
Transport, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning					
	Replacement of swimming pool and an additional 9 cabins at Adelaide Shores Resort	437	1,313	—	—
	Annual Program				
	Reserves	100	300	312	320
	Corporate Services Office and Works Depot	294	400	416	428
	Caravan Park Accommodation and Facility Upgrades	592	800	832	854
	Resort Accommodation and Facility Upgrades	614	700	728	747
	Golf Course	100	150	156	160
	Boat Haven	—	150	156	160
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority					
	Major Project				
	Memorial Gardens—Enfield Memorial Park	220	330	280	-220
	Memorial Gardens—Smithfield Memorial Park	135	150	100	-30
	Recycled Water/Irrigation Infrastructure	40	170	70	-70
	Information Technology	130	140	110	100
	Memorial Gardens—Cheltenham Cemetery	150	200	150	-150
	Memorial Gardens—West Terrace Cemetery	345	35	185	-35
	Cheltenham Mausoleum	200	—	—	—
	Enfield Mausoleum Stage 4	800	800	—	—
	Multi-Function Community Precinct—Enfield Memorial Park	750	5,888	12,500	5,862
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	359	305	179	-186
Urban Renewal Authority					
	Major Project				
	Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment	3,285	1,646	1,806	814
	Annual Program				
	Plant and Equipment	194	80	47	81

Minister	Agency/Title	2019–20 Budget	2020–21 Estimate	2021–22 Estimate	2022–23 Estimate
No Minister					
Auditor-General					
	Annual Program				
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	233	239	245	251

#### STATE ASSET SALES

**117 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). What was the asset sale referred to in state summary for SA, in the ABS national accounts catalogue 5206 March quarter release from 3 June?

- What was the consideration received for the asset?
- To whom was the asset sold?
- For what period is the asset sold?
- In which financial year is the consideration to be received?

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

The ABS published the following commentary on its website in relation to the components of State Final Demand (chain volume measures) for the March quarter 2020:

Public gross fixed capital formation decreased 0.6 per cent, driven by a:

- 12.5 per cent fall in commonwealth public non-financial corporations
- 41.0 per cent fall in state and local general government reflecting an asset sale which occurred last quarter. Without the impact of this sale, general government investment in new assets rose

The ABS has indicated to DTF that the 41.0 per cent fall in state and local general government expenditure reflects a return following a large abnormal increase in general government expenditure in the previous (December) quarter, relating to the transfer of assets from the public non-financial corporation sector (Renewal SA) to the general government sector (TAFE SA), as highlighted in the 2019-20 state budget (Budget Paper 3: Budget Statement, page 34). These assets had been leased by TAFE SA and owned by Renewal SA. On 1 October 2019 TAFE SA purchased these assets from Renewal SA. The purchase of these assets by TAFE SA increased investing expenditure in the general government sector by \$601 million in 2019-20.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**119 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Deputy Premier

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General):** The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**120 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Education:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**121 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Innovation and Skills:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**122 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**124 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Human Services

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General):** The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**126 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Child Protection:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

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

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**127 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised:

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116

#### CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

**128 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

**CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS**

**131 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government:

(a) Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure?

(b) Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financial years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning):** The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116

**FUTURE SUBMARINES PROGRAM**

**153 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). What has been the impact of COVID-19 on the development of South Australia's skills base required for the domestic delivery of the Future Submarines Project?

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

Most defence companies have remained operational during COVID-19, which is a positive for the growth of the workforce and skills. South Australia's strong response to the pandemic may also attract suitable and skilled workers from allied nations once international borders reopen.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, planning for the provision of industry driven education and training continued with a focus on the most immediate trades and professions required for the naval shipbuilding enterprise.

The near term focus is on the supply of combat system engineers, systems engineers, designers (drafters), integrated logistics support, quality and structural engineers, as the priorities identified by the Naval Shipbuilding College. These roles are necessary for the design of both the Hunter class frigate and Attack class submarine.

States and territories with border restrictions (including South Australia) have agreed to limited interstate movement to support defence national security priorities, which includes naval shipbuilding.

The South Australian government is supporting our local defence industry through the crisis and the steps to a speedy recovery.

**FUTURE SUBMARINES PROGRAM**

**154 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Has the Premier been briefed on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the maximisation of local content in the Future Submarines project? If yes, what did that briefing say?

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

Defence SA participates in weekly meetings with the Department of Defence to discuss the impacts on the sector as a whole. The major concerns have been of a general nature regarding cross border travel, freight and maintaining cash flow to SMEs. No specific concerns have been raised in these discussions about the impact of COVID-19 on the Attack class submarine program.

I have also held regular COVID-19 roundtables with South Australian defence industry participants to provide relevant information and ensure we are addressing the sector's needs.

**FUTURE SUBMARINES PROGRAM**

**155 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Has the NAVAL Group raised concerns over the skills available in South Australia to deliver on their commitment to maximise local content with the domestic delivery of the Future Submarines project?

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

The Naval Shipbuilding College (NSC) is assessing the workforce demand for the continuous naval shipbuilding programs, which include the Hunter class frigate and Attack class submarine programs. It is important to address it as a whole of enterprise requirement so the solutions are effective and efficient, and do not advantage one project at the expense of another.

Naval Group, BAE Systems and other industry participants provide NSC with their South Australian workforce needs.

The Adelaide City Deal between the South Australian and Australian governments, includes an agreement to implement a Designated Area Migration Agreement (DAMA). The DAMA provides access to more overseas workers than the standard skilled migration program. Under the DAMA framework, employers in designated areas experiencing skills and labour shortages can sponsor skilled and semi-skilled overseas workers.

**FUTURE SUBMARINES PROGRAM**

**156 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Can the premier confirm that late last year the NAVAL Group raised concerns with the Premier regarding skills shortage for the Future Submarines project?

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

The South Australian government has regular conversations with defence industry companies regarding workforce skills requirements.

The Naval Shipbuilding College (NSC) is assessing the workforce demand for naval shipbuilding programs, which include the Hunter class frigate and Attack class submarine programs. It is important to address it as a whole of enterprise requirement so the solutions are effective and efficient, and do not advantage one project at the expense of another.

Naval Group, BAE Systems and other industry participants provide NSC with their South Australian workforce needs.

The near term focus is on the supply of combat system engineers, systems engineers, designers (drafters), integrated logistics support, quality and structural engineers, as the priorities identified by the Naval Shipbuilding College. These roles are necessary for the design of both the Hunter class frigate and Attack class submarine.

**FUTURE SUBMARINES PROGRAM**

**157 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Can the premier guarantee that the Future Submarines will be built in South Australia, by South Australians?

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

South Australia is the national centre of naval shipbuilding and submarine sustainment, and the build location for Australia's Attack class submarines and Hunter class frigates.

The Australian Government's \$90 billion commitment to build 23 new vessels in South Australia delivers unprecedented opportunities for the state and we are doing the work to train the next generation of workers to maximise these opportunities for South Australia and South Australians.

Naval Group Australia estimates 2800 jobs will be created as part of the Attack class submarine program.

**SPACE INDUSTRY**

**158 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Can the Premier provide a breakdown of projects currently being funded, supported or managed by the South Australian Space Industry Centre and/or the Australian Space Agency?

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

The South Australian Space Industry Centre (SASIC) supports and/or funds:

- The Australian Space Forum, which continues to attract growing interest locally and internationally. It has grown from 110 participants at the first forum in May 2016 to more than 1000 national and international registered attendees and 40 exhibiting organisations at the last Forum in February 2020.
- The Space Industry Work Experience Program, an initiative of the SASIC, in partnership with the Department for Education's Advanced Technology Program (ATP). The program provides students from years 10 to 12 the chance to undertake short-term placement at selected local space companies. In 2019, 31 students from 23 schools worked with mentors within local space organisations, giving them direct access and hands-on experience.
- GRAVITY Challenge. Managed by Deloitte, SASIC is a key contributor to the program. GRAVITY Challenge is a space technology innovation program exploring new uses for space data and space capability. Its goal is to activate the space ecosystem by bringing market challenges and global innovators together to create viable solutions, and ultimately accelerate their commercial uptake.
- The South Australian Space Scholarship Program, which provides a total of \$100,000 worth of scholarships to South Australian entrepreneurs and innovators each year, to study, intern or attend world-leading conferences. Since the establishment of the program in 2018, nine candidates have successfully received scholarships, enabling them to attend some of the world's largest space conferences and intern at prominent space agencies.
- The Southern Hemisphere Space Studies Program scholarships, which fund five aspiring South Australian space professionals valued at \$10,000 each. The program is an intensive, five week, live-in experience in the southern hemisphere summer, involving the international, intercultural, and interdisciplinary educational philosophy for which the International Space University is renowned.

- The Space Incubator Program, Venture Catalyst Space, delivered through the University of South Australia's Innovation and Collaboration Centre (ICC). A highly competitive six-month incubator program, which aims to develop and grow the innovative ideas of selected space companies. In 2019, five companies took part in the program, with each receiving funding (stipend up to \$10,000 per company), access to training and workshops, one-on-one mentorship, a modern co-working space and cutting-edge technical resources and tools.
- The ActInSpace hackathon, co-organised by the French and European space agencies and delivered by the ICC with support from the South Australian Government. The hackathon engages teams to work over a 24-hour continuous period to find a solution to a challenge posed by the European and French space agencies and Airbus. The first hackathon staged in Adelaide in 2018, was won by South Australian team Wright Technologies, which travelled to France to and was successful in competing against 32 countries in the global finals.
- The Mission Control Centre, to be located on the ground floor of the McEwin Building at Lot Fourteen. The South Australian Government will invest \$2.5 million through the Adelaide City Deal—a 10-year agreement between the Australian and South Australia governments and the City of Adelaide. Saber Astronatics has been chosen to establish the state-of-the art space hub.
- The SmartSat CRC headquartered at Lot Fourteen, which brings together industry, government and academia to collaborate on research and development-focused initiatives in niche areas of intelligent satellite systems, advanced communications and analytics. The South Australian government provides in-kind support.

SASIC does not have oversight of a breakdown of projects funded/managed by the Australian Space Agency. SASIC are, however, consolidating and refining their activities to best support South Australia's space industry, in collaboration with the Australian Space Agency.

#### SPACE INDUSTRY

**159 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Can the Premier provide a breakdown of South Australian Space Industry Centre/Australian Space Agency projects currently being undertaken in South Australia?

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

I refer the honourable member to the answer to Question on Notice 158.

#### SPACE INDUSTRY

**160 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Can the Premier advise how South Australia's share of the reported \$2 billion investment in the space industry has been allocated?

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

As of December 2019, the Australian Space Agency estimated the pipeline of capital works at \$1.6 billion, including research and development in all states and territories for financial years 2018–28 with 170 projects.

The South Australian share was reported to be 31 per cent (~ \$496 million).

#### SPACE INDUSTRY

**161 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (1 July 2020). Can the Premier provide the number of South Australians employed either directly or indirectly in the space industry?

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

South Australia is home to around 80-space related organisations comprising more than 50 private companies, more than 10 research organisations, industrial associations, and consultancies.

A baseline figure for the number of direct space related employees is estimated at approximately 800. The number of indirect employees is difficult to determine as many of these employees work only part time in the industry, supporting other sectors such as high-tech, cyber and defence.