

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16 February 2021

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.B. Teague) 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.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:01): I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice for the rescission of an order.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is present; I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I move, pursuant to order:

That the order made on 12 May 2020 that standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable ministers and members to speak and conduct business from any seat within the chamber and the Speaker's gallery and that members of the Legislative Council be prohibited from admission to the Speaker's gallery be rescinded.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is present; I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

Ministerial Statement

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As members know, on 17 December 2020, I appointed the Hon. Paul Rice QC to conduct an inquiry in response to the sentencing of two paedophiles for sexual offences against two then 13 to 14-year-old girls who were under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection. Terms of reference were published on that day.

On 9 February 2021, Mr Rice provided the report on the child protection inquiry to me as Attorney-General. Redactions have been made to the report in order to protect the identities of the two children referred to in the report as C1 and C2, as recommended by Mr Rice. The Crown Solicitor's Office provided legal advice with respect to any additional redactions that may be necessary and risks that may follow from the public release of the report, having regard to defamation and/or procedural fairness. Accordingly, the public interest in releasing the report outweighs the potential legal risks.

Only one further redaction has been made, which was to further protect one of the girl's identity. Government considered the report and, in keeping with our commitment to transparency, approved its public release. It was tabled minutes ago, and I understand an electronic copy has been forwarded to you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Rice made six recommendations, all of which were accepted by the government. Not only have they been accepted but some of his recommendations have been upgraded. We have imposed greater oversight and made additional improvements, and I will now outline how this will be achieved. I will not repeat verbatim the recommendations; they will be for members to view in the report.

Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 refer to improving instructions and guidance to ensure that the minister and chief executive are advised of any serious allegations of a criminal act against a child, that departmental policies and directions are unambiguous, that guidelines be developed to distinguish high and low matters of importance, and that the minister advise the chief executive of the types of events and incidents about which she wants to be informed.

In response, the government will establish a permanent significant incident reporting unit, to be headed by the Crown Solicitor's nominee. This person will work closely with the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection and will report to the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet until we are confident that the reporting mechanisms are being followed, including to the minister.

The Crown Solicitor's nominee will also review data collection to ensure that the information required by the reporting procedure is available to the chief executive and the minister. This will ensure that the policies, directions and guidelines are clear, concise and well understood and leave no ambiguity.

Recommendation 4 was that the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection undertake a comprehensive staff education program directed towards a knowledge and use of the existing incident management procedure. In response, the government will ask the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to oversee the staff education program to ensure that the incident management procedure is understood and implemented. This will ensure an additional layer of oversight.

Recommendations 5 and 6 recommend that the government consider increasing the penalty for a breach of a written direction to three years for a first contravention and four years for a second or subsequent contravention—that is, imprisonment—and that a person arrested for a breach of a written direction be a prescribed applicant for the purposes of the Bail Act.

In response, I have instructed my department to immediately prepare the necessary draft bill to give effect to these recommendations so that the government can introduce legislation to this parliament within 30 days. The government acted swiftly and decisively when it appointed Mr Rice to undertake this review. A tight time frame was imposed, which he met. Now, just over a week after receiving the report, the government provides its response, which not only accepts the report's recommendations but provides additional rigour and oversight and provides for time to take the assessment of the redaction issue fully into account.

In the presence of the parliament, I thank Mr Rice for his report and for identifying areas that need to be improved. Our government continues to make significant progress in the provision of child protection services and in the recruitment of departmental staff and more foster carers. We take our responsibilities very seriously—our children and young people are owed nothing less.

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (MOTOR BIKE DRIVER LICENSING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 February 2021.)

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:09): I rise to support the Motor Vehicles (Motor Bike Driver Licensing) Amendment Bill 2020, which amends the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to enhance the

Graduated Licensing Scheme and improve the safety of novice motorcyclists, their passengers and other road users, and I thank the minister for this important work.

Motorcyclists have a higher risk of death or serious injury than all other road users. On average in the past five years—2015 to 2019—motorcycles accounted for around 4 per cent of all registered vehicles, but motorcyclists accounted for about 15 per cent of all lives lost on South Australian roads and 19 per cent of serious injuries. Sadly, 91 motorcyclists have lost their lives on our roads in the past five years, predominantly males with an average age of 37.

In the case of novice motorcycle riders, data for the 16 to 19-year-old age group shows that over the last five years—2015 to 2019—the trend in young rider serious casualties increased by an average of about 12.5 per cent per year. This is in contrast to the trend in young driver serious casualties, which has decreased by an average of 7.7 per cent over the same period.

One strategy to reduce this road trauma is through an improved graduated licensing scheme for motorcycle riders. A graduated licensing scheme is a staged approach to obtaining a full licence, with learners commencing in relatively low-risk situations. As the novice rider grows in knowledge, skills and on-road experience, restrictions are gradually lifted as the rider progresses through to an intermediate stage and then onto a full licence.

The GLS for car drivers was strengthened in 2010 and 2014. In 2010, the minimum age for solo driving on a provisional licence was raised to 17 years. This is likely to have reduced the casualty crashes involving young drivers, as research now shows that the older a young person is when they are licensed the safer they are when driving and riding unsupervised.

In 2014, the provisional—intermediate—stage was increased from two to three years along with the introduction of passenger and night driving restrictions. Such restrictions help to keep young people out of high-risk situations on the road. In 2018 the University of Adelaide's Centre for Automotive Safety Research released the report 'Recommendations for a graduated licensing system for motorcyclists in South Australia', outlining key elements that could be included in an enhanced GLS for motorcycle riders in South Australia, aimed at reducing the crash involvement of novice riders.

Community feedback was sought on the recommendations via a consultation process with individuals and stakeholders and indicated support for most of the recommendations. Key stakeholders were provided with an opportunity to review the draft amendment bill, giving relevant parties an opportunity to make comments relative to their areas of expertise. A total of 107 stakeholders were invited to comment, and responses were received from a variety of road safety stakeholders, including motorcycling riding groups, motorcycle industry representatives and motoring bodies as well as state and local government.

The bill more closely aligns the requirements for novice motorcycle riders with the successful motor vehicle GLS approach to provide more riding experience under protective conditions and reduce the incidence of crashes involving novice riders. While some stakeholders suggested further improvements to motorcycle safety, which should be considered, this amendment package is focused on the licensing system and does not extend to rider training and assessment. A review by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport of South Australia's training and assessment program for motorcycle riders is currently underway.

Raising the age to obtain a motorcycle learner's permit from 16 to 18 years of age is supported by research, which has found that younger riders, whether new or fully licensed, have more crashes per distance travelled than older riders, suggesting age itself, irrespective of experience, is an important determinant of crash risk.

Between 2015 and 2019, a total of 324 riders aged 16 to 19 were involved in a casualty crash. Of these, seven riders lost their lives and a further 66 sustained serious injuries. An improved motorcycle graduated licensing scheme will be beneficial for novice motorcyclists and should contribute to a safer cohort of fully licensed riders once they have successfully completed the scheme.

Under the bill, a person aged under 18 years who holds a current provisional driver's licence will be eligible to apply for a motorcycle learner's permit in recognition that the prospective rider has already gained some experience in the road and traffic environment while in the comparative safety

of a car. However, unlike the Queensland model, this provision does not mandate that a person is required to obtain a car licence before being able to ride a motorcycle.

An exemption is also available for young people living in regional South Australia, in recognition of the more limited transport services available in those areas and the need for young people to participate in training and employment opportunities. The bill allows a person who is at least 16 years of age and who lives in a prescribed locality to be issued with a restricted motorcycle learner's permit to allow them to travel from their place of residence to tertiary education, to vocational education and training, for work purposes or to participate in a sporting activity.

The exemption does not extend to students travelling to a secondary school—that is, high school—as they are already getting to school by other transport means prior to turning 16, and they can continue to do so. Riding contrary to these restrictions will result in an expiation fee and demerit points that will be prescribed in the regulations. It is intended the expiation fee and the demerit points will align with other comparable offences that apply to learner and P1 drivers, which currently carry a fine of \$382 and three demerit points.

The bill introduces a requirement for a person to hold a motorcycle learner's permit for a minimum of 12 months. Currently, learner riders holding a car licence classification do not have a minimum period for which they are required to hold a motorcycle learner's permit. To provide novice riders with more riding experience under protective learner conditions, the bill requires a person to hold a motorcycle learner's permit for a minimum of one year before being eligible to apply for an R-Date intermediate licence classification, irrespective of any other licence held by that person. This will apply to new and existing learner's permit holders upon commencement of the new provisions.

The bill introduces a restriction for learner riders from carrying a pillion passenger or a sidecar passenger, including a qualified supervising driver, and from towing trailers. The act currently allows a person on a motorcycle learner's permit to carry a pillion passenger or a passenger in a sidecar, provided that the passenger is acting as a qualified supervising driver. It is not a requirement under the act for the holder of the motorcycle learner's permit to be accompanied by a qualified supervising driver, as is the case for a holder of a learner's permit for a car.

Due to the inexperience of the rider, the balance distribution while riding and the possible distraction to the rider that a pillion passenger may pose, the bill no longer allows any pillion passenger to ride with the rider on a motorcycle learner's permit. This includes a passenger in a sidecar. Therefore, any person accompanying a learner driver will have to ride on a separate motorcycle.

As towing a trailer may increase the risk of a crash, this practice will also be prohibited during the learner's permit stage. The bill introduces a night-time riding restriction between midnight and 5am for all learner riders aged under 25 years, irrespective of whether that person also holds a P2 or a full driver's licence for another classification of vehicle. Currently, night-time riding restrictions are limited to riders aged under 25 years who hold only a motorcycle learner's permit or a P1 licence. The bill extends this provision and applies a night-time riding restriction between the hours of midnight and 5am to all motorcycle learner's permit holders aged under 25.

However, as per existing provisions, a motorcycle learner's permit holder will be exempt if the person meets the prescribed circumstances listed in schedule 2 of the act. This includes when riding for employment, education, between home and an activity to participate in sports, artistic, charitable, religious or scientific activities provided by an organisation, association or club. As with the existing provisions relating to the motor vehicle GLS, no formal application for an exemption will be required; however, the rider would need to carry evidence that they were riding with the exemption grounds.

The bill introduces a restriction on riding an automatic motorcycle only if they have been tested on one. The bill raises the minimum age of an R-Date intermediate licence from 17 to 19 years of age. This will enable novice riders to gain more experience. Existing learner riders, who are aged under 18 years, will not be restricted from where they can ride and nor are they required to obtain a provisional licence in order to maintain their existing learner's permit, although it will require them to ride under protective conditions for longer before progressing to an R-Date classification.

The bill introduces a restriction for the holders of a licence date with an R-Date intermediate licence classification to have a zero blood alcohol concentration while riding a motorcycle irrespective of whether that person also holds a full car or higher classification of licence. Alcohol consumption and riding a motorcycle is a dangerous combination. It is reflected in our crash statistics. Alcohol impairs skills and decision-making and can increase confidence and aggression. Currently, the holder of a full car licence is able to ride a motorcycle on an R-Date classification with a blood alcohol concentration of less than .05 grams in 100 millilitres of blood. The bill requires all R-Date motorcycle riders to have a zero blood alcohol concentration when they are riding.

The government's bill will deliver a strengthened graduated licensing scheme for motorcyclists and will make our roads safer for all South Australian users. The Marshall Liberal government is dedicated to improving road safety for all South Australians. Just today, police have stated that irresponsible riders and drivers who risk their life and other people's lives will be met with zero tolerance. This bill and its amendments are in line with that.

I have been having ongoing discussions with my own local community, the minister and South Australia Police on how we also address the serious issue of rogue motorcycle riders in King. I hope to progress and support some changes in this place to address this persistent issue of troublesome and reckless riders in our community. These riders put their lives and the lives of others at risk. We need to get tougher and introduce tougher consequences and harsher deterrents for reckless and appalling behaviour on motorbikes, which we have seen most recently and over the last few years.

Recently, the MFS commander at Salisbury told me, when I was discussing this serious concern, that there are over 170 people impacted and traumatised on average when a person is seriously injured on our roads. My heart goes out to the man most recently killed in a motorcycle crash in Ridgehaven at Paracombe. He was the third motorcyclist killed in South Australia this year. I support the amendments in this important bill.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:23): I do not plan to take up too much of the house's time today, but I do want to rise to speak on the Motor Vehicles (Motor Bike Driver Licensing) Amendment Bill 2020 ever so briefly and to provide some context as to the reason for my support in the context of my local community. I know many of the members have already spoken in the debate so far about what is proposed under the bill. In short, it includes bringing forth many of the recommendations that were made in the CASR report. I will quickly run through those in terms of the licensed areas.

For a learner's permit, it recommends raising the minimum age to obtain a motorcycle or learner's permit from 16 to 18 years. Persons aged 17 years can obtain a learner's permit if they also hold a provisional licence for a car. Exemptions have already been detailed with regard to people living in regional areas using motorcycles for the sole purpose of tertiary education, vocational education, training, work or sporting activities.

Learner riders will be prohibited from carrying any passengers, including qualified supervising drivers. They will be prohibited from any towing and prohibited from riding between 12am and 5am if they are under 25 years of age. Exemptions also apply to those categories that I just recently referenced. Learner riders must hold the permit for a minimum of 12 months.

In regard to the R-Date provisional licence, the minimum age for that licence will be obtained from 19 years, up from 17 years. R-Date licence holders can no longer have any blood alcohol concentration, regardless of their licence type, within their body while riding a motorcycle. R-Date licences must be held for a minimum of two years, up from the current minimum of 12 months.

In regard to R-licences (or full licences), as a result of minimum age and time requirements, an R-licence cannot be obtained until 21 years of age. It is currently 18. Importantly, riders who conduct their test on automatic transmission motorcycles will be restricted to that type vehicle.

Late last year there was an increase in reported hoon driving in the Henley Beach area, with motorbikes being of particular concern. In response to this increase, I had a discussion with SAPOL about what could be done in the area to target this growing problem. Over the summer period, the local police have initiated Operation Safe Shores, which includes providing extra police numbers from Friday to Sunday nights, with a primary focus on the Glenelg, Henley Beach and Semaphore foreshore areas.

The local police station and police members also liaised with the road policing section (or the traffic police) and requested a concentrated policing effort along the Henley Beach foreshore area across the summer period. That is obviously timely, given the increased activity that occurs in my community over that period.

Since the initiation of Operation Safe Shores, we have seen success, with irresponsible drivers being caught under the pretence of hoon driving. A specific example of that success is highlighted by the recent arrest of an L-plate motorbike rider who will face court after being caught riding at 70 km/h over the speed limit at West Beach just last month. We know that changes to this legislation will bring the age to obtain a learner motorbike licence up from 16 to 18 years and will help to address the multitude of cases that are similar to this one that I have mentioned just recently from West Beach.

Data shows that young riders in the 16 to 19-year-old age group are particularly over-represented. Young people account for approximately 5 per cent of all South Australians but account for 10.3 per cent of all motorbike fatalities and serious injuries in the period between 2015 and 2019. The percentage of serious injury and/or death following an accident on a motorbike is obviously significantly higher than that of a car accident.

When I picture a 16 year old who can obtain a motorcycle licence and ride alone, it really does astound me when I think back and remember perhaps what I was like as a 16 year old and what some of my friends were like as 16 year olds. Sometimes, consequences of actions were not thought about as readily as they perhaps should have been. A motorbike does take time and a lot of experience to master. Having access to that vehicle at such a young age is at times very difficult to understand.

In my community over the last couple of years, there have also unfortunately been two notable motorbike-related fatalities. One occurred in 2017, when a 23 year old was unfortunately killed at Seaview Road at Henley Beach. He was a young sportsman who lost his life after falling from his motorbike. Another was in Lockleys last year or the year before, when a car and a motorbike collided. The man who died in Lockleys was said to have been an experienced motorcycle rider, although just 31 years of age. It goes to show that even with years of experience unfortunately these horrific accidents do still occur.

These accidents are shocking and upsetting and have occurred in zones where the speed limit ranged from 40 km/h through to 60 km/h yet still resulted in tragic death. Crash statistics in this state obviously show that motorcycles are over-represented in lives lost on our roads in that period that I just mentioned and have accounted for 4 per cent of all registered vehicles, yet motorcycle riders accounted for 15 per cent of road fatalities and 19 per cent of serious injuries on our roads.

This legislation paves the way for our novice riders to gain more experience and understanding of the responsibilities that pertain to riding a motorcycle while they are getting their licence. It will now take several years to obtain a full licence and it will more closely align with the motor vehicle licensing regime, which I fully support. We have lost far too many young people to motorcycle accidents, and the changes to this legislation will go a long way to prevent further loss.

We will not stop all accidents, but there is more that we can do to encourage a better understanding of the responsibility that comes with obtaining a motorcycle licence and with driving that sort of vehicle. Each life lost is truly a tragedy. I know everybody in this place is likewise committed to ensuring that we try to reduce the fatalities on our road and, in particular, those of motorbike riders, so I fully support this bill and commend it to the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:30): I rise to make a short contribution on behalf of my electorate, the electorate of Stuart. There is no member of this house who would not feel anywhere from disappointed through to sick to the stomach, let alone if they were connected to one of the people who had lost their lives, about what we are seeing on our roads. It is just tragic. Our government needs to act to try to keep young people, particularly young males, safe on the roads while riding motorbikes.

There is no debate, certainly from this side of the chamber, about the fact that, through the Minister for Police and road safety, we need to take some action. Having outlined that as my view very clearly, I would say that as a country and outback MP limitations on the responsible use of

motorbikes do not sit too comfortably with me. So I am very pleased that the minister has found a way to retain greater flexibility for young people in country and outback areas with regard to the use of motorbikes, when and where they can be used and what they can be used for, and also with regard to the age of accessing licences.

I want to go into that briefly because, while on one level the words in this bill that hopefully will form the new legislation are quite clear about training and work activities and educational activities, I want to be very clear that in the discussions I have had—and I have had very clear commitments from my colleagues—it does not necessarily have to be paid work that this flexibility would be applied to.

The reality is that in country and outback areas it is very normal for a young person to use a motorbike responsibly for work on their own family farm or perhaps to travel on the road between paddocks or different sections of their own family farm. That would not strictly classify as employment because usually those young people are not getting paid for that work; it is just part of the work they do as a member of the family in the family business. To be sure that people in my electorate and other places who might be affected by this understand, those types of activities would be covered by the additional flexibility provided in this bill.

Another important feature is that it is very normal and quite appropriate for family members to help each other out. One family farm might be mustering, getting ready for shearing, crutching or sales and members of another family might help them with that activity. Then, on another occasion at another part of the year, the first family helps the second family get their work done. Again, that is not paid employment in the strict sense of the word, but it is work done by young people supporting their family business and often supporting their family business by supporting another family that supports their family business. Those types of things will be dealt with in a very sensible, very pragmatic way so that young people can use the additional flexibility provided to them in country and outback areas in appropriate and sensible ways.

If a young person is using their motorbike in an inappropriate way or outside those clear guidelines and also outside the more practical approach to those guidelines I have just mentioned, that is a different matter entirely. I am only talking about things that are within the intent of this bill and hopefully soon within the intent of this legislation—that young people will be able to do all the things that, in a practical sense, they do in the country with regard to using a motorbike for education, training or work.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (11:35): I thank those members who have contributed to the debate on the bill. I also would like to thank the Department for Infrastructure and Transport for their work in developing the bill. In the interests of time, I will keep my remarks brief.

This bill reflects a very balanced approach between mobility and road safety with the inclusion of exemptions to allow young people who reside in the regions to gain a motorcycle learner's permit prior to turning 18 years of age to attend tertiary education, vocational education and training for work purposes, or to participate in a sporting activity. Holders of a provisional licence for a car will also be eligible to obtain a motorcycle learner's permit from 17 years of age.

The bill also provides for a staged learning approach by adding a number of restrictions to motorcycle learner's permit holders such as no passengers, no towing trailers and, for all permit holders under 25 years, night-time riding restrictions between midnight and 5am. It restricts the holder of an R-Date licence classification from riding with any alcohol in their system, regardless of the type of licence that they hold.

Broadly, the bill intends to create a genuine GLS for all novice riders, with restrictions gradually lifted through each stage prior to being able to ride a high-powered motorcycle. Whilst young riders have been a focus in this bill, these initiatives will benefit novice riders of all ages and should contribute to what is a safer cohort of fully licensed riders once they have successfully completed the GLS.

Community feedback on the CASR recommendations from the 2018 YourSAy survey indicated that raising the age for a person to gain a learner's permit for a motorcycle to 18 could significantly impact on employment or education opportunities for young people in regional areas. Stakeholders from the agricultural industry identified the need for provisions for young people

involved in farming in particular. Having listened to the needs of regional communities, and after careful consideration, an exemption for young regional riders was drafted for inclusion in the bill, with riding limited to education and economic purposes in recognition of the limited transport options in regional areas.

I thank all members for their contributions to the debate and certainly for the constructive manner in which they have advocated for their communities. It is my belief we cannot afford any further delay in passing this very important reform. I note the indication of support on behalf of the opposition by the member for Elizabeth and I thank him for that. I hope that such support extends to the other place. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

The CHAIR: We are in committee on the Motor Vehicles (Motor Bike Driver Licensing) Amendment Bill 2020. We are dealing with 16 clauses and a title.

Clause 1.

Mr ODENWALDER: In the spirit of this debate, and recognising that the government has brought this bill on before the abortion bill today in order to expedite its progress through this house, I do not intend to delay this debate in any particular way, but I do have some questions.

My first question is a broad one and that is: why has this bill taken so long to reach this point? Just to go over the history, we know that in 2017 there was a spike in motorcycle deaths. The then government convened the motorcycle reference group, which in turn commissioned the report from CASR, which has been well canvassed by the various speakers, and we will go through some of those as we go through the committee stage. But then, of course, the election took place, and there was simply no action for the best part of a year.

The Motorcycle Riders' Association and others tried, I understand, to see the previous minister, but were met with silence. They came to see me and the Leader of the Opposition, and we listened to their concerns and drafted a bill, which largely but not entirely reflected the recommendations of the CASR report. This bill has sat on the *Notice Paper* since, I think, May 2019, and it is still on the *Notice Paper* (it was reintroduced after prorogation, if I have my chronology right). Nevertheless, it has been around for nearly two years.

The government has consistently opposed even debating it. It has been adjourned every Wednesday morning, which is the time that we get a lot of private members' business. My question to the minister (and if he has any access to the former minister it might be useful, because the Motorcycle Riders' Association did not) is simply: why has it taken so long for a bill, which has some changes to my bill, to get to this place?

The CHAIR: Minister, I am sure you will be able to answer that question without—

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am not sure how directly relevant that is to any clause here, but I will do my best to answer it, with bona fide intentions. I commend the member for Elizabeth for his passion for this area. Our government is certainly dedicated to road safety and protecting all road users, including motorcyclists. Any life lost is certainly a tragic reminder of the vigilance needed on our roads to make it home safety.

The bill introduced into the parliament is based on the expert report provided by CASR (Centre for Automotive Safety Research). It is strengthened by input from key road safety stakeholders, motorcycle groups and industry representatives. I believe extra time was taken in June 2020 to conduct further in-depth consultation because of the significance of the proposed changes, and this carefully considered reform should not be rushed. But we are where we are. There are those who can look backwards, member for Elizabeth, and there are those of us who can look forward. I appreciate the frustrations of the member for Elizabeth. I would like to have seen the bill progress earlier, but we are where we are, and I think it is time to get on with it.

Mr ODENWALDER: I appreciate the minister's implicit reference to the tardiness of his predecessor. The question was not answered, though. The question was answered in the sense that there had to be consultation. The CASR report was already prepared. The Motorcycle Riders' Association, the Ulysses Club and other interested groups were very keen to meet with particularly the previous minister. My question still stands: why has it taken so long?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I could refer to my earlier answer, but I will say that road safety is certainly a complex issue. We did not want to rush the legislation without taking the time to consider properly all the risks. I have sought, as I have been the minister for about six months now, significant input from the community but also from stakeholders formulating the amendment bill currently before this place. I know that the devastating effects of bushfires and COVID certainly took priority over other initiatives, but these are important initiatives as well and I am here to progress them now.

The CHAIR: And we are now in committee on the bill, so the government is making progress.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Mr ODENWALDER: There is quite a lot in this clause, so I seek the Chair's indulgence since I am honestly trying to expedite this as quickly as we possibly can. However, it seems to me that there are a few questions to be answered in clause 7. The guts of it is the 18-year age cut-off. The bill does not allow, except under certain circumstances, a rider to get their learner's permit until the age of 18.

Without traversing another bill that is before the house, there has been some suggestion from the Motorcycle Riders' Association and others that the age, contrary to the CASR report (I accept that), should be brought down to 17 as a compromise in order to not discourage people from riding, I think in the same way that you have approached the carve outs for country people. I wonder how you arrived at the 18 years, and did you consider 17 years as an age to start?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: In setting the minimum age limit for learner riders at 18, we have prioritised the safety of both riders themselves and other road users. Research has found that age is obviously a very important determinant of crash risk, regardless of experience. We know, as has been pointed out by members of both sides, that younger riders have more crashes per distance travelled than older riders. Research has found that riders older than 25 have less than half the risk of a crash than riders aged 15 to 19.

Consistent with that research, setting the minimum age limit at 18 years we think strikes the right balance between road safety outcomes and providing young people with the opportunity to ride motorcycles. I do note, however, that there are some exemptions. A person who is 17 years of age and holds their provisional licence for another vehicle class will be eligible to be issued with a learner's permit for a motorcycle.

In recognition of the limited transport options available in regional areas, an exemption will apply to allow 16 and also 17 year olds who reside in regional South Australia to gain a learner's permit but restrict them to riding a motorcycle only to attend tertiary education, vocational education and training, for work purposes or to participate in a sporting activity.

Mr ODENWALDER: The minister mentioned that if a person holds a provisional car licence they can obtain a bike learner's permit at age 17. It is my recollection from the CASR report that a requirement to hold a car licence before you got your motorcycle learner's permit was considered, and indeed is in place in some other states, but was rejected by the CASR report. Why then is this included in the bill when it is at least implicitly rejected by the CASR expert report?

Further to that, while you are getting advice, the Motorcycle Riders' Association certainly believe that, and I think this is implicit in the CASR report, it could potentially have the perverse effect of building a rider's confidence on the road before they get behind the handlebars of a motorbike. They may have in their mind that, having driven a car for 12 months, they have a handle on road conditions, when in fact obviously, as has been pointed out, road conditions are very different for motorcyclists. Can the minister comment on that and advise why he arrived at this measure which brings down the age for people who hold a provisional driver's licence?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I can advise the member for Elizabeth that we are not requiring motorcyclists to get their Ps in a car before their Ls in a motorcycle. However, we are recognising that when a vehicle operator does have their Ps then obviously with that comes a certain level of experience and maturity, in use of the roads and insight of the road rules. But we are certainly not requiring them to get their Ps in a car before.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand that, minister. I am not sure—perhaps I misheard you, but I am asking for the reason for the change. I am asking you to justify why a person with a provisional car licence should be able to hold a motorcycle learner's permit before others.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I thank the member for Elizabeth for the question. With having your Ps in a car would come experience in driving a car, use of the road and also insight into various road rules, which gives you some experience. That is the sort of theory behind it. I appreciate where the member for Elizabeth is coming from and there may be a difference of opinion there, but we have certainly been guided on the CASR report. I am pretty confident that we have arrived at a reasonable balance here.

The CHAIR: I will allow another question on clause 7, member for Elizabeth. Further to that, it looks to me that you could possibly follow this line of questioning on clause 8 as well, because it relates again to—

Mr ODENWALDER: I thank you for your guidance, sir.

The CHAIR: I am giving you guidance and I understand that clause 7 is key in this.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do want to get this bill through. It has obviously generated a lot of interest in the public's mind and I want to get this through as quickly as possible. I won't pursue that particular line of questioning, but I think there is something in that, in the discrepancy between what the CASR report fairly explicitly rejects and what the government has put in this bill.

My next question, within the same clause, should be a very easy one for the minister. How are we going to define a 'prescribed locality'? What is the procedure to define that? Given that it is regulated, what is the mechanism by which it might change over time?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Good question; thank you, member for Elizabeth. 'Prescribed locality' will be defined as a list of postcodes contained either in the regulations or by *Gazette* notice as appropriate. The government intends to align the postcodes for the prescribed locality with the postcodes for district 2 of the compulsory third-party (CTP) insurance districts, which comprises part of the vehicle registration fees, making it easier for applicants to identify eligibility for a restricted learner's permit. Those postcodes closely align with areas of the state considered to be regional.

In terms of how they will be changed, I can advise that, from 1 July 2020, district 1 includes all postcodes between 5000 and 5200 (inclusive), with the exception of 5001, 5153, 5154, 5157 and postcodes 5231, 5232, 5240, 5242, 5245, 5250, 5251, 5501, 5942, 5950 and 5960. District 2 includes any area within South Australia outside of the postcodes above, plus localities listed within the following postcode areas: 5118, 5120, 5172, 5174 and 5501. I am happy to provide the member with further information in relation to those specific numbers.

The CHAIR: Last one.

Mr ODENWALDER: One more on that line, sir, and then I will move on. What is there, either in this bill or without this bill, to prevent a person from fabricating their address in order to get a licence? They may say they live with their aunty in a regional area or something of that nature. Is there anything that the government has considered to prevent people circumventing the system in that way, and would there be any penalties for doing so?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Firstly, member for Elizabeth, I would ask that no-one fabricate those details because that would be a very bad thing. I am sure a whole raft of penalties could apply for fabricating such records. In terms of how a 16 or 17 year old who lives in regional South Australia applies for a restricted learner's permit, there will not be any special application process for the issue of a restricted learner's permit. Applicants will need to attend Service SA and, if they have not yet done so, undertake the learner's theory test.

For those who reside in a Rider Safe postcode area, they will be required to undertake the basic Rider Safe course. Once the basic Rider Safe course has successfully been completed and the person resides in a prescribed locality set out in the regulations, they will be issued with a restricted learner's permit for a motorcycle. A learner's permit will have a notation on it to remind the holder of the permit, as well as to alert SAPOL, that the person is only permitted to ride from their place of residence to attend tertiary education, vocational education and training, for work purposes or to participate in a recognised sporting activity.

A person will be eligible to have the restriction removed upon turning 17 and issued with a provisional licence for a car, or when they turn 18 years. So, until a restriction is removed, a person must continue to ride only for the purposes permitted by the exemption criteria.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10.

Mr ODENWALDER: We are getting through it not only because I wish to expedite this pretty quickly through the house but also because we have traversed a lot of these issues in the past. I do not want the impression to be that I am skipping over certain measures that are very important. I do have a couple of questions.

This is the clause which, amongst other things, mandates the hazard perception test as part of the deal to get a learner's permit. Obviously, we have seen some pretty bad statistics this year. Half of the deaths on our roads have been motorcyclists this year and last year was particularly bad as well. We have seen in the media recently, Anne-marie Taplin, the mother of Harry Taplin, who was tragically killed. She has been very vocal in the media calling for on-road training, as well as a whole lot of other things.

The minister mentioned in his second reading speech that there is a review of South Australia's training and assessment program for motorcycle riders, which is currently underway by the department. I have several questions, but first of all: has any thought been given to on-road training? Does it require legislative change and has he investigated this possibility yet? I should clarify: that is on-road training in order to get the learner's permit. I think that is what they are asking.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Thank you, member for Elizabeth, for the question. Obviously, our hearts go out to Mrs Taplin. If I am not mistaken, I met Mrs Taplin yesterday and I certainly was willing to listen to her and appreciate her concerns. Hopefully, I will be able to work with her and other advocates in this area.

We are currently considering a report by KPMG into further on-road training for drivers. We will certainly continue to look at ways to improve road safety and that is why we want to see this bill passed in parliament as soon as possible: to save lives. The member for Elizabeth would appreciate that some of what he is referring to would be potentially under me, as Minister for Police and Road Safety, and some will also be potentially under the Minister for Infrastructure as well.

We will continue to monitor this situation. I think it is important. Let's progress these reforms. I am happy to have a conversation about those other measures on another day, but, yes, I have met with Mrs Taplin and the Ulysses group.

Mr ODENWALDER: When did this review begin and when is it expected to report? When will you make it public, minister?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I do not have all those details here, member for Elizabeth, so I will take that one on notice.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

Clause 13.

Mr ODENWALDER: This, as I understand it, relates to the carve outs for rural people, which various members have talked about already. I support the provision in the bill that allows young people in regional centres in—what do we call them?—prescribed localities to get to work and

training. I am a little sceptical of the idea that sporting events are so essential. I understand the importance of sport. I have a young son who is very obsessed with his sport.

An honourable member: He's very good.

Mr ODENWALDER: He's very good, that's right. Every time he visits Campbelltown, the whole place erupts.

The CHAIR: He takes after his old man.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, that's right, he does—a chip off the old block. In any case, I do just want to clarify what is meant by other activities. Is there a hierarchy, in the minister's mind, when he drafts this bill? Is sport elevated above other activities that young people might find important, whether it is dancing or the chess club or whatever it might be? Why is sport elevated to such a high level that it is commensurate with work and training?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: You would appreciate, sir, that we on this side of the chamber have an enormous value that we place on our regional members and regional South Australia, and I note that they have provided advocacy for their electorates for an extended period in relation to this bill. We are fortunate to have many regional members of parliament, and they very strongly advocated for the needs of their constituents.

We did also accept community feedback on the CASR recommendations from the 2018 YourSAy survey that indicated that raising the age for a person to gain a learner's permit for a motorcycle to 18 could significantly impact on employment or education opportunities for young people in regional areas. Stakeholders from the ag industry also identified the need for provisions for young people involved in farming.

I think that the exemptions here, member for Elizabeth, strike a fair balance for young people in regional areas. As I have said on radio before, sir, you cannot catch an Uber to Oodnadatta (or I do not think you can, anyway), and there obviously are limited transport mechanisms in our regions.

The CHAIR: You could, minister, but it would cost a lot.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Hypothetically you could, sir, but I don't think anyone is doing it at the moment. While the government acknowledges the many benefits provided by a range of rec activities, sport, in particular, we think plays an important role in regional communities. When I visited the West Coast, I think everyone out there was playing a sport—mainly football and cricket. It obviously plays an important role, a huge role, in our regional communities: it can bring regional communities together, contribute positively to community identity and sense of place and promote social interaction and community inclusion.

I noticed that some of the leagues could not play during the COVID-ridden season—what a travesty that that could happen—and it had its impacts. Sport also plays an important role in providing opportunities for physical activity and improved health outcomes, so we think that this achieves a good balance.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 16) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (12:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:04): I promise I do not intend to hold up the house with a third reading contribution. This has been a long time in the making. I want to reiterate first of all my disappointment that this has taken so long to reach this point but also my pleasure in the fact that the government did decide to carve out this morning to debate this bill and to bring it finally to the end of this process in the House of Assembly.

I sincerely hope that the government, when it considers its agenda for the Legislative Council in the following week and the weeks thereafter, will make a priority of this bill, an absolute priority of this bill. There are too many people losing their lives on motorcycles on our roads. This quite simple change could have been enacted two years ago. It was not, and we are still seeing countless needless deaths of motorcyclists on our roads.

I want to thank a couple of people who have helped me over the last couple of years in formulating my views on these things, particularly the Motorcycle Riders' Association of South Australia—Ebi, Cathy and Graeme—and Neville Gray from the Ulysses Club, and others with whom I have struck up not just a working relationship but something of a friendship. I have spoken on their radio show a few times.

They are passionate about this cause, not only about motorcycle licensing, and they desperately want to see a return to the days when the Motorcycle Reference Group would advise the minister. They would come in, sit down and talk about motorcycle road safety in a holistic way so that some of the tragedies we are seeing on our roads might be better avoided. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (12:06): The data is certainly clear: young motorcyclists have a much higher risk of being involved in a tragedy on the road than they should have. We need to absolutely stop this carnage on our roads, and we need to protect motorcyclists. We need to protect families as much as possible from that devastating knock on the door that unfortunately some SAPOL officers have to make after a fatal crash.

What we need to do is implement a better licensing scheme so that novice motorcyclists gain the experience and the training they need to be safe road users. I believe that this bill will deliver a strengthened graduated licensing scheme for motorcyclists and will make our roads safer for all users. I thank members of this house for their cooperation—certainly the member for Elizabeth; the opposition; the government, especially members who have commented—and all the stakeholders. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:08): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, it is with great pride that I rise to introduce the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020, not because it is easy but because it is a historic day for the women of South Australia and their families. Yet it is also tinged with disappointment that we are the last state in the country to decriminalise abortion and allow it to take place in anything other than a legally mandated hospital with the approval of two doctors. Formally, the bill repeals division 17 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and creates a new standalone act to regulate the termination of pregnancy as a lawful medical procedure.

Abortion law reform has been the subject of considerable discussion over recent years, both locally and interstate, and is an incredibly emotive topic for many in the community. I find it personally disappointing that some have deliberately inflamed tensions and sought to use abortion as a political weapon. In 1969, South Australia became the first Australian jurisdiction to legislate for the lawful medical treatment and termination of pregnancy. Over 50 years have passed since those laws were first enacted. In that time, there have been significant changes to clinical practice in this area, including the advent of early medication abortion.

As a result of this and other developments, it is clear that South Australia's laws no longer reflect best clinical practice and have instead become a barrier to health care access for many women and their families, particularly in country areas, so this must be remedied. To that end, on 2 February 2019, I asked the South Australian Law Reform Institute to inquire into and report in relation to the topic of abortion law reform, with the aim of modernising the law in South Australia and adopting what is best practice reforms in relation to the lawful regulation of terminations.

Referral of abortion law reform to SALRI for proper investigation to consider recommendations for reform based on best practice in this area and with the guidance of other jurisdictions was considered the most suitable way to achieve effective, modern and appropriate reform of abortion laws in South Australia. It is a big topic, and it is a big subject to canvass.

Ultimately, SALRI presented to me its report on 31 October 2019. The SALRI report made 66 recommendations, including that abortion should be removed from the criminal law and treated as a public health issue. As noted by SALRI, abortion raises many ethical, medical, legal and other issues and implications. It attracts strong, emotional and often conflicting views, both from those directly affected and the wider community.

The development of a suitable legislative framework for the lawful termination of pregnancy required, I suggest, sensitivity and careful consideration to ensure a moderate and suitable way forward was identified. This bill before the parliament is a combination of the work of SALRI and the Attorney-General's Department as an important matter of law reform. I have personally carefully considered the SALRI report and the submissions of members of the public and stakeholders, and I am confident that the right balance has been struck.

Consistent with the recommendations of the SALRI report, but by no means accepting all of its recommendations, this bill that I now present for consideration repeals abortion from the criminal law and creates a new standalone act to regulate the termination of pregnancy as a lawful medical procedure.

In recognising that abortion should be treated as a healthcare issue, the bill makes it clear that a person who performs, consents to, assists in or attempts to perform a termination on themselves does not commit an offence. The bill is informed and guided by the principles of best clinical practice and promotes and respects patient decision-making by removing a number of barriers which currently impede access to abortion care services.

The bill allows for a medical practitioner to perform a termination on a person who is not more than 22 weeks and six days pregnant. Thereafter, the bill provides that a termination may be performed by a medical practitioner on a person who is more than 22 weeks and six days pregnant, where the medical practitioner has consulted with another medical practitioner and both practitioners consider that, in all of the circumstances, the termination is medically appropriate.

In determining whether a termination is medically appropriate, a medical practitioner must—not may, must—consider all the relevant medical circumstances and the professional standards and guidelines that apply to the medical practitioner in relation to the performance of that termination. The College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists has a position statement on this, which along with reams of other information has been circulated to members of the parliament. It is important that this information is available. Of course it is complicated, and not many of us have medical training—I certainly do not—but it is important we acknowledge that the agencies and the experts in this field have provided that material so that it might assist us in being satisfied of that presentation.

While SALRI recommended the absolute removal of gestational limits, I made it clear I did not agree with this. It is my view that the gestational limit of 22 weeks and six days most closely aligns with current clinical practice in other Australian jurisdictions and is the preferred limit of Wellbeing SA, and it is in this bill.

Importantly, the bill will also allow for a registered health practitioner to perform a termination on a person by administering a prescription drug, or by prescribing a drug, provided the practitioner is acting in the ordinary scope of their profession and is authorised to do so under the Controlled Substances Act 1984. This supports the now very common process of a non-surgical termination. This position reflects SALRI's recommendation that the categories of persons authorised to perform terminations should not be confined to medical practitioners but should where appropriate include other registered health practitioners who are suitably credentialed to perform such procedures within the ordinary scope of their profession, for example, our nurse practitioners.

In keeping with modern health practices, the bill removes a number of outdated requirements that currently act as a barrier to access for women, especially in rural and regional communities, including (1) that women be personally examined by two medical practitioners prior to seeking a termination and (2) that women must have resided in the state for at least two months prior to a

termination. The bill also removes the requirement for terminations to be carried out in a prescribed hospital. This represents an important step forward in removing restrictions such that women can access a GP clinic or telemedicine as part of their consultation.

In accordance with the SALRI recommendations, the bill preserves the right of a registered health practitioner to conscientiously object to perform, assist in or provide advice in relation to a termination of pregnancy. These provisions were drafted in very close consultation over quite some time with the Australian Medical Association and reflect their state and federal principles. I am particularly grateful to Dr Chris Moy for his assistance in this regard as the President of the AMA. It is important that they have settled upon what they see as important for their members, their medical practitioners, to be protected and provided for within the envelope of conscientious objection.

In the circumstances where a registered health practitioner conscientiously objects to a termination of pregnancy, the bill requires that the practitioner immediately disclose their conscientious objection to the patient. Furthermore, in the case of an objection to performing a termination or providing advice about the performance of a termination, the bill requires the practitioner to either transfer the care of a patient to another registered health practitioner, who in the first practitioner's opinion can provide the requested service and does not hold a conscientious objection, or provide the patient with information on how to locate or contact such a registered health practitioner.

This should be in the manner of a prescribed form, as in New South Wales, with the contact details of the health department and/or QR code. In short, it provides for the right to conscientiously object. They simply have to disclose their conscientious objection to the patient and either refer them to someone else who can do it or provide them with a health service that can provide that referral and that it be in the prescribed form.

For the avoidance of doubt, the bill also provides that the right of conscientious objection does not extend to override any duty owed by a registered health practitioner to otherwise perform or assist in the performance of a termination in an emergency, or to provide aftercare or any ancillary treatment associated with the termination of pregnancy. Again, I thank the AMA for working with me personally, and with those who are advising, to make sure that we protect this circumstance where a medical practitioner wishes to be a conscientious objector and still make some provision for a service referral to the patients.

The bill also establishes an offence for unqualified persons who perform or assist in the performance of a termination. There is a clear public interest in protecting the public from dangerous and unsafe medical practices carried out by persons who are not authorised or qualified to carry out terminations of pregnancy. However, the bill also ensures that proceedings for the offence will only be able to be initiated with the written consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions. This is an important safeguard to ensure that proceedings for the offence will only be instituted in circumstances where there is a public interest for the offence to be prosecuted.

Related amendments have also been made to the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009 to expressly include coercive conduct in relation to the termination of pregnancy as an act of abuse within the meaning of the act. Put simply again, for someone who is going to exert pressure on someone who is pregnant either to have a child or not—that is, to have a termination or not—that coercive control will be part of intervention orders protection in our state with this amendment. Provision has also been made for the publication and use of information relating to the termination of pregnancy.

A further added requirement to be removed is that of residency, specifically that a pregnant person needs to be resident in the state for the prior two months. A mother contacted me recently as her pregnant daughter was overseas and unable to return due to COVID restrictions, and abortion was punishable by imprisonment there. I understand she was finally able to return to Australia but had to undergo a termination in Sydney as it was unlawful here. This is an unacceptable circumstance: that South Australians are required to be resident here.

The rejection of the measures in the bill will mean that women will be forced to travel interstate for the health care they need. I urge members to appreciate the significance of the distress, inconvenience and cost unreasonably placed on women in these circumstances. These reforms represent a significant step forward in removing the outdated barriers to access for women and

improving the availability of abortion health services across South Australia, particularly for rural and regional areas of the state.

I will address each of the concerns and the amendments that come before this house in greater detail during my second reading reply; and, of course, I want to listen carefully to those who raised concerns as to how they might be addressed by way of amendment. I just advise the house that I propose to respond in detail to those matters after listening carefully to those contributions, and, of course, they will doubtless be raised in the committee stage.

I must emphasise to the parliament from the outset that I will not outsource good lawmaking on social reform issues to the extremes of this parliament or any other extremes in the community. Members will be asked to give consideration to amendments, which I urge them to respectfully do, but to consider them in relation to the circumstances of the ill that they are attempting to cure.

Amendments put forward as a purported compromise that restrict access for women, I suggest, are being done to frustrate the bill. It may be, however, that there are amendments. I note that amendments have been tabled by the member for King—who I think takes her legislative obligations very seriously, as I would hope all members do—which ensure that the bill operates as intended, and I indicate my support for these and am grateful to her.

The fundamental premise of the bill is that members of parliament are being asked to trust women and to trust their medical team when it comes to the issue of late-term abortion. This is not a controversial position when we trust doctors with every other medical decision we make in our life. Decisions will not be made morally better, morally easier, simply because it becomes a justification within a statute.

I fundamentally reject the premise that this bill makes it easier to obtain a late-term abortion. I fundamentally reject that. It is a nonsense. There is no such thing as abortion to birth, because it is never medically appropriate—I repeat that: it is never medically appropriate—to terminate a healthy baby at term for no reason whatsoever. Find me a doctor who agrees to this, and I will refer him or her to the regulator myself.

I have also been accused, as have other proponents of this bill, of lacking the courage of my convictions for not explicitly legislating grounds for late-term termination. On the strong advice of my department, which I do value, including parliamentary counsel, let me say this: it is hardly controversial to say that, by prescribing a list of circumstances, we will inadvertently include circumstances we do not want and exclude circumstances we do want.

That is the challenge of lawmaking, and that is the consequence if it cannot be done accurately; and even the movers of amendments promoting this in another place could not adequately explain the consequences of that occurring with those amendments. So, I do urge members to think very clearly about the consequences and ask the question about what we are going to do in trying to be too prescriptive when they are asked to consider those matters.

I suggest that what is best is to allow doctors to use their best clinical judgement, which this bill allows, within the clinical standards within which they have to operate. I have been accused of many things in my career, but lack of courage is not one of them. I am always prepared to have a fight on a principle, and regardless of whether it turns out that I am right or wrong, I will put my views on the record and make the public and my constituents judge me accordingly.

Throughout my over eight-year partnership with the Premier, we have had many discussions about conscience matters. I trust his judgement and I think he trusts mine on a number of these issues. We consider them as part of our responsibility as being members of parliament here and in formulating policy in relation to social issues. I value his advice. I think I am stronger in the presentation of what I present to the parliament and to you for that, and I thank the Premier for that.

I also consider, not entirely consistent with what the South Australian Law Reform Institute recommended but in consultation, after significant consideration, with the clinicians and lawyers and the professional associations and with the widest possible consultation, that I am presenting to you something that will be workable, respectful and effective.

I am proud to serve in the Marshall government and, of course, to be labelled from time to time as a reformist Attorney-General, but today I am presenting to you a bill as the member for Bragg,

a bill in the mould of my predecessor, the first member for Bragg, Dr David Tonkin, who introduced in this very house, probably standing somewhere here, perhaps on the other side at that stage, the very first anti-discrimination law in Australia. I am proud to follow in his footsteps. I am proud to have the courage to be able to take on reform when we need to do that, but I do recognise the sensitivity of what is before us, and I again say how important it is that we are respectful of that—all of us.

I suggest that this bill does reflect the best clinical practice, promotes patient decision-making and respects the individual choice and autonomy of the patient while ensuring the appropriate safeguarding measures are in place where necessary. These are all fundamentally liberal principles in the form of a bill acceptable to Liberal MPs, as seen most recently in New South Wales.

I wish to thank my department, especially Emily Carr and Joanna Martin, for their tireless work, and the staff of parliamentary counsel. It is an enormous body of legislative work, and I thank them advance because the parliament will have the benefit of their continued advice during committee, as was the case in the Legislative Council, to ensure that members in considering these matters have much information available to them in considering the bill and/or any amendment.

I also place on the record my great appreciation to the AMA, the Law Society of South Australia, the staff at the Pregnancy Advisory Centre and the Women's and Children's Hospital, SALRI, Professor Rosalie Grivell from the royal college, and SAAAC for their advice and assistance. It has been a long period to develop this bill and I think it has been valuably contributed to by all of those and many others, and I thank them for that contribution.

I strongly commend the bill to members here and I seek leave to table the explanation of the clauses, which I understand I need to do because I understand you have not received this from the other place. Apparently they are already in the possession of the parliament, so I table that.

The SPEAKER: I take this opportunity, in the somewhat unusual circumstances of a private member's bill being debated in government time, to draw attention to standing order 113 and, in particular, the provisions for time and the provision for the nomination of a lead speaker. I will leave that matter in the hands of honourable members and indicate that, unless and until a member indicates they are the lead speaker in accord with standing order 113, the time limits otherwise applicable to that standing order will apply to the debate in the second reading.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of clarification: do I assume that means that, unless someone identifies they are a lead speaker for a group within the parliament, they all have 20 minutes?

The SPEAKER: On the point of order, what I would propose to do in this regard, mindful that the standing order refers specifically to 'the Leader of the Opposition or a member deputed by him or her has the capacity to speak on unlimited time', I would leave that for the house for the time being—the mover having spoken with unlimited time—and just indicate that I will not seek an indication now or from any speaker about that. If there is no such indication, then a speaker will have the time allocated for debate in the usual course, so it would be 20 minutes.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:36): I, too, rise to speak in support of the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020, which seeks to update antiquated legislation that deems the termination of pregnancy a criminal act here in South Australia. In doing so, I wholeheartedly acknowledge the mover of this bill (the member for Bragg), who is indeed brave, those who supported this bill in the other place and the thousands of women and the people who supported them, who campaigned 50 years ago for change and on whose shoulders we stand as we debate this bill before us today.

Together, we consider much-needed modern social reform for South Australian women. In rising to speak, I also acknowledge that for many members of parliament, and indeed many members of our South Australian community, this issue can generate deep emotion and provoke intense thought. It is certainly an issue that I have deeply contemplated and one that elicits strong feelings for me.

It is right that in this debate, as in every debate, our thinking and our emotions shape our words and actions and that we listen to the thoughts and the feelings of others. However, it is also absolutely utterly crucial that, as we contemplate this issue as legislators, we also base our words, our decisions and our votes on facts and that we reject all to do with this issue that is not based in fact. It is our absolute responsibility as legislators to do so.

It is a fact, as was the case in 1969—the last time this matter was substantially addressed—that advances in medicine and in our community have been made and that changes to our laws are required to reflect these developments. It is a fact that the developments we are progressing through this bill are reflected in other jurisdictions. Decriminalisation of abortion has occurred in every other Australian state and territory without an increase in the number of terminations, including the very rare instances of late-term terminations.

Ending a pregnancy is a deeply personal decision, and any associated trauma should not be exacerbated by it being deemed a criminal act. We must approach these issues with a deep trust in women and indeed with a deep trust in her healthcare professionals. If women are faced with the difficult decision to terminate a pregnancy, we should demonstrate love, kindness and compassion and never, ever judgement. As we contemplate this legislation, we should also demonstrate love, kindness, truth and compassion, never judgement.

I know that many from faith communities have put forward varying views about this bill and that many have, in turn, spoken about those varying views from faith communities. As a person of faith, my view is that demonstrating truth, love, kindness and compassion in our decision-making, in our consideration of the facts presented to us, including in relation to this bill, must prevail. I support this bill with those things in my mind and in my heart and with deep thought about the facts that we all know.

We know safe access to abortion is widely supported across our nation and in South Australia and it has been for many, many years. Gallup polling consistently shows just 20 per cent of Australians oppose decriminalisation. It is over time that our parliament acknowledges this and passes legislation that reflects today's community sentiment.

We are not here to debate a woman's right to have an abortion. That argument was had and settled in the affirmative decades ago. What we are here to debate is the removal of abortion from the criminal code into health legislation and what that actually signifies. What the passing of this bill will signify is that we, as a parliament and as a community, do indeed, as we rightly should, trust women and trust healthcare professionals.

The fact is that the number of terminations in South Australia has been steadily declining for more than 20 years. Much of the opposition to this bill, including through many letters, emails, representations and telephone calls to my office, has focused on the very emotive issue of late-term terminations. I wholeheartedly support people respectfully taking the opportunity to have their say and I thank everyone for doing so—that is what our democracy is all about enabling.

I say also today that I have contemplated carefully correspondence from both supporters and opponents of this bill. I have extensively read and listened to medical and legal experts and have determined, based on the facts they have presented to me, that late-term terminations are, and will continue to be, extremely rare. They are only ever undertaken when a woman and a medical team agree it is medically appropriate not to continue with a pregnancy.

Late-term terminations are simply not, nor will they ever be in the future, undertaken in anything but the most serious, complex and often heartbreaking circumstances. Terminations after 20 weeks are very rare and almost non-existent beyond 24 weeks. This bill will absolutely not facilitate such procedures taking place more frequently than they do now.

As they do now, healthcare teams will continue to act in accordance with regulations and laws and late-term abortions will continue not to be performed unless deemed medically appropriate by two doctors. As the member for Bragg has said, nothing in this bill enables abortion on demand, nor abortion up to birth. People seeking terminations do so often in very difficult circumstances and never, ever just because of a change of mind. I call on members of this house to trust people going through this extraordinarily difficult situation and to think of them with love, with kindness, with compassion and absolutely without judgement.

This bill will not enable sex selection. As I have said, as is the case with every other health procedure, a termination will only be undertaken for medically appropriate reasons with consideration of the medical risks. The Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1995 requires healthcare professionals to discuss all treatment options with women as part of obtaining informed consent. This will absolutely not change as a result of this bill.

This bill contains protections for the small number of conscientious objectors within the medical profession who do not wish to provide these services due to their own personal beliefs. If performing a termination conflicts with those personal beliefs, a practitioner can object to undertaking or assisting with the procedure, inform the person and take whatever steps are necessary to assist with the transfer of their care to another registered health practitioner who does not hold such an objection.

It is a fact that this bill will not open up terminations being performed by anyone other than qualified and registered healthcare practitioners. Nothing in this bill removes or reduces Therapeutic Goods Administration requirements for a registered medical practitioner to prescribe or manage early medical abortion medicines.

The bill will amend the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009 to specifically recognise coercive conduct in relation to the termination of pregnancy as an act of abuse within the meaning of the act. This shockingly common form of domestic abuse involves women being forced by partners to either have an abortion or to continue with the pregnancy or to get pregnant or to not get pregnant. This is an important change that will hopefully further deter this kind of insidious abuse. This bill will also improve access to early abortion services for women in rural and remote areas.

In this debate I once again urge people to be guided by compassion, love, kindness and fact. Through various materials we have heard this bill will lead to a surge in gender selection. It will not. We have heard doctors will be forced to provide abortion against their own will and conscience. They will not. We have heard there will be abortion on demand up to birth. There will not be. It is a fact, however, that that particular assertion can cause harm to women who have made or who are making a difficult decision to terminate a pregnancy.

The two heartbreaking examples explored in senior *Advertiser* journalist Rebecca DiGirolamo's piece on Sunday highlighted the difficulty, heartbreak and devastation felt by women who have had to decide to terminate a pregnancy. While their stories differed, both women had to face difficult decisions. I would urge members to read these compelling stories from these two incredibly brave women in Rebecca's article. It is not easy to talk about such issues, and I commend them for doing so.

As I have said previously, the absolute, clear intent of this bill is to remove abortion from the criminal code. This bill has been drafted in consultation with the very medical experts that lead reproductive health care in this state, and we need to also trust their expertise and judgement. This bill is about saying to women, 'We trust you and your healthcare teams with decisions around your own reproductive health care.' It is absolutely imperative our parliament decides to instil that trust in women and in their healthcare team.

In making that decision, our parliament will be aligning with jurisdictions around the country. In making that decision, our parliament will be sending a clear message to our community that we are prepared to progress change that enables respect and trust for women and leading healthcare professionals and legal experts. In making that decision, our parliament will reflect the expectations of a modern, kind, compassionate community. I urge members to support this bill.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:48): I rise to speak in favour of this piece of legislation, but I do so with a weight of knowing how morally significant these kinds of decisions are. Not only are they a matter of conscience, which means that we each individually must make up our minds, but they are complicated and there is no easy and obvious answer to the questions that these issues pose.

In saying that, I give my respect to the people who have raised their opposition to some elements or even to all of this bill. Although there are exceptions—of extremists in our society—on the whole people who have raised concerns inside this parliament and out have done so from a position that says that they care deeply about the lives of women and the lives of children, and I can only respect coming from that place in considering how one should approach the vexed question of termination of pregnancy.

It is also complex for people who have never had a child but love them, for people who have never had a child but want them and for people who have had a child that was very much wanted and loved, but there are also people who are not so fortunate as to be in the situation of being pregnant with a child that they want and a child that they know to be healthy. We in this place do not

get to live in the world that we wish were true; we get to live in the world that is and to do our best in the face of that. That requires us to approach these complex questions with a sensitivity to the reality of people's lives and also a respect for the limits to our knowledge and our capacity to make decisions in the detail of how people will live.

What do I mean by that? I do not think we can envisage every circumstance a woman finds herself in when pregnant, and I resist amendments that seek to imagine when something is okay and when it is not, in that level of detail. I think we are better off stepping back and taking a moral position that we believe in minimising harm and that we trust the medical profession and we trust that it has sufficient checks and balances to make those wise decisions alongside women, when there are detailed complexities that we cannot envisage.

I support this bill largely as is. In fact, I support it as is, but I am prepared to contemplate amendments that have been put forward that do not do any harm to this idea that we ought to be empowering women and trusting the medical profession. We need to reach a position on abortion that gives women in circumstances that many of us have not experienced, or would not wish to experience, the easiest and most comfortable approach to terminating a pregnancy that is not able to be sustained. In doing that, we need to empower the medical profession to guide women through and to make judgements on how those pregnancies can be terminated safely and with the minimum of harm.

I believe that this bill substantially does that. As I said, I think there are some amendments that can be contemplated and have been, indeed, filed, that support rather than do harm to that concept, and I am considering supporting them. What I do not support is an attempt by parliament to push its way into a level of detail that risks consequences that have not been contemplated and that will harm the women involved and cause more complexity for the doctors.

I think many of us—I certainly do not speak for everyone in this chamber, but many of us—have reached a place of being comfortable with the idea of termination in the early weeks of pregnancy under circumstances that are between a woman and her doctor and that that ought to be done in a way that does not put up barriers to access for women who may be living remotely and to women who are otherwise unable to easily have access to two doctors.

There has been a lot of concern, though, about what happens in the late stages of pregnancy. It seems to me that anyone involved in those discussions and those considerations is going through some of the most difficult moments of their life, particularly for the parents but also for the doctors, who, after all, are not in the medical profession to hurt anybody, still less a small child, a baby.

When they are in those circumstances, they are taking their best approach, they are doing their best to think wisely and considerately and sensibly, and the last thing they need is for parliament to be putting additional burdens on them that make that job harder. I have always said that the only amendments I would consider would not add additional burdens and additional complexity to what is already a difficult and complex time.

I would like to pay tribute to the advocates of this bill, the extraordinary people—largely women but also men—in the medical profession and outside, who have said to us, 'Please make this more straightforward and help us reduce the chance of harm to women going through these circumstances and also to the medical profession involved in this terribly complicated and difficult time.'

I have chosen, therefore, to have the balance of every decision I have made about this bill and about possible amendments to be on the side of those advocates. I pay tribute to the extraordinary effort they have gone to to make sure that people are informed, that there is scientific evidence before them and that there is an attempt to remove hyperbole from the discussion. What we need to be doing is concentrating on what is real, what is likely, what is possible and how we can legislate in this place to be as respectful as possible for women who are experiencing, as I say, what must be one of the most complex and difficult moments in their lives.

I pay tribute to the Attorney, who has come forward with this piece of legislation and shown courage in defending the arguments within it. I pay tribute to everyone in this chamber who has participated and will participate in a respectful way, but I will be guided by what I believe to be right. I had a conversation with a man from my electorate outside the Semaphore supermarket recently.

He is opposed to this bill, but we spent most of the conversation agreeing with each other. We agree that it is a moral issue, we agree that it is a sensitive issue, but we came down on different sides in ultimately what is the wisest and kindest way to deal with this.

I would like to conclude my contribution with that word 'kindness'. There has been, with some of the opposition that has been raised, a view that there are doctors who are eager to undertake terminations that are not medically appropriate and that there are women who enter these considerations lightly. I do not believe that to be true. I believe the people in those circumstances ought to be treated with kindness by this parliament and ought to be allowed to treat each other with kindness rather than seek to navigate through overly complex legislative mazes put in place by people who do not believe that they are capable of making wise decisions themselves.

As difficult as it is for every single one of us, and particularly for those who care so very deeply about the next generations and who have had the joy of having children they love, I will be supporting this bill.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:57): I rise to make a contribution on this Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020. I indicate at the outset that I would first like to make some comments in the broad about this debate and about this issue more generally and then seek to get to the specifics of some of the bill later in my contribution.

This is a vexed topic. Because of the advent of modern science and modern medicine and of a whole series of advances that have been made, it is a question that we must grapple with in the same way that we grapple with all these life issues, whether that be around voluntary euthanasia or the like, because, as a human race, we have come much further than we could have expected even 50, 100 or 200 years ago.

There are arguments on both sides of this debate that are well worn and well understood by most, if not all, in this chamber, and I do not propose to go over those again. However, there is something fundamental about the concepts we will debate clause by clause through the committee stage of this bill. At its most fundamental, this is a debate about when life begins. Is it something that begins at conception? Is it something that only begins at birth? Or is it somewhere in between, some arbitrary line?

At its most fundamental, this is a debate that goes to the heart of the evolution of the human race. Our desire to preserve the quality and quantity of life, to use science and advance science in order to prolong life, whether that be for our elderly or for the unborn or the newborn, is something that we as a human race have strived towards since the very beginning. Indeed, that desire, that need to see the continuation of our race and of the human race, has driven us and helped us to evolve to the point where we are today. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE (EXPIRY) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL (COSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (OMNIBUS) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

RADIATION PROTECTION AND CONTROL BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 770 residents of South Australia requesting the house to oppose the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020.

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 1,060 residents of South Australia requesting the house to oppose the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020.

*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 Speaker—

Auditor-General Reports—Passenger transport service contracts: Heavy rail—
Report 4 of 2021 [Ordered to be published]

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Remuneration Tribunal—
2021 No. 1 Determination—Berri Country Magistrate Housing Allowance
2021 No. 1 Report—Berri Country Magistrate Housing Allowance

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

Department for Child Protection Review—Report of Independent Inquiry Report 2020-21
Summary Offences Act 1953—
Dangerous Area Declarations Pursuant to Section 83B Report for Period
1 October 2020-31 December 2020
Road Block Authorisations Pursuant to Section 74B Report for Period
1 October 2020-31 December 2020
The Motor Vehicle Insurance and Repair Industry—Response to the Eighth Report of the
Economic and Finance Committee dated 19 January 2021 Government Response
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fair Trading—Fuel Pricing Information

By the Minister for Planning and Local Government (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—Designated Day—COVID-19
Local Council By-Laws—
Berri Barmera Council—No. 7—Local Government Land Amendment
City of Marion—No. 10—Shopping Trolley Amenity (Exemptions) Variation

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

Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group—Annual Report 2019-20
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy—Regulated Substance

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances—Poisons—Storage of Pentobarbital

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

Charter of Rights for Children and Young People in Care, Review of—Report by the guardian for Children and Young People Report

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fire and Emergency Services—Miscellaneous

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. D.K. Basham)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Forestry—
Fee Notice
Miscellaneous

Ministerial Statement

HUGO, MR J.H.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: It is with great sadness that I inform the house of the recent passing of Mr James Henry Hugo OAM on Friday 12 February. Mr Hugo was a distinguished, respected and much-loved member of the Department for Correctional Services, a department he served diligently in a range of capacities for over 50 years.

Mr Hugo commenced his training as a temporary prison officer on 18 September 1967, initially posted to the Yatala Labour Prison before moving to the Adelaide Gaol in 1970. On 27 February 1969, Mr Hugo became a permanent correctional officer. In October 1986, he was appointed to the role of senior correctional officer at the Adelaide Remand Centre and became a unit supervisor on 1 October 1991. He acted in many roles during the 1990s, including home detention supervisor in 1992, unit manager at Yatala in 1994 and, for a short time, division manager at the Yatala Labour Prison.

Despite his resignation due to ill health a year prior, in a sign of his unique spirit Mr Hugo returned to DCS in 1996 as a visiting inspector. In 2002, he was appointed visiting inspector coordinator, becoming responsible for managing the team of visiting inspectors across South Australian prisons. He truly embodied the role, advocating on behalf of offenders, reviewing the conditions of our prisons and delivering monthly reports without missing a beat.

Within his local community, Mr Hugo served as a justice of the peace and provided services to a number of councils and community groups across Adelaide, including Campbelltown and Burnside. In fact, I met Mr Hugo in 2002 through the Lions Youth of the Year Quest. In November last year, I had the honour of opening the James Hugo Complex at the Yatala Labour Prison. I was particularly thrilled that Mr Hugo could attend. The James Hugo Complex comprises the Northern Metropolitan Business Centre and Learning Academy. Both buildings provide critical support services and expanded training capabilities.

Mr Hugo gave more than 50 years of distinguished service to DCS. His wit, charm and many stories will be missed. During his time with DCS, he received a number of awards, including most recently the Order of Australia Medal in the 2021 Australia Day Honours. He also received an Australia Day Achievement Award in 2019 and the Premier's award for outstanding volunteer services in 2008. In 2019 he was awarded a 50 year service medal from the Department for Correctional Services.

Despite his declining health in recent years, Mr Hugo never missed an opportunity to visit a prison, attend a Christmas party or the DCS annual staff awards. Always enjoying a cup of tea, he would comment with a sly smile that he was still breathing whenever I asked about his health.

Mr Hugo often lamented the number of ministers he had served, and I am confident there are many in this place with fond memories of Mr Hugo. He exemplified the Public Service with his passion for—as he described—the mad, the bad and the sad. Mr Hugo's experience is unparalleled, as was his fondness for the many staff with DCS. He is well known to have hosted personal tours of the old Adelaide Gaol for interested staff and their families.

Mr Hugo loved his wife, his family, the occasional hot chips and a nice glass of white wine. The corridors of Yatala, the phone line to central office and the hearts of many will be all the emptier with the passing of this fine gentleman. My thoughts and condolences are with Mr Hugo's wife, Faye, and family during this time.

Parliament House Matters

CHAMBER PHOTOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER: Members, I have granted permission to a photographer to be present and to take still photography from the public gallery during this afternoon's proceedings.

Question Time

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:11): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How can you continue as a minister after the review by Paul Rice QC into your department, which specifically identified your significant failure, and with your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: The Rice review states, quote:

It was crucial for the Minister to tell the Department that she wanted to know about the serious sexual abuse of children under guardianship. This was a significant failure on the Minister's part.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): Mr Speaker, as you would be more than aware, the decision regarding who is in cabinet and who is not in cabinet is actually, on our side of the house, the responsibility of the leader of the parliamentary team, and at this point in time that is me, has been me—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for eight years—a very stable leadership. Can I make it very clear, sir, that the minister enjoys my full confidence, as does the chief executive of this department, the Department for Child Protection.

We have moved very swiftly as a government in response to the issue regarding the failure within the department to progress information captured in that department through the ranks to the deputy chief executive, the chief executive, and ultimately to the minister. In fact, it was the Attorney-General who late last year appointed His Honour Paul Rice QC to conduct an inquiry into the situation within the department, and we received that report last week.

We very gratefully received that report. It was done in quick time. I think it was a very thorough report, which found that there were opportunities to significantly improve the reporting within that department. There were six recommendations. We have accepted all those recommendations. In fact, we have gone further than just accepting those recommendations: we will establish a significant incident reporting unit within the department, which will be headed by a nominee from the Crown Solicitor's Office.

It will be a very important role, making sure that all the critical incident reporting is done in that department, and in fact that person will actually report to the chief executive of my department, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

We are taking this matter extraordinarily seriously. I do want to acknowledge that this is a particularly difficult area of public policy. I think that there have been some very significant improvements made in this department—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —over the last three years. A huge amount of work has been done. Previous inquiries have found—

Ms Stinson: That's why you should get someone who's up to the task.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that in fact this was a department in crisis. That was what was found in recent reports when the previous government were on the Treasury benches. There was no such finding in this report given by Paul Rice QC, but there were significant opportunities for improving the critical incident reporting and that is why we are acting very swiftly and very transparently. We were very, very quick to commission that review, get that review, consider that review—

Mr Picton: Spin, spin, spin.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —table that report with very limited redaction in the parliament this morning and, most importantly, put an immediate action plan in place. I have every confidence that the minister, the chief executive and that department will be able to adequately respond to those recommendations, those suggestions, as a matter of urgency and we will make sure that the cabinet remains focussed on this issue and that the resources will be provided to make sure that that occurs.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Reynell, I call to order the member for West Torrens, I call to order the member for Kaurana, I call to order the member for Playford and I call to order and warn the member for Badcoe. The member for Reynell.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the minister agree with Mr Rice that she should have told the department that she wanted to know about the serious sexual abuse of children under guardianship?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:16): I thank the member for the question. As was made plainly clear in recommendations 1 and 2, if the significant incident reporting is working well, it would clearly identify what should be in as a significant incident and the reporting process. Judge Rice found that the process was unclear and ambiguous and difficult, and that the staff weren't aware of the policy. So if the policy works well, which we are rewriting the policy and being explicit and very clear as to what should be included as a significant incident, and the—

Mr Brown: How many times does it have to happen?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —reporting procedure, there will be an extensive education rollout that will be overseen by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment's office—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —and therefore it will be implicit what is expected to be done and that will then flow through, and I will be notified along with the CE and the deputy CE.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Reynell, I call to order the member for Cheltenham, I call to order the member for Wright, I warn the member for Playford, I warn the member for West Torrens and I call to order the leader. The member for Reynell.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister now provided written instructions to her chief executive and her department that she must be told about criminal offending against children in care?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order: I suggest that there's actually information in that but I am happy to take the answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just saying—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:18): Thank you, sir. The question raises the—

Ms Stinson: But she just called a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I raised what the issue is, and I said I will take the answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader on a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Mr Speaker, I would just like to seek some clarification as to what your adjudication was on the minister's point of order.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has sought the call. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As I understood the question in relation to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned. The member for West Torrens is warned for a second time. The member for Wright is warned. The deputy leader has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It may not be immediately apparent to members in the house but perhaps I will just make this clear. The chief executive of all of the departments is employed by the Premier. As announced today, in relation to the obligations that are recommended to be undertaken for duties to be undertaken by the chief executive, they include specifically recommendations 1 and 2 in relation to serious criminal offences and also matters which (No. 2) might raise the attention of the media.

Both of those recommendations suggest that it's appropriate for the chief executive of the department, employed by the Premier, to undertake a review and republication of certain procedures and guidelines. That has been fully accepted by the government and is being undertaken. Indeed, I am aware that the Premier has issued a letter to all chief executives in respect of any incident procedure in relation to their departments to undertake that.

But in relation to this specific inquiry by Mr Rice, which was to obviously assess the circumstances surrounding the incidents resulting in the McIntyre and McIntosh sentencing and

imprisonment in relation to the teenage girls involved, that issue was under scrutiny by Mr Rice, he gave the recommendations and those recommendations are being implemented in full.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Nothing to see here, all okay. Minister has done a great job.

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

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:20): Supplementary: when did the minister issue those written instructions, and will she table them in the house?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:21): I refer to my previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is taking expert advice—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for King will resume her seat. The member for West Torrens will leave for 20 minutes under standing order 137A.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The member for King has the call.

Ms LUETHEN: My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is taking expert advice to drive down power prices?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:22): Thank you to the member for King, who is incredibly diligent on behalf of her constituents to make sure that costs of living are driven down all the time. One of the best ways that we can drive down the cost of living for the member for King's constituents—in fact all of our constituents—is by pushing down the price of electricity, and that is exactly what we are doing.

We are doing it, as the member for King asked about in her question, not by guessing, not by playing politics, not by doing some of the things that those opposite did when they were in power: we are actually working with industry. We are working with generators, with consumers, with distribution and transmission companies. We are working with every aspect of the industry and we are taking expert advice from the market bodies as well. Interestingly, it's working. We have just released a report yesterday that showed that since 1 July there has been a \$111 reduction per year for the average South Australian electricity price.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The year before, it was \$96, and the year before, it was \$62. Since coming to government, our policies are working. The average residential cost of electricity prices available for consumers have gone down by \$269 per year.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: That's in stark contrast with what we saw four and five years ago under the previous administration. In two years, electricity prices by exactly the same measure went up by \$420 per year. In three years, with our policies, based on expert advice

and getting on, doing the job, implementing things, electricity prices have come down by \$269 per year for all consumers. It's hardly surprising because you know what we didn't do—

Mr Brown: Which decade?

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —was commit \$600 million of taxpayers' money for dirty diesel generators to never be used. We didn't do that. What we are actually doing is leasing them into the market—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —so that they can run on gas, not on dirty diesel. They can be available every day of the year, unlike—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —our predecessors, who required—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —that they not be used every day of the year. The largest home battery scheme in the world on a per capita basis is being rolled out. Our household battery schemes, the South Australian government's Virtual Power Plant, has 221 megawatt hours of capacity into the system, working every day to support South Australians. Not only those households who have the equipment but also those households who don't have the equipment are benefiting from our policies: addressing low demand in the middle of the day, taking the peak off high demand in the evening and pushing wholesale prices down.

Our policies are working. Our policies are working because we didn't pursue them for political purposes like our predecessors. We took advice, we developed policies from opposition, we are implementing them in government and they are working.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Our grid-scale storage system is working, our household battery scheme is working, our demand management trials are working and our progress towards an interconnector with New South Wales will add another \$100 per year reduction to the numbers I have already provided.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Reynell, I call to order the member for Hurtle Vale, I call to order the member for Colton and I call to order the member for Newland. I warn the member for Lee, I call to order the Minister for Education and I call to order the Premier. The member for Reynell.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Who was correct in telling Paul Rice QC the account of the meeting on 22 September last year following the sentencing of McIntyre? You or your chief executive? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Rice stated in his report, and I quote:

The Minister told the inquiry that after the media coverage of McIntyre's sentencing, she gave specific instruction to the chief executive that she was to be told in advance of sentencing for any such similar matters.

Mr Rice went on to report:

It seemed the chief executive may have had a different memory of the meeting than the Minister.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:27): In the report, which I commissioned—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —as Attorney-General and in which Mr Rice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will resume her seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is entitled to be heard in silence. The Deputy Premier has the call and is entitled to be heard in silence. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I just confirm that the report referred to was commissioned by me as Attorney-General and provided to me by Mr Rice QC in response to our request that not only he make the inquiry as per the terms of reference provided but, in addition to that, he provide that as expeditiously as possible. I am pleased to report, of course, that that is precisely what has happened.

In the course of that, I confirm that if the member would like to review the report she will note that both the minister and the chief executive were interviewed, along with another long list of witnesses that are identified there. The transcript has not been provided to me in respect of the report that I have received from Mr Rice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Reynell, the member for Playford will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Is the Attorney-General's decision in the wake of the Rice review to establish a significant incident reporting unit outside of your department an admission of your failure and that of your department?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:29): I thank the member for the question. Can I just say that there is no decision of me as Attorney-General in respect of this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member has indicated that this is a decision of me as Attorney-General. It is not. It is a decision of the cabinet, and the consequence of the cabinet decision is that six recommendations given by Mr Rice have been completely accepted by the government. and indeed we have outlined—I won't repeat them again—the three extra areas of oversight to ensure that his recommendations are complied with and are undertaken successfully to ensure the outcomes that he has recommended, so there is no decision of me as Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Reynell, I warn for a second time the member for Badcoe. I warn for a second time the member for Lee.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:30): Are you as minister no longer trusted with the most sensitive information on child protection?

Members interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: It's a supplementary.

Mr Whetstone: You can't read supplementaries. Don't read them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HILDYARD: I'm allowed to write notes. I can write notes, actually.

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:30): Well, if the member is asking me if I can be trusted, I refer to my previous answer.

SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall government is assisting the freight industry to stay safe on the South Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:31): I thank the member for Kavel for his question and note that he's a fierce advocate for his community in the Adelaide Hills and also the fact that his community does rely very heavily on the South Eastern Freeway.

The Marshall government is investing tens of millions of dollars into upgrading the South Eastern Freeway to improve safety and create more jobs, but I will come back to the more jobs and the project in a moment. It's not just commuters, I should say, who rely on the South Eastern Freeway. It's our freight industry that supports thousands of jobs here in South Australia.

I would like to acknowledge how crucially important the freight industry is to South Australia. Those opposite may not care for them. We know that they are incredibly important, especially during COVID-19. They have done an outstanding job to make sure that we have kept our supermarket shelves stocked and kept people operating here in South Australia.

Steve Shearer at SARTA has been working very closely with the state government, and I thank him and his organisation, along with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and the Marshall government. They have been in lock step with making sure the freight industry continues on strong through COVID-19.

Before I continue, those opposite may not be familiar with the South Eastern Freeway. After all, it is after the tollgate. Of course, we know that the South Eastern Freeway feeds a lot of very important electorates—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the member for Hammond's electorate; your electorate, sir; the member for Kavel, we have mentioned him; the member for Finniss; and also the member for MacKillop. Of course, it goes all the way to Mount Gambier as well.

I mentioned that the Marshall government is investing millions of dollars into the South Eastern Freeway. We are building what matters. Of course, the Managed Motorway project has just been completed, adding an extra lane from Crafers to Stirling to remove some congestion along there and improve safety again for the people who use that stretch of road.

We are investing \$35 million into resurfacing the South Eastern Freeway and this will generate more jobs from the tollgate up to Stirling. This is a very important project, improving safety on the South Eastern Freeway. We know this will be a project that will cause some inconvenience. We ask people to bear with us because we are building what matters for the people of South Australia.

I'm told by the trucking industry and the people who live in the Adelaide Hills, including the member for Kavel, that this stretch of road hasn't been touched for more than 20 years. In fact, I think Di Laidlaw from the upper house was the minister in this place when that was last resurfaced and had some improvements done—that was the last time it was touched. It was ignored by those opposite for such a long period of time, it's degrading now and we are fixing it, building what matters.

As I have said, as well as helping the freight industry improve safety at every turn, it was my pleasure to be at the SARTA headquarters with the Premier and the Minister for Innovation and Skills to launch the Heavy Vehicle Simulator, a package worth some \$450,000. We have partnered again with the federal government, the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and, of course, the Minister for Innovation and Skills has invested in this as well through his department, along with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

What this new simulator will be able to do—and again, a lot of this is put together here in South Australia—is allow the industry to go out and help educate people on how to drive, in particular on the South Eastern Freeway, safely. It will be upskilling our truck drivers that have been on the road for a long period of time or new truck drivers at the same time. This is a great piece of kit.

We know we need to build what matters and build those important roads to make sure that our road network is as safe as possible. Then there's also the education and the training, and that is what we're delivering as well to these people that work on our roads. This will make the trucking industry safer, it will make people that use our roads safer and we are continuing to build those piece of infrastructure that will make South Australia safer. Right across our state, we're investing billions of dollars into making our roads safer so that we have a better transport system here in South Australia.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Will the minister now be notified by the Chief Executive of DPC of critical incidents, or will the Premier be advised first?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:35): I thank the member for her question. As we have already discussed, we have accepted all six recommendations of the Rice review. The first two are regarding the identification of what is a significant incident and what should be included in the reporting process. The report found that the existing or the current reporting process is overly complex and ambiguous and that the staff weren't even aware that it existed. We will be fixing that and there will be oversight through the office of public sector employment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —and both the Premier and myself would be notified in the future once that is set up. Currently, I have regular meetings with my CE and I am notified of all significant incidents.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Reynell, I warn the member for Wright for a second time. I warn the member for Hurtle Vale.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. When will your department be capable of running the significant incident reporting unit?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:36): I did make a ministerial statement this morning, but I will just repeat for the benefit of the member. The process to be undertaken to support recommendations 1 and 2—that is, the chief executive's role in redelivering a new, concise, clear and unambiguous set of guidelines and protocols—is to be assisted by the establishment of a significant incident unit to be headed by a nominee of the Crown Solicitor's Office.

In short, that enables someone of senior legal capacity to assist in the drafting and development of such guidelines. As the minister has pointed out in other forums today, it quite clearly was a circumstance where, post the DeBelle inquiry, the review of the operational protocols was such that it provided, from Mr Rice's perspective in reviewing all of these, a complex and ambiguous set of protocols, which was a key element in the lack of application and understanding of those personnel who are expected to employ those and comply with them.

Whilst Mr Rice doesn't reflect on any individual member of the department, he makes it clear that they don't work and they can't work and they need to be remedied. To support that, the government have endorsed the establishment of the unit on a permanent basis—not on an ad hoc basis but on a permanent basis—and, further, that there be two aspects of that: the redrafting exercise, with the support and assistance of the headed nominee from the Crown Solicitor's Office, and the compliance of the data to review when significant incidents are received and analysed by the unit.

All the compliance aspects of that are to be supported by that purpose. That role is to include the provision of reporting up to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the head of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. As I remind the members, all the chief executives of the departments in the government are employed by the Premier. That has been the case, I think, for some 15 or 20 years or so. From memory, I think it went back to Premier Olsen, as that regime of employment.

Whilst the Rice review doesn't refer to that actual legal relationship, that is something that we have employed as a government to ensure that not only the department is operational in this regard but that every department that is involved in incident reviews has that relationship at the department head with the Premier of that employment so that there is oversight in itself of all of the departments.

SAFE AND STRONG SCHOOLS

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government has been keeping South Australian schools safe and strong?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:40): I thank the member for the question. It is a tremendously important question because at the heart of what we do in the education department is every student, every child and young person, in every school and preschool in South Australia getting every opportunity to learn the enabler of a successful and happy life is of course so dependent on a good education.

Throughout the coronavirus pandemic around the world, what we have seen is that, for students, whether vulnerable or not, their education has been disrupted. It's been particularly damaging to the futures of many vulnerable children and young people around the world, children whose academic growth has been dramatically disenfranchised through being kept home from school, through lockdowns of extended periods of time.

Of course, the extraordinarily powerful activity that is learning and education has been disrupted for months, potentially for years. We know in our schools, even in South Australia, we have students who don't get the support that they ideally need at home, where it is not necessarily the safest place for them to be, where many students, who we need to be at school as much as possible, can not only get their learning but also their wellbeing supported.

In other states, and indeed in other countries, where they have had extended and protracted lockdowns and no opportunity for them to be at school, that has had a dramatic and deleterious effect on those vulnerable students. Indeed, many university studies over the last six months have already demonstrated the impact of the loss of learning that has happened for all students where this lockdown has happened. There are some students who have really taken to learning at home.

But I tell you what: it is so hard for teachers to effectively teach literacy skills, reading and writing skills, to a five or a six or a seven-year-old child over a computer screen. It's really hard for a 17 or 18 year old, doing year 11 or 12, trying to get their science practicals in a proper place to get

their assessments done in time for their year 12 marks, to be able to be assessed from a home environment without access to specialist facilities and labs.

The South Australian education department has worked extraordinarily hard alongside, in close collaboration, with the Catholic education system and the Independent schools sector in South Australia to ensure that we are working with SA Police and Professor Nicola Spurrier. We are operating on the health advice provided by SA Health. We have been able to keep schools open as much as anyone.

In fact, South Australian students through 2020 had the least disruption to their schooling pretty much of any students in Australia, and that puts them pretty much in line with any students in the world. We had the loss of a week at the end of term 1 for some professional learning opportunities for teachers and we had some days in November, obviously. We also had some schools where there was a significant impact because of a localised infection issue, and those staff responded so well.

Across the education department and in government and non-government schools, our teachers and our education staff responded quickly, nimbly, deftly and with the interests of the children and young people in our schools and preschools at the heart of everything that they did, and we are all, I know, so grateful to them. But what they have achieved is a continuity of learning throughout the school year, last year, and that continues this year.

There will continue to be challenges. We are very pleased that most of the restrictions that were in place during 2020 have now been able to be lifted in our schools and preschools. There are some site-specific concerns in some areas that remain and there are some activities that remain. We have introduced QR codes in all of our schools and preschools, and indeed all of our schools and non-government schools now have those for staff and adult visitors.

SA Health, I'm very pleased to say, is very pleased with the attendance data that means that for our students it's not necessary. We are continuing to have increased cleaning. We are continuing to have increased provision of hygiene products. Our education staff and our education department and the Marshall Liberal government are working every day to keep our schools safe and strong to deliver world-class education for children and young people here in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The time allowed for answering the question has expired. I note that there are multiple time clocks in operation. To the extent that there is a problem with one, I will monitor the other.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. When were you first advised about each of the five cases of girls in care who are currently pregnant, as advised by Paul Rice QC in his report tabled today?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:45): I thank the member for the question. As I have stated before, I have regular meetings with my CE where I am updated on any pregnancies now, so I am fully aware of those children.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will cease interjecting. The leader has the call.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): A supplementary question to the Minister for Child Protection: does the minister know when she was first advised of the five children referred to in the Rice review?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:45): I don't have the exact dates but, as I have said, I am regularly updated as a result of what occurred regarding McIntyre and McIntosh and not being informed. I made it very clear to my CE that I wanted to be notified of any pregnancies and, since then, I have been.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the leader, I call to order the Deputy Premier. The leader.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Will the minister take on notice the question of when she was first informed of those five cases referred to in the Rice review, as she was presumably informed about at her regular meetings with the chief executive?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:46): I will take that on notice.

Ms Cook: There are five pregnancies. How many assaults are there?

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned for a second time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

COVID-19 CONTACT TRACING

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:47): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is photographing handwritten COVID check-in data considered misuse, and which part of the act covers this behaviour? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: I have been informed police commissioner Grant Stevens has said today that it will now be an offence under the emergency act to misuse handwritten COVID check-in data. I ask the Attorney: does this mean it wasn't an offence when I asked this question last week?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:47): Firstly, I thank the member for the question. I indicated to the member that in relation to the taking of a photograph, in relation to her QR question last sitting week, the publication of that material may be an offence. But you made the inquiry, and I undertook to go away and find some further information. The information I did find was that no-one has been, on the information I have been provided, prosecuted in relation to disclosure relating to QR offences, which we had also canvassed in the last week of sitting.

Yes, I am aware of the statement made by the police commissioner as to whether he thinks the taking of a photograph or other evidence of the handwritten documents that people fill in on entering a property ought to have some sanction as an offence. Obviously, I will consider that. I am still waiting on him, actually, in relation to a drive dangerous proposal that he announced on radio a couple of weeks ago. I understand the gist of what he would like to have in that regard, but I am still waiting for that.

To date, it seems that his agency has not referred any matter for prosecution in relation to any breach of the QR codes. I am not aware, as I indicated on the last occasion you raised the question in the parliament, whether anybody has been dealt with for taking a photograph. But as I indicated, I thought it was important that if the member had information about someone who has been found to be doing that or is undertaking that practice, they should refer the matter to the police for the very reason that, if any information from that photograph is used or published, that may be a breach and that would be a matter for the police to take up.

COVID-19 CONTACT TRACING

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:49): Supplementary: under which part of the act will it be an offence? I put it to the Attorney that it would be very hard for us to pursue someone having taken a photograph in a supermarket if we don't know what we are actually pursuing them for.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:49): I can't answer what section it might be. I hear what the police commissioner is suggesting: that we look at whether there might be an offence in relation to taking that information. I just remind members that every one of us has a camera in our hand and taking photographs, which any one of us does at any time, in itself isn't necessarily an offence. What becomes very much an offence in our law at present relates to the publication or disclosure of information from that.

As the member would remember, being a long-time member in the parliament, there are a number of offences now that relate to the publishing, placing on the internet or distribution of photographs, children in school yards and all these sorts of things. There is a lot of law around the publication or disclosure of that information.

I will wait until I see what the police commissioner sends me in relation to taking a photograph of itself, but I don't disagree with the member on how difficult that might be if there is going to be an offence. If it is recommended by the police commissioner that we do, of course we will look at that with interest and obviously assess whether that is something that is either practical or appropriate.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Given the multiple failings outlined in Judge Rice's review, why has no disciplinary action been taken against anyone?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, resume your seat.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale will leave for 15 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for Hurtle Vale having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:52): The terms of reference of the inquiry for Mr Rice QC were to undertake a number of things, including an assessment as to what happened or failed to happen and as to why there was no reporting to the senior levels, including to the minister, in respect of the two young girls who are referred to as C1 and C2 in the report. That report is comprehensive. Although it had been requested to be done in a fairly short time, it has been done.

Six recommendations have come forward; none of them include disciplinary action by any party in the department or otherwise. That is a matter of course for Mr Rice as to why he would or not. The fact is he didn't. He has made his six recommendations and we have taken it. There is nothing in his report that identifies any person or persons who are directly responsible for the failure to send that information up the line.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is no reference to anyone in relation to disciplinary action. I do refer the member to a separate reference by Mr Rice, which indicated in respect of future matters of potential negligence or failing to comply with, even at the negligence level, a guideline or a procedure as to whether that is misconduct under the code of conduct.

That has been referred to the commissioner for public employment. He asked that that occur. To the best of my knowledge, that has actually already occurred but, if it hasn't, it is on its way to Ms Ranieri to obviously consider the matters that he thinks are worth looking at. There is no recommendation in the report that disciplinary action be taken by any person and that is the position. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no indication either to Mr Rice or to the government from the chief executive that she proposes to take any action.

FRUIT FLY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is using expert advice to educate South Australians about the impact of fruit fly in the state?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:54): I thank the member for Chaffey for his important question. The Marshall Liberal government is currently undertaking the biggest fruit fly response in South Australia's history. South Australia has a strong record of successfully eradicating fruit fly from the state, and remains the only mainland state recognised as fruit fly free by international markets. South Australia is home to some of the world's best experts on fruit fly. Most importantly, we listen to industry and take advice from the Riverland Fruit Fly Committee.

Approximately 110 staff are responding to the Queensland fruit fly outbreaks in the Riverland, and the officers have collected more than 33,000 kilograms of fruit from properties. More than 250 staff are responding to the fruit fly outbreaks across the state. We have also added additional traps on top of the 7,500 we already have in place across the state. The fruit fly outbreaks in both metropolitan Adelaide and the Riverland are putting thousands of jobs, livelihoods and businesses at risk. We are not taking this response lightly. Keeping the state's fruit fly free status is critical for our farmers, providing economic advantage and market access.

To date, the government has spent about \$17 million in the eradication program, a record investment in fruit fly eradication for South Australia. On Sunday, we launched a new fruit fly education campaign to raise awareness about restrictions in place for the movement of some fruit and vegetables. The new campaign features high profile and proud South Australian chef Poh of *MasterChef* fame. Poh is a wonderful ambassador for the state's food industries, and we believe her trusted voice will help get an important fruit fly message across to the general public.

We need the general public's help to minimise the movement of fruit and prevent further spread. We are committed to eradicating fruit fly from South Australia to protect the \$1.3 billion horticulture industry and the 37,500 jobs that rely upon it. Given the widespread outbreaks, we have broken down outbreak zones and suspension areas into a traffic light system—green, red and yellow—to help make it easier for the public to understand restrictions on fruit fly movements. The traffic light map of outbreaks and any other further information can be seen at fruitfly.sa.gov.au.

Another expert area in South Australia, which we utilise for fruit fly response, is the sterile insect technology with flies produced at Port Augusta. Releasing sterile insect technology is the world's best practice proven technique designed to combat—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: —any remaining wild flies in the outbreak areas. It usually occurs six to eight weeks after the initial organic baiting and clean-up phases of the response. Releasing sterile flies into the affected areas helps prevent any remaining wild flies from reproducing.

Every time we have an outbreak it costs taxpayers money to eradicate. It puts tens of thousands of jobs at risk. Prevention is better than the cure, and that is why we have introduced a zero tolerance approach at the Yamba quarantine station and random road blocks across the state. We are committed to protecting jobs and businesses from the impact of fruit fly.

CHILD PROTECTION, RICE INQUIRY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Premier. Given the findings of failure within the Rice review regarding the Minister for Child Protection, why won't the Premier now deliver on a promise he made in September 2018? With your leave and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier said in September 2018, quote:

I have told my ministers they cannot expect to remain in cabinet if they see nothing, hear nothing and question nothing.

Ministers have to be inquisitive, inquiring and challenging.

Responsibility ends on the minister's desk, not at the departmental door.

Is it now the Premier's policy to accept ministers who do hear nothing, see nothing and act on nothing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:59): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for this question. Far from doing nothing, our government acted extraordinarily promptly. As soon as we learned about this situation where critical incidents were not forwarded to executives and ultimately the chief executive and then ultimately, of course, the minister, we put an inquiry in place. This was done extraordinarily promptly. So, rather than kick the can down the road like those opposite may have done when they were in government, we acted extraordinarily quickly.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And, may I say, and I thank the Attorney-General for putting that inquiry into place, that inquiry was delivered very expediently to the Attorney-General. It was reviewed by cabinet in prompt time and, of course, we have now published our action plan. So, far from not taking action, we've taken action, we've acted responsibly, we've put forward a great level of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —transparency with this with very minor redactions only to protect the identity of the two children in the care of the state, the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection, and we've published it. We've tabled it in the house today and now it is made available, so I am very satisfied that we have acted promptly. This contrasts quite considerably with what we saw under the previous government.

Under the previous government—and I am sure you are happy for some compare and contrast, given the nature of the question which was put forward—what we saw was report after report after report and no action taken whatsoever. In fact, the Nyland royal commission report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —actually said the department was in crisis. There was no such finding. There was no such recommendation in this report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which we have seen. In fact, the author of this report made it very clear that he had no evidence to suggest that the officers within the department did anything other than put the interests of the two children as their highest priority—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —as their highest priority, and that's exactly what we need to keep a focus on. We need to keep a focus on the safety of our most vulnerable children here in South Australia, and that's why we acted promptly. This is a completely stark contrast to what we saw over 16 years of failed administration in child protection. Since coming to government, we now have a dedicated minister in the cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have a dedicated department and chief executive. We've moved ahead with a range of policies which put these most vulnerable children—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's really interesting the interjections that are coming: why doesn't the minister answer?

Mr Brown: We get nothing but spin, empty spin. All we get: empty spin.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Playford will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The attacks from the front bench against the leader. The leader asked me a question so it is appropriate in that instance for me to answer that question. The question was actually asked by the Leader of the Opposition to me, so I have outlined to the house the evidence that suggests that we have acted extraordinarily promptly. This is an extraordinarily high priority for our government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have dedicated additional resources, we have put additional policies in place and I think we have significantly improved the operation of this very important portfolio within government. But what former Judge Rice's report makes very clear is that there is more work to do, especially around the area of critical incident reporting. We accept all of his recommendations—in fact, we go much further—and we will make this a major priority for our government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the deputy leader, I call to order and warn the member for Reynell. The member for Badcoe will leave for the remainder of question time in accordance with standing order 137A, as will the member for Lee.

The honourable members for Badcoe and Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

PASTORAL LANDS

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Environment. Has the minister received advice that the draft pastoral lands bill exempts the rangelands from the objects and enforcement provisions of the Landscape South Australia Act?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:03): I thank the deputy leader for her question. She raises a very valid point about ensuring that the draft pastoral act intersects appropriately with the landscape act. This is something that, as the minister responsible for the landscape act, I am working very closely with the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development to ensure that we get right.

There needs to be an appropriate intersection between these acts that ensures that conservation of our very fragile pastoral lands is sustained. They are in a part of our state that is renowned not only for its conservation value but also its productivity with regard to the very important pastoral industry when managed effectively and appropriately.

We know that the management of our pastoral lands is a real challenge; it requires a high level of experience. That is often why pastoral properties are passed down from generation to generation, and when they change hands we can actually experience environmental problems as a result of mismanagement, and unfortunately that has happened over the years.

As a stakeholder minister with regard to the reform of the pastoral act, I want to make sure that we get the conservation balance right, and I am working extremely closely with the other ministers—not just the Minister for Primary Industries, but other ministers, particularly and including the Minister for Energy and Mining, whose electorate encompasses much of that land—to ensure that we do strike the balance. I am continuing to receive advice as to the primacy issues with regard to the landscape act and its role in supporting and potentially underpinning certain aspects of the new pastoral legislation.

CYBERSECURITY

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (15:05): My question is directed to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. I ask the minister whether he could update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is keeping South Australia safe and strong and protecting South Australian businesses from cyber attacks?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (15:06): Thank you very much, sir, and I thank—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the member for Davenport for his question. Of course, cybersecurity affects so many businesses every day. The Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre was launched by the Premier in July last year. Since then, they have developed seven training courses and 140 students have gone through those training courses. There have been 34 events, with 700 attendees.

I certainly remember one event where Adelaide businesses were explaining what they had to go through to recover from a cyber attack that happened to them. It will surprise many in this place to learn that it is a 24-hour, day after day after day project in order to recover from such a situation. It costs multiple millions of dollars, so it's important that we have a cybersecurity centre here in South Australia to protect our South Australian businesses.

The Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre has also developed the cyber risk executive program. It is designed to educate senior executives about cyber risk and to provide advice that results in greater investment in cybersecurity. The first cohort of executives will complete the pilot program at the end of this month. A new fit-out of a portion of the ground floor of the Eleanor Harrald Building will house startup cybersecurity entrepreneurs and businesses to further establish South Australia as a leader in cybersecurity.

The centre commenced the cybersecurity test range formal accreditation process by the Defence Vetting and Security Service to complete the services that we are offering. The South Australian cybersecurity capability will be further strengthened by developing and implementing a cyber industry action plan, growing our state's reputation as a cybersecurity centre of excellence, not just for the protection of businesses but also for training the skills that we need in those jobs for cybersecurity, those staff required to manage the cybersecurity businesses and to work for those companies that are supporting businesses in their cybersecurity protection.

We are creating high-value and high-growth jobs and protecting South Australian innovation precincts, businesses and research organisations through increased best practice in cybersecurity technology—that is what we are doing here in South Australia. The development of a cyber industry action plan is an important initiative under the Marshall government's Growth State Hi-Tech Sector Plan 2030. There is a very strong focus on technology in that growth sector and, of course it goes without saying, a very strong focus on cybersecurity. We must protect what we own here. We must protect our IP and we must protect our industries.

AustCyber plays a crucial role in building a globally competitive industry by providing support to individual companies across the digital economy. AustCyber is a not-for-profit national organisation that yesterday announced its merger with Stone and Chalk, based here at Lot Fourteen. That merger of the two organisations will strengthen South Australia's position nationally for key tech innovation and startups right here in South Australia.

PASTORAL LEASES

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. What is the estimated increase in asset value of the leases held by Hancock Agriculture in the increase in their tenure from 42 to 100 years?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:10): I thank the member for her question. It's great that the deputy leader is talking about the pastoral industry. It is such an important part of our state's economy. They do

wonderful things in that part of the world in managing a very difficult environment and turning it into a very productive outcome for many.

As we look at this piece of the South Australian economy, it is very exciting how we can support it going forward. There are opportunities for this part of the country that haven't been available before, where they can take advantages going forward and look at different opportunities to bring income onto those properties and improve their ability to supplement their income from pastoralism through other opportunities, including carbon farming.

Late last week, I was pleased to be in Port Augusta to talk to a large crowd of pastoralists about the opportunities in front of them. One of the key things that the deputy leader raised in her question is carbon farming and the 100-year lease opportunity that sits there behind that need. The 100 years is very important to many pastoralists, whether it be the Hancocks or anyone else, to actually be able to enter into agreements and use carbon farming to supplement incomes. It's really pleasing to see that interest.

The reason we need 100-year leases in that part of the world is so those farmers can enter the agreements that are out there to actually be able to use the 100-year—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir, standing order 98: debate. The question was: what is the estimated increase in value of leases held by Hancock Agriculture, not the debate surrounding the decision to increase the pastoral lease to 100 years.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I have taken note and listened carefully to the question of the deputy leader and the minister is in the course of answering the question. The minister has the call. The minister has concluded his answer.

Grievance Debate

MINISTER FOR CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:12): I rise today to condemn, in the strongest possible terms, the Minister for Child Protection's abject and utter failure in relation to her handling of the abuse and pregnancy of two 13-year-old girls in state care. Every time I think of what those girls went through, I feel ill. Every time I think of the minister's complete obliviousness to their plight, like many others in our community, not only do I feel ill but I feel really, really angry.

When I listen, as we have had to today, to our Premier and our Deputy Premier protecting her obliviousness, that anger absolutely turns to fury. Our community and, so crucially importantly those girls in care—every child in care—deserve so much better. Following today's release of the damning Rice review by former District Court Judge Paul Rice, Minister Sanderson must step down or immediately be sacked. This independent review found the minister oversaw 'a significant failure regarding her handling of two sexual abuse cases'.

This review was launched late last year after the minister admitted that she was totally unaware of two cases of pregnant 13 year olds in state care who were sexually abused by paedophiles and, unbelievably, the second girl being enabled to live with a paedophile for two months. This is despite the fact that the minister publicly claimed she had changed reporting procedures after the first case emerged to ensure that she would be told. The fact is clear: the Rice review found that, despite the minister's public statements that she would be informed of serious sexual abuse, she has not actually issued this instruction to her own department. Judge Rice states:

It was crucial for the Minister to tell the Department that she wanted to know about the serious sexual abuse of children under guardianship. This was a significant failure on the Minister's part.

Judge Rice also found differences between the accounts of child protection department chief executive Cathy Taylor's evidence and the minister's, specifically in relation to a meeting the two held in September 2020. The minister told Judge Rice that she 'gave specific instructions to the chief executive that she was to be told in advance of sentencing' of serious sexual assaults. However, Judge Rice reports:

It seemed that the Chief Executive may have had a different memory of the meeting than the Minister.

He found:

It seemed to me that there was an ambiguity or an uncertainty about what was agreed at the meeting.

In 2018, Premier Marshall issued clear instructions to his ministers:

I have told my ministers that they cannot expect to remain in cabinet if they see nothing, hear nothing and question nothing.

Ministers have to be inquisitive, inquiring and challenging.

Responsibility ends on the minister's desk, not at the departmental door.

This independent inquiry clearly states in black and white that Rachel Sanderson failed. This was not just a minor failure. In Paul Rice's own words, it was a significant failure. The Premier has absolutely no choice. If he is to be true to his words in 2018 about ministerial accountability, about inquisitiveness and about taking responsibility, he must immediately sack the Minister for Child Protection.

It is beyond belief that the minister has made repeated public statements that she would be informed about sexual assaults when she never issued those instructions to her department. This minister is clearly out of her depth, and for the sake of children in care, children who need and deserve so much better, who deserve to be kept safe, she must be immediately replaced.

These latest issues come in the wake of a host of other failings in child protection under this minister's watch, failings that this government refused to investigate in the review. In fact, Judge Rice says, 'It is important to note the limitations of this inquiry.' Budget estimates reveal skyrocketing numbers of children in care and 14½ thousand calls to the Child Abuse Report Line unanswered. Instead of doing what she can to prevent family breakdown, the minister has outsourced the Therapeutic Reunification Service. South Australian children in care deserve so much better. This minister has to go for their sake.

Time expired.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:18): The Marshall Liberal government has invested significant funds in our Aboriginal Education Strategy 2019-2029. It is a 10-year strategy that seeks to lift educational outcomes and opportunities for Aboriginal learners across South Australia, seeing them have success in the early years, seeing them have success in schools and seeing them be on pathways towards achievement in life.

It was with great pride that I was able to share with the SACE Board CE last year the great news that last year, in 2020, despite the challenges of the coronavirus pandemic, we indeed had record SACE completion for our Aboriginal learners here in South Australia. While that is great news for those learners in the upper secondary years, I can inform the house that we are making reforms to literacy in the early years and introducing clarity around early years literacy instruction, including phonics. Indeed, our phonics checks are showing that, as well as the uplift in the general figures for all students across South Australia, our Aboriginal young learners in year 1 are having among the most dramatic uplifts in their achievement in early years reading, which is great.

There are some other case studies in parts of the Aboriginal Education Strategy that today I would like to share with you and the house. They are important strategies and they bear retelling. I congratulate all of the team in the education department's Aboriginal education team who are working on these, as well as Aboriginal staff within our schools supporting our Aboriginal learners.

One of the initiatives is an expansion of the Workabout program, particularly to support Aboriginal young people in Port Lincoln, the Murraylands and southern and western metropolitan regions to make a successful transition from study to employment, training or further education. We have radically increased support to this great program. It offers a range of programs and services to support Aboriginal students. Through the Workabout Centre, Aboriginal students work towards SACE achievement, engage in career education and transition from school into training, employment and higher education.

In Port Lincoln, for example, the Workabout Centre is working with local industry. A foundation course to support transition to employment is the 5-Steps to Work Readiness program, delivered in a culturally safe and comfortable environment. It powers Aboriginal students as they prepare to enter employment.

Throughout last year, the centre has supported students to research and identify employment opportunities in their local area. It supports students to create industry-specific résumés, cover letters, job applications and preparations for interviews. Fourteen students enrolled in the Workabout Centre have now gained employment as a result of that program. Pathways have included a mixture of casual and seasonal work, local industry work within fishing and aquaculture industries, work intrastate and in retail and hospitality.

One of the programs I was particularly pleased to learn about when I was in Port Lincoln last year with the member for Flinders was the work being done on the English as an Additional Language or Dialect Hub. It is a comprehensive online course that builds the knowledge and practice of educators to teach Aboriginal EALD learners, raising awareness of Aboriginal learners who may be learning standard Australian English as an additional language or dialect, and supports department staff to understand Aboriginal English as a legitimate dialect in its own right and the significance of this dialect in regard to culture and identity for the speakers.

Can I tell you that for the staff and families who have already engaged with this program, it has been transformative in their empowerment as they are able to undergo their learning and their confidence as they interact with our schools. When I was in Port Lincoln, I was really pleased to learn about the work of Jodi Kennedy, the hub coach who is implementing a two-tier coaching role covering implementation of that online learning directly alongside supporting teachers to add depth and meaning to the online resources.

Jodi has been providing intensive support to Port Lincoln Primary School and Port Lincoln High School, including working with classroom teachers, focusing on the explicit teaching of writing and the use of EALD teaching strategies, support to the leadership and Aboriginal education team to co-plan whole-of-staff PLC sessions, and facilitating professional learning. It is having a big impact on many learners and many families, and I encourage all members to learn a bit about it.

I also want to commend to the house the Aboriginal Learner Achievement Leaders' Resource, which in September 2019 was distributed to all schools across South Australia. It is easy enough to find information about this but the work on data-informed planning, tracking and monitoring growth, assuring consistent high-quality classroom practice, rigorous evidence-based learning interventions, engaging Aboriginal families as partners in literacy and numeracy learning and promoting the continuity of learning is having an impact in many schools. I would be happy to provide further information through detailed briefings to interested members.

SAFE PETS SAFE FAMILIES

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:23): On 28 January, Safe Pets Safe Families held the official opening of their new warehouse and pet food bank. I had the pleasure of attending the opening, along with the federal member for Adelaide, Steve Georganas, and the shadow minister for child protection and member for Reynell, Katrine Hildyard. There were also many local government representatives in attendance.

It was wonderful to hear from the founder, Jennifer Howard, about her journey to becoming an amazing advocate for families who, mostly through domestic violence—such was the journey she experienced herself—end up heartbroken and torn apart because they are unable to take pets with them when they flee to safety. Safe Pets Safe Families is a registered charity and they have around 140 foster carers and 300 volunteers. They work as a human and animal charity under one welfare framework, providing care and support, as well as education to people and pets in crisis. They reduce the incidents of abuse, neglect, surrender and euthanasia in companion animals.

It is South Australia's first official pet food bank. Pets are often forgotten in the emergency food provision sector, where food is provided to vulnerable people who then often have to sacrifice their food to feed their pets. This organisation is committed to changing this and making sure that pets' food bowls are also full. Food is provided to many charities so people in need can feed their pets. The project is a really important part of the Safe Pets Safe Families objective towards keeping people and pets together, preventing unnecessary trauma through surrender and, horribly, euthanasia of animals that are much loved.

Safe Pets Safe Families works closely with Women's Safety Services in South Australia to support their shelters in becoming pet friendly. They run pop-up vet clinics inside the shelters, and

they supply pet food, toys and bedding from their pet food bank to women and families escaping violence. Safe Pets Safe Families has cared for over 1,000 animals through their foster program. It has been keen to remove the barriers for people with pets escaping domestic violence. These clinics also support and assist people by providing housing for pets if their owners are facing homelessness—and I have a personal experience of reaching out to them for support—or experiencing a mental health crisis.

It is filling a huge gap in the system, a really important one. They reach where other services cannot and provide really amazing support and a conduit between other programs and services. They have seen 1,027 pets in the last three to four years, and I think they will see many, many more as they have now become more centralised, moving out of the outer southern suburbs to a more central location. They are a registered vet service provider. They have outreach through Paws and Pals and the clinics they host. I think they do an amazing job.

I really want to congratulate Jennifer Howard on all the work she is doing to coordinate volunteers. I know she has an amazing vision to educate and support young people to invoke a feeling of kindness and compassion to animals which then flows on in their life; it is so very important. They are hoping to secure a mobile vet van in the future, which will make their services much more efficient and bring the service to rural areas, where there is also a need. They are expanding their foster program to the Riverland this month. I really look forward to seeing how this wonderful organisation continues to grow in the future.

The Southern United Netball Association is close to my heart. I have lost much skin on their courts under several layers of resurfacing over the years. They currently have 12 courts with sports lighting, but they have reached the end of their asset life. Laurie Bilby, the executive officer, has done an amazing job working with the City of Onkaparinga to successfully secure \$1.7 million from the federal government to help with the upgrade of these courts and the lighting. I know that they are putting in applications to the state government for their program funding.

Given the current and future demand and the thousands of young people and families who are involved with the utilisation of these courts and the importance of bringing people together in the community through sport as a conduit, I hope that they are successful. I put my wholehearted support behind this application. I look forward to doing that formally in writing, and I hope for a successful outcome. Laurie and the team do an amazing job for our people playing netball in the south.

CHERRY GARDENS BUSHFIRE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:28): Mr Speaker, as you know, the Cherry Gardens fire, which ignited on the afternoon of 24 January 2021, burnt at least 2,700 hectares and destroyed two houses, 19 buildings and two vehicles. It was deliberately lit and only extinguished through the dedication of CFS brigades from across the Hills and the state and after heavy rain. I wish to acknowledge and record in this place the extraordinary work of volunteers and local businesses who assisted the Hills community in the course of the fire.

At Mount Barker Oval, Kerry Hunt, founder of Hills Horse Evacuate Support, assisted by Annalise Johnston, Bek Smith, Katie Ann Chandler and members of the community, established a refuge for horses and livestock. I am deeply thankful for their quick thinking, experience and commitment to the health and welfare of livestock and, of course, livestock owners. I also wish to acknowledge and thank the many local businesses and community groups who rallied to assist at the oval, including X Convenience, Pizza Giovanni, Cafe Acqua, Mount Barker Lions Club, From The Butler's Pantry, Flint Community Care, the SES and the Red Cross. It is also right to record and thank a farmer who drove from Mannum to deliver stock feed and slept in his car.

The risk of fire is deep in the psyche of my community. We are also still recovering from the Cudlee Creek fire. It is for this reason that the Cherry Gardens fire naturally raised anxiety levels and caused very deep concern, as of course you are well aware, Mr Speaker, the fire having impacted your community heavily too. As the member for Davenport, Steve Murray, rightly observed, the fire started, as members will recall, in Cherry Gardens in his electorate.

We often talk about the scale of losses in a bushfire and not the protection offered by the CFS. In this fire, it is estimated that the CFS saved 60 homes. This is extraordinary and deeply appreciated. I want to thank the member for Davenport, the member for Heysen and the member for Mayo for their local leadership and the Premier and the Minister for Emergency Services for being

immediately available and committed to the recovery effort in Cherry Gardens and before this in Cudlee Creek and other areas of the state very badly impacted last year.

CLARE VALLEY FLYING GROUP INCORPORATED

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:30): Today, I have the opportunity to talk about the Clare Valley Flying Group Incorporated. The Clare Valley Aerodrome is located 14 kilometres north of the township of Clare at 90 RM Williams Way. This airstrip was officially opened on 1 November 2014 by Richard de Crespigny, a Qantas QF32 pilot, and his father, Peter. The Clare Valley Aerodrome facility has been proudly developed by the Clare Valley Flying Group Incorporated, which is a community based and focused group and a not-for-profit organisation. This group is comprised of a committee of 16, and members from the Clare Valley, the Mid North and interstate come in and do all the work there voluntarily.

The founding chairman was Adrian Smith, who invited me, as the local member back in 2009 at the by-election, to their first meeting at the Sevenhill Hotel to discuss the opportunity to establish an airstrip at Farrell Flat at that particular time; however, it was eventually established in the Clare Valley on RM Williams Way. I must admit that at that particular period of time I was not too sure of the area because I had not been there for a long time, being in Port Pirie and being the new member, so I had to question where Farrell Flat was. I found out where it was, and I did not think it was the right location. However, they decided to have it in the Clare Valley.

The Clare Valley Flying Group is very passionate about promoting all aeronautical activities of the aerodrome as well as promoting what the Clare Valley has to offer to all visitors. It is one of the very few privately owned aerodromes in South Australia. The funding history of this organisation is that, as the local member, having just been appointed at the by-election, in 2009 I was able to secure funding of \$153,000, which was only stage 1 of the group's vision of about seven stages.

The stage 2 vision was the sealing and lighting of the main runway, 17-35, which provided the Clare Valley and the surrounding areas with an all-weather 24-hour landing facility. This enabled commercial expansion and additional business, freight and tourism opportunities. In addition, it enabled the local RAAus flight training school, Spencer Gulf Training, and other organisations to provide continuity with an all-weather facility.

In November 2017, I wrote to the then Treasurer, Treasurer Koutsantonis of the Labor government, who conditionally supported my request for a state-matched contribution to the upgrade of the aerodrome to the value of \$395,628. This was on the condition that the Clare Valley Flying Group seek the equal amount through the commonwealth Building Better Regions Fund. In December 2017, the group was unsuccessful in their application for a commonwealth grant.

I then requested that this funding be banked by the state government for future successful applications through the federal government. The Treasurer at the time agreed to this; however, the change of government then occurred in March 2018. In June 2018, I wrote to the new state government Treasurer, Rob Lucas, to ask if they would honour the previous government's commitment of a state-matched contribution of \$395,628 for the upgrade of the aerodrome, which they agreed to do providing the club was successful in obtaining the commonwealth grant funding. The club was successful in doing so.

In March 2019, work commenced on the upgrade. The club now boasts, and rightly so, about having not only firefighting water tanks and associated equipment but also a very grand and impressive terminal and numerous hangars, together with a Victorian firm stationing their helicopters at the site. This very impressive facility has not only allowed for a great increase in tourism but just shows that if a group have the vision and they agree with it, then go for it, as this group have done.

The business community of Clare and the surrounding areas has been really supportive of this group to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars of in-kind support and materials. The Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council have shown great leadership and vision in supporting this great venture. They can see the opportunities for working together and creating opportunities not only for locals but also for tourism. I would estimate that the value of the whole lot would now be well in excess of \$2 million, and I would not like to mention the number of businesses that have participated for fear of missing someone out.

In January 2021, the Clare Valley Flying Group was named the 2020 Aero Club of the Year in the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) Wings Awards. This award recognises the outstanding efforts of individuals and groups in Australian aviation. I must congratulate everybody involved with this, and there has been great perseverance. It has been a great honour to help them out with their vision and I congratulate everybody involved on getting this national award.

GRANITE ISLAND CAUSEWAY

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:35): Today, I rise to acknowledge the Marshall Liberal government's essential Granite Island Causeway project. Within my electorate of Finniss, the South Australian government has already committed \$31.1 million towards funding the causeway project. As many members of the house may know, the Granite Island Causeway is an icon of Victor Harbor, the Fleurieu and South Australia. It is the link between the natural beauty of Granite Island and Victor Harbor. It is a popular tourist attraction and an important element of the Fleurieu.

The causeway was once strong, proud and able to battle the weather. This is no longer the case, as 98 per cent of the timber piles, 100 per cent of the bracing, 30 per cent of the crossheads and 69 per cent of the balustrade posts have been assessed to be in poor to failed condition with very advanced deterioration. This negative assessment is due to a combination of rot, marine borer attack and white ant damage. To the frustration of locals and visitors, the horse-drawn carriage cannot operate during windy conditions.

After parts of the causeway collapsed in 2019, temporary bracing was installed. Since then, an assessment found that repairing the existing structure was untenable. It is for this reason that the causeway has to be replaced. To make a complete reconstruction of the existing structure would shut down the Granite Island access for at least 18 months and cause significant damage to tourism in the area.

I respect tradition. It was in 1875 that the causeway first reached Granite Island; however, very little of that original structure remains. Only 12.5 per cent of the below deck structure is original and none of the above deck structure is original. The important heritage value we want to save is the link to Granite Island itself. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to building the new causeway next to the existing causeway.

The new causeway will continue to transport the horse-drawn cart. The new causeway will also provide disability access compliance and improve pedestrian amenity. The project will provide 43 full-time equivalent jobs during construction. Recently, there were two information sessions at the Victor Harbor Bowling Club and 160-plus people attended, with overwhelmingly positive responses from them all. I am proud the Marshall Liberal government is delivering this \$31.1 million project. The Marshall Liberal government is building what matters for the people of Finniss.

Bills

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:39): To continue on from where I left off talking about some of the fundamentals, some of the reasons why we are even able to have this debate today stem from the advances in medical science that have happened over past decades and centuries.

We as a species, we on this earth, have actually been phenomenally successful at doing these things. Life expectancy in recent decades and centuries has improved dramatically, infant mortality has dropped dramatically, diseases that were once fatal are now chronic, and all these advances help to improve the quantity and quality of life that we enjoy, but the advancement of science does also give rise to opportunities and for individuals to make decisions for themselves about terminating or not terminating pregnancies in the modern era.

I think, though, also at its most fundamental this debate is about at which point does an unborn child have rights independent from its parents. Again, I come back to that point of when life begins. Is it at conception? Is it at birth? I think that trying to grapple around the idea of when an unborn child, or indeed a child that is born alive, begins to have its own rights and independence

from the rights and choices that its parents and mother choose to make is the most relevant one here to us today.

My position on these issues has always been clear: I am for life in all of its forms. The gift of spending a few precious years on this earth is the most fundamental gift we are given. In fact, without it there are no other gifts that can be given, and the joys, trials and tribulations that come with the journey of life are all that we have. Whether it be in this debate or other debates where we challenge the very concept of life and our control over it, my position as being somebody who is for, in reasonable circumstance, helping to defend life is a value that I will continue to hold inside and outside this place.

I am lucky to have been raised by two loving parents and to grow up with three loving—if sometimes precocious—brothers. I can only imagine how difficult it was for my parents to try to steer and control four boys, all headstrong and all with their own characters, through to adulthood with the strength of character and moral courage in this age where teenagers often are indulgent and show degrees of disrespect.

Looking at my family, I can only now say that my mum and dad did a pretty good job. From an early age they taught us the value of personal responsibility; whether it be earning our own money, owning and learning from our mistakes, making decisions for ourselves and living with those consequences, we were taught that our actions had consequences, and this was no more important than during our teenage years.

As we began to go out and bring girls home for dinner and take them out on dates, we again had this concept of personal responsibility ingrained in us front and centre. I do remember dad having a conversation with the four of us using humour and some bad language to try to convey a point about how personal responsibility extends to when teenagers engage in relationships.

The fundamental advice, cleaned up for the benefit of this chamber, was very much that those decisions that we chose to make and those actions that we chose to undertake could have consequences, and for us those consequences and the responsibility that come with that would need to be upheld, and in no uncertain terms as we went out into the world and engaged in teenage life we took those values with us and we took those responsibilities very seriously.

I do very much agree that women in desperate situations and in situations not necessarily of their own making have difficult choices to make. An argument that is often played out in this space is that the man, the father, can walk away but that the mother cannot. A mother has to gestate and then give birth to a baby whilst a father can simply walk away and disappear and not have to take responsibility for those actions.

To that argument, I would say that more should and needs to be done to make sure that fathers are responsible for their half of the equation and that the answer here is to make sure that, as it takes a couple of people to create a child, it should be that a couple of people together, both a mother and a father, take responsibility for that child and, everywhere that we see fathers not living up to their responsibilities, to take action so they live up to the consequences of their actions.

This is something that we as a society and potentially that we as a parliament need to deal with and reinforce because those responsibilities should not be easily abdicated, as it takes a mother and father to create a child and therefore it should take a mother and a father to take responsibility for that child.

We get to what I think will be the crux of the debate, and that is when the rights of the mother and the choice that the mother wants and seeks to make, and the difficult choice they are often faced with, collides with at what point an unborn or newborn child has their own rights. I think it is a debate and a question that has evolved over time as advances in medical science have given us new opportunities to help babies survive at earlier and earlier stages in a woman's pregnancy.

What has come out in the health advice that has accompanied the SALRI report is that at 22 weeks and six days babies are considered viable. That is something that everyone in this debate so far that I have heard accepts and understands that there is now a line at around 22 weeks and six days where foetuses are viable if they were to come out into the world.

That line helps to create for us a point at which we can start to discuss the rights of unborn and newborn children independent of their parents. The point at which that child is able to viably live out here on this beautiful earth independent of their mother, I think, is the point at which we can start to rebalance this equation. That is why, as we get into the amendment the Minister for Environment and Water has tabled, this is a worthwhile conversation for us to have.

I would like to put on record some comments that have been made by various health and medical professionals in the field, who took the time to come and speak and address members of parliament a couple of weeks ago. The first of these is Professor R.J. Norman, who is a Professor for Reproductive and Periconceptual Medicine at the University of Adelaide, a founding director of the Robinson Research Institute for reproduction at the university and has founded a number of fertility companies. He says:

In this bill we are operating a dual standard. 'We deny human rights to a viable fetus, yet in premature birth we strive our utmost to preserve human life. Logically there is no difference between the potentially disposable material in the womb at 23+ weeks and the sacred and inviolable rights that are conferred upon the baby at birth.' [Toolis 1999]. My recommendation is that in the case of a normal fetus, the primary aim should be to deliver it alive and provide life-giving support for the child and perinatal psychological support for the woman involved.

We then had the opportunity to hear from an adjunct associate professor in obstetrics and gynaecology at Flinders University, who said:

Today you heard arguments as to why abortion after viability, 23 weeks, should not be allowed: because the live birth option is safer for the mother from 23 weeks, and humane to the baby, and because the evidence from Victoria clearly shows it's open to abuse—patients will request it and there are doctors who are prepared to do it.

A third comment from Dr Roy Watson, who is a specialist obstetrician and gynaecologist and a past Vice-President of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, states:

Firstly, is the matter of gestation. I find it abhorrent that this legislation would allow aborting a baby at term for any reason, but certainly for maternal psycho-social reasons. Even when it is necessary to end a pregnancy beyond fetal viability to safeguard the health of the mother, this can always be done in a way so as to allow the child to continue their life. Almost everyone with whom I discuss this issue agrees that feticide after the point of viability is not acceptable.

I think those comments from respected experts in the field, which I put on the record for the benefit of the chamber and for those tuning into the debate more broadly, all grapple with this concept of what we do after the point of viability. Again, given that medical science has advanced to a point where we are able to keep children alive from 23 weeks on, I think it is very worthwhile for us to have the debate at this point.

I will certainly be supporting the Minister for Environment and Water's amendments on that basis, on the basis that we need to balance the rights and the individual choice that women need to make for themselves, whilst also protecting the rights of unborn and newborn children. Those two sets of rights are not mutually exclusive in almost all circumstances, but in some circumstances they can be at the exclusion of each other. This parliament needs to make a decision on at what point the rights of one outweigh the rights of the other. I would contend that the point at which a foetus is able to viably survive beyond the womb would be a logical point for us to draw that line in the sand.

Unfortunately, these debates can often be characterised in the media and more broadly as being a binary choice: that you are either with us or you are against us. In this instance, I think there is sensible middle ground. I think that from the conversations I have had with members of my community, decriminalising abortion is a positive step. I think that it is, again, a question that was settled some 50 years ago, and we have a piece of legislation in place now that does not reflect contemporary practice but also does undue harm to women in the process.

The other side of that equation is that, in dealing with the concept of what is appropriate in terms of late-term abortion, there is middle ground for us to be able to decriminalise on the one hand but create a sensible middle ground way forward when it comes to late-term abortion. For the benefit of the house, I have drafted some amendments in relation to language that is used throughout the bill.

Without reflecting on a vote of the house, it was a concept that this parliament debated in the Statutes Amendment (Gender Identity and Equity) Bill back in 2016 where there was an attempt at that time to change the concept of 'a pregnant woman' into 'a person who is pregnant', essentially using gender-neutral language to describe women as part of that statutes amendment bill.

At that time, this chamber overwhelmingly voted to reject that proposition on the basis that what we should be dealing with in legislation should be based on biological fact, as distinct from the more fluid concept of gender. In no way would this amendment do anything to stop or halt women, or people who do not identify as women, being offered the care that they need; in fact, the current practice provides those opportunities, whilst the current legislation does not use gender-neutral language.

Again, the debate that was had at that time was that our legislation should focus on biological sex as opposed to the more fluid concept of gender, so I put forward these amendments on that basis. I also note some of the outrage around the Australian National University putting out a publication in recent days seeking to change a whole heap of language around parenting. I think it is something that is slightly different from the debate we are having now but no less instructive in terms of the response from the community.

To be able to gestate and give birth is fundamental to what makes a woman a woman. To bring back legislative language based on biological sex as distinct from gender, I think is an important way to go to make sure that we have legislation that reflects more closely medical science and biology.

I know that as we go through the committee stage of this bill there are going to be some tough decisions and some tough conversations that this chamber is going to have to have, but I do look forward to it being done in a spirit of open-mindedness and in a spirit of seeking to grapple with some of the most fundamental questions about when life begins and what is appropriate for this chamber to make decisions on in relation to those questions and what the answer we ultimately come to means for our community at large.

Certainly, everybody I have spoken to on all sides of this debate is seeking to grapple with answers about those fundamental questions and we all do so coming from a good place. I think that is the spirit in which this debate will occur. I am looking forward to that being the spirit in which this debate occurs so that the South Australian people can see that we, as their representatives, are doing our job and taking on these questions and deliberating on these things in a way that would make them proud, regardless of whether they agree with the individual decisions that we in this chamber have to make.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:56): I rise on behalf of my community and South Australian people in general to speak on this very important bill. It was 50 years ago that we, as a state and a parliament, had the argument about termination of pregnancy and whether it was a health practice that should be offered within our health service. We know that that decision was a very difficult decision.

I feel a great deal of responsibility in terms of making my decisions in relation to the termination of pregnancy amendments. We are making this on behalf of a diverse range of people in our community. For some, this is the most challenging and devastating decision that has to be made. Over the last few months, I have personally experienced some of the most terrible emails, threats and allegations about being a baby killer, someone who condones murder and someone who is condemned to hell for my values.

I have turned up at my office and found letters under the door accusing me and my team of endorsing infanticide, murder and some of the most awful things. Before starting to receive these things, not once had I ever thought that it was possible for this type of material to be printed or presented, mostly anonymously, I might say, in terms of the handwriting on them. Some have certainly had the endorsement of the Christian lobby and some have been organised mail-outs and contributions.

In saying all that, I feel very sad for people who are very challenged by this. I am very challenged by this as well, but what I have to do is draw on experiences I have had, not just in parliament but in my clinical experience as a registered nurse for nearly three decades, working across a range of hospital settings. I spent some time working in what was called the family planning unit at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I did a few shifts there, which was part of our registered nurse training. Back then, as a young woman who was not a parent at that stage, I remember thinking how awful and devastating it would be for those women coming in there and making those decisions. Not

once did I consider, as is the allegation, that people are just careless and could not care less about the life they are carrying. This is not the experience I have had, particularly in terms of late-term pregnancy.

Some of the allegations and language being used about pregnancy to birth termination are that somehow this is some kind of easy option after having stress incontinence, pain, vomiting, nausea and sickness—the whole horrid thing that can come with pregnancy. Some of you might have sunshine, lollipops and unicorns, but, buddy, I am telling you that is not the case for many women who are pregnant.

To think that somehow these women could wake up one morning pregnant with a full belly and think, 'I'm just sick of it now. I might just change my mind and I might just go off and get rid of it.' That is just fanciful, hurtful and evil nonsense. That is not what happens. These women who are forced to make a decision later in pregnancy, because of a range of medical conditions with them or their baby, are going through absolute hell. It is not because they have just changed their mind and want to get rid of this baby.

This is not a baby that you can, as I have been told, wrap in a blanket and love and hold for the next 50 years of its life—because that is not what is going to happen. That is simply not an option for the women who face this. There are long discussions and long speeches that could be made about a whole range of things within this bill, but that is one facet that I have just found the most hurtful nonsense coming out of the anti side and does not reflect the women I have seen going through this awful experience.

I also feel for the country women, women in the rural setting who are forced to drive hundreds and hundreds of kilometres in their cars to go to Adelaide because they have to have two medical practitioners to certify and offer simple—simple—treatment and medication. That has got to stop. We have got to have a situation where that woman can go hand in hand with her loved one, with her partner, knowing that her family is at home to love her.

That is not what happens now: she has to sit around in a hotel room somewhere waiting to bleed and miscarry. It is disgusting. That is not what should be happening. This piece of legislation will help to correct that. It will stop this from having to happen. We can have one practitioner prescribe and administer this medication, this treatment, or we can have not just a medical practitioner but a nurse practitioner. They are suitably qualified and educated to do this. I implore you to consider this when you are debating this bill.

We are not having an argument about whether termination should happen. We had that debate 50 years ago and we stopped dozens of women dying from haemorrhage, from infection and from backyard butchery. We stopped that from happening. That is over. Let's move on to the next step. The next form of decency is where a woman can go home to her loving husband or partner and have her children in her home with her and have the procedure done in her town. That is what we want to see.

We also do not want to see women who are having late-term terminations—and they still do and they still will have them—have to get in a plane and go interstate and have it without their partner, without their husband or without their children in the home with them. It will still happen. They still do it now. It is not like this is a new treatment that we are getting kicked off the ground. What we are doing is we are saying that it should happen here so they can be loved and cared for.

I thank you for the opportunity to be able to debate this and the Attorney-General for bringing this bill to the house. It is a very challenging piece of legislation. There is much more in it and we could get very technical. I have medical training, but I am not going to get technical. It is not about that. This is about compassion and this is about doing what is right for people, not just women. I am not even going to start going into gender identity. We can talk about that in the amendments, good grief. This is not about that.

This is about compassion. This is about providing our community with options that are loving, caring and supportive. I support the bill in this form. I am prepared to listen to amendments and I am prepared to take guidance on those, but I will be supporting the bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:04): I rise to make a brief contribution on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. I support the current legislation in regard to abortion law in this state. The Termination of Pregnancy Bill would permit abortion for any reason up to 22 weeks and six days'

gestation and beyond that, right up to birth if two doctors agree it is appropriate. I strongly oppose up to full-term abortion.

Women seeking an abortion will no longer need to attend a hospital in an attempt to liberalise the use of do-it-at-home chemical abortions—for example, RU486. This is particularly dangerous to women in rural areas. Health practitioners will also have their right to conscientious objection severely eroded. They will be required to participate in an abortion in cases of emergency and must at all times refer patients seeking an abortion to another health practitioner—in other words, making them a party to the act. The vast majority—and I stress 'vast'—of the contact to my office, especially across my electorate of Hammond, is opposed to this bill; therefore, I will be opposing the bill.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:07): Reproductive rights have come before the house many times since my election to this place in 1997. Conscience issues rightly demand a greater amount of engagement with the community and a greater amount of research, deep thought, reflection and deliberation.

As on previous occasions, my office has been inundated with form letters and emails, often hundreds a day, from people all over the state. Phone calls and personal visits have also been received, mostly from people outside my electorate, and I have had the opportunity to discuss the bill with unknown individuals who have approached me in shopping centres or on the street. I can assure you, each and every person, and especially each and every constituent, I tell them I hold their views front and centre in approaching the deliberations here today.

The core issue for me is this bill sees the removal of terminations from the criminal statutes to health legislation. It seems within the community this is mostly not a point, or major point, of contention. The fact women even have to consider the prospect of a termination rather than anticipate with great joy the arrival of a baby is a great shame. I say 'women' with mixed feelings because some of my constituents are very disturbed the term 'women' has been removed from the bill intended to empower women in favour of the term 'people'. The South Australian Law Reform Institute report recommended this replacement of terminology and it is a notion that has already been accepted elsewhere, having gone through in the successful New South Wales abortion legislation.

I truly believe no woman ever wants to be in the position of considering an abortion for any reason. The fact society at large has not yet fully addressed the issue of birth control—that is, preventing unwanted pregnancies—is another great shame. It is a fact of nature that not all foetuses are healthy or viable. Congenital abnormality and deformity are things every mother worries about. Reactions to confirmation of terrible news about the unlikelihood of having a healthy baby range from, 'No matter what, I will continue with this pregnancy,' to considering all other options. There is no one-size-fits-all outcome; it is a deeply personal and distressing decision.

If as a society we are to coerce someone to carry every foetus to full term, it also leads us to consider and enforce the options of relinquishing and adoption, both of which have had their own unique and different heart-wrenching issues for a mother. But it would be a happy situation indeed if all adoptions ended up as a perfect solution for the child. We all know that is not always the case, as generations of stolen Aboriginal children show us, as do the terrible stories from children who have survived in orphanages until adulthood. The desire to know and be with your family is very strong. For the relinquishing mother, in most cases there is always the longing to have known your child, and from accounts I have heard lives are never quite the same.

If as a backup to good sex education and birth control the next thing the state could provide is an assurance of full and total support for single parents, I believe terminations would not necessarily ever be considered. When a baby remains in a situation where a parent or the parents have insufficient support, we all too often end up with cases of dysfunctional parenting, resulting in shattered lives. I also believe most parents do their best, or try to do their best, and while children may have less than perfect families they still love their parents. However, all too often children are removed from their families because they are at risk.

In this state, at this very moment we have over 4,700 children needing foster care, and these are just the children we have already removed, not counting the children we know about and have not yet acted to protect. It is a continual concern for me that, while there is rightly great concern about the right to life, no similar concern seems to exist to the same level about the right to a safe, secure

and fulfilling life for a child. This situation must be addressed, for if people have such a deep commitment to an unborn life surely they can find it in their hearts to bring that same determined concern and action to the support of the hundreds of children and families who need assistance.

It is the finer detail of the bill where concerns are raised about all manner of definitions and situations. As a person who has always advocated pro-choice—that is, to support people to make their own fully informed decisions—I bring this view to my deliberations on this bill. For example, while I gave it great thought at the time, I did not want to access IVF procedures at a time when becoming pregnant seemed to be impossible. In reality, I was just far too impatient. Nevertheless, I decided that if no children was to be my fate I would accept that.

Nor do I feel I would want access to organ transplantation. The question about giving one of my organs to one of my family might need more thought. This does not mean, however, I would ever wish to impose my views on others or impede any other person's access to these procedures. These decisions are best made by individuals in consultation with their medical practitioners, and often the original inclination may not be the final decision. So, too, I believe it is a person's right to have a termination, a decision that must be made with full information of all the pros and cons and with the non-judgemental support of counsellors, medicos and healthcare workers.

It has been heartening to hear from the Australian Medical Association, the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, the Human Rights Law Centre, among other peak bodies, and a large number of health professionals, that the number of abortions is decreasing, particularly the number of late-term abortions. At the many briefings I attended, there was information about the length of time it takes for some pregnancies to be confirmed and that this can lead to a late-term abortion. While this is not the optimal situation, the pregnant woman's informed wishes must be respected.

I will consider the many amendments we have been given in the past 24 hours, amendments to the original bill we were asked to assess. I put on record now my disappointment the amendments have been provided so late as to prevent full consultation with the community I represent. In any case, that is the nature of conscience issues. Many fervently held views are competing for attention and acceptance. I will listen carefully to all the debate on amendments and explanations put to us in committee before making my final decision.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:14): This is such a sensitive bill because it is about the lives of babies and mothers. As such, and because I take my role as both a community representative and a legislator seriously, I have dedicated significant time to deliberate on this proposed private member's bill by the Attorney-General. I have been closely reviewing all debate in the upper and lower houses on this bill.

Most importantly, I have been listening to the feedback from constituents living in King to help me understand people's views and experiences on this most important topic. Additionally, I hold this feedback from people living in my community foremost in my mind. In preparation for this debate, I have considered expert advice and evidence and considered my own thoughts and experiences, too, because this is a conscience vote. I am so thankful to the many community members who have made representations to me or who have provided their views to me when I have asked.

This is an emotional topic about a critical decision. Can I say that what I have consistently heard from individuals is that this decision about what to do is gut-wrenchingly difficult. My heart goes out to any woman or couple having to consider a decision about the life of a baby or her life in some of the exceptional circumstances that I have learned can arise. I thank every woman, man and couple who have shared their terribly difficult personal experiences with me to help me understand further the unforeseen complications that can arise when a girl or woman is pregnant. The key themes that have emerged from personal views presented to me in the King community include:

- a view that women are responsible human beings who should be trusted to make the best decisions about their own lives, and they can make their own choices about receiving medical care;
- an overall consensus that preserving the life of the mother or baby is a critical decision;
- that abortion should not be considered a criminal act; and

- some views presented to me that I should just vote down the bill in its entirety and, if I do not, people have threatened that they will not vote for me.

I make it very clear that the decision I make on this bill will be guided by facts, by listening to the medical experts, community views and my own views on this conscience matter. I will not be persuaded to vote a certain way due to the threats that have been made to me by some community members. This bill is about mothers, babies and families and deserves to be contemplated in a well-considered and respectful way. I have prayed for guidance on this important deliberation, and people have kindly prayed for me too.

Some people have asked me to simply vote the bill down. I have learned in the past three years in this place that, in any vote on a bill, the decision is between at least three positions: firstly, supporting the proposed bill; secondly, supporting the existing law and continuing without any changes; and thirdly, supporting the proposed bill with amendments, which I believe will enhance the legislation. There will be a number of amendments tabled in this place, and I will be respectfully considering each of these.

It is important to remind ourselves of what is already in the existing law today so that it can be accurately compared with the new proposed law. On that front, it is important to note that the principle at stake in this bill is not whether abortions will become available in South Australia. That matter was considered by the parliament in 1969 and, for more than 50 years, terminations of pregnancy have been widely available in South Australia during the first 28 weeks of pregnancy.

Additionally, early non-surgical termination has been available in Australia since 2012. Provision also exists in the current law in section 82A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act for terminations to take place after 28 weeks in circumstances where a medical practitioner is of the opinion, formed in good faith, that the termination is immediately necessary to save the life of the pregnant woman or prevent grave injury to her physical or mental health.

In 2018, the majority—91.1 per cent—of pregnancy terminations were performed in the first trimester. The proportion performed in the second trimester was 8.9 per cent, consistent with the average over the past five years. The proportion of terminations performed at gestation 20 weeks or over was 2.1 per cent. The current practice of termination of pregnancy is that 0.1 per cent of terminations have occurred over 22 weeks and six days' gestation. In South Australia, there has not been a recorded termination over 27 weeks.

The proposed bill suggests several changes. The framework for the legislation would remove abortion from the criminal code. The time frame for the standard consideration of a termination to be allowed would be reduced from 28 weeks to 22 weeks and six days.

After 22 weeks and six days, the bill allows for a termination to be performed by a medical practitioner on a person who is more than 22 weeks and six days pregnant, where the practitioner is acting within their scope of practice, and the practitioner has consulted with another medical practitioner and both practitioners consider that in all circumstances the termination is medically appropriate. In determining whether or not a termination is medically appropriate, a medical practitioner must consider all relevant circumstances, the professional standards and guidelines that apply to the medical practitioner in relation to the performance of the termination.

Why would a mother consider a termination? Today, genetic testing has the capability to identify which foetuses with congenital abnormalities have a syndrome, which would also often indicate an intellectual disability. The routine morphology ultrasound is completed at 20 weeks' gestation in the vast majority of pregnancies in South Australia. If an abnormality is identified on the ultrasound, it may represent an isolated, treatable, congenital abnormality—for example, an isolated congenital heart lesion amenable to surgery soon after birth—or it may be the earliest evidence of a genetic syndrome.

This testing can be done but takes three-plus weeks from the time of the ultrasound to provision of genetic results. An upper gestational limit of 22 weeks plus six days for termination of pregnancy means there is insufficient time for genetic results to be returned to a woman in a way that gives women choice regarding termination of pregnancy. If genetic results are returned just before 22 weeks plus six days, there is significant time pressure on women to make what is likely to be one of the hardest decisions of their life.

Removing the upper gestational limit for termination of pregnancy allows time for genetic testing, testing that has the capability to provide women with the opportunity of the most informed choice, including how to prepare to care for a baby that is born with abnormalities. I have been told today that people can be rushed into making a decision and that this could lead to people requesting a termination when with more information they might not have made this decision.

To understand in more depth what is medically appropriate, I have sought further information about the sorts of circumstances within which a termination after the prescribed period might be authorised. I have learned during my research that many medical groups have confirmed that terminations are only carried out in the most compelling of circumstances, where women and their partners are faced with terrible decisions, such as cancer or severe foetal abnormality, often only diagnosed at 18 to 20 weeks. I have been advised that when New South Wales considered its legislation last year it found that in Victoria there was no increase in late-term abortions after terminations were decriminalised in 2008.

There is common ground across my community regarding the sanctity of life of an unborn child. We all agree on this. That is why it is so very important to separate facts from fiction in what is being proposed. Some community members have presented fears, suggesting that if the proposals are accepted then more women would have late-term abortions for any reason and that the two doctors who are required to determine if the termination is medically appropriate may go rogue with their responsibilities. The idea that the bill might lead to a jump in terminations is at odds with the Australian statistics, which show that abortions in SA have decreased significantly from 1999 to 2018, and evidence from other states shows reforms have not led to a rise.

It has been suggested by some community members that the bill will allow for terminations to be performed up to birth on demand, including in situations where the baby is viable with no indication of congenital abnormalities and the mother has simply changed her mind, perhaps at 37 weeks. I reject this proposition because the additional presence and approval of the two medical practitioners after 22 weeks and six days' gestation recognises that terminations at a later stage of pregnancy involve complexities that merit the involvement of a second practitioner who must agree that a serious medical condition exists. The decision to impose a gestational limit of 22 weeks and six days is supported and considered appropriate by the Australian Medical Association (AMA) and the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

I have been advised that South Australian doctors are held accountable, firstly, under codes of conduct under the Medical Board and AHPRA, and, secondly, professional standards under professional bodies (such as the AMA and colleges), health service policies, procedures and credentialing requirements and the overriding principles enshrined in medical and health ethics, which they must comply with. I am advised that doctors must act ethically, and if they do not I am advised that they risk losing their right to practise.

In the last three years of data collection there have been five terminations of pregnancy between gestations of 24 weeks to 26 weeks. This has demonstrated that later gestation termination of pregnancy is exceedingly rare, and it is not expected to change under the new bill should it pass into law.

To recognise and acknowledge some of my constituents' concerns about the legitimacy of medical practitioners' decisions, I foreshadow an amendment in my name which replicates clause 6(2) in substantially the same terms but which imposes an additional legislative requirement on both of the medical practitioners to consult with the pregnant person when considering whether a termination is medically appropriate.

This addition is an important safeguard in ensuring that both the medical practitioners separately consult with the pregnant person, not just each other, in determining whether or not the termination is medically appropriate in all circumstances. While the advice I have received is that a medical practitioner would always consult separately with the patient as a matter of good clinical practice, my hope is that this amendment will reduce concerns that this would not already occur.

This amendment will also expand the clause to consider the professional standards and guidelines that apply to the medical practitioner in relation to the performance of the termination of a baby. I have been advised that polling across Australia shows 80 per cent support for a woman's right to choose, including an overwhelming number of women who identify as religious.

As I have been doorknocking the past few weeks and attending community events, I have been asking pretty much everyone for feedback on this important topic, and the majority of men and women I have asked told me they support the proposed changes. There are also certainly people against, and their concerns largely come from a decision of concern for the babies. This is why I will move amendments, why I am taking the time to explain my position in the chamber today and why I will seriously consider other members' amendments too.

I have learnt that there are serious circumstances where rape, incest and abuse to girls and women are not apparent, or the pregnancy is not diagnosed until a more advanced gestational age. Requiring a woman to continue a pregnancy in such circumstances is advised by health professionals as unreasonable.

I cannot imagine instructing a young girl who has been raped that she has no choice in the matter about what she will choose to do if she is pregnant. People do not like to contemplate and talk about rape, abuse and incest because it makes us feel awful and uncomfortable, but we must think seriously about these prevalent issues in our community today. We must consider these situations and victims, as we consider this bill, with love, kindness and compassion.

I believe we must consider the serious psychological impact that continuing a pregnancy can have on the woman and her child in situations such as rape and incest, and because I am committed to South Australian children growing up more safely, to protecting our most vulnerable community members, and because I am dedicated to putting a stop to sexual abuse of children, I am made aware of more real-life stories of child rape than perhaps a lot of other members.

The statistics show that in South Australia there were three abortion procedures performed for children under 15 in 2018. Child sexual abuse is a topic no-one wants to talk about, but ignoring and hiding from the frightening reality of it is only putting more and more of our children at greater risk than they already are. According to the Australian Institute of Criminology, up to 30 per cent of children experience some sort of child sexual abuse.

Between 5 per cent and 10 per cent of children experience severe sexual abuse. Children with disabilities are up to seven times more likely to be sexually abused than their non-disabled peers. That is three in 10 children in your local childcare centre who could be experiencing some sort of sexual abuse at home. That is six children experiencing child sexual abuse in your average primary school classroom.

A woman I know who was courageous and open about her own life story has given me permission to share some of her story to illustrate a real-life example of incest. She was pregnant as a nine-year-old girl, raped by her uncle and, because of the hidden incest in her family, was forced to give birth. She grew up in a family who denied the incest. Her baby son was given to her aunty and grew up in another family. Her son did not know who his real mum was. She told me her son now suffers with serious medical conditions. Her son then married a person he thought was his cousin who was actually his stepsister.

There can be lifelong adverse impacts for people impacted by these types of situations and it must be stopped. In this case, this brave woman revealed her abuse to her subsequent grown-up children from her own marriage, and her children have found this too hard to accept and now refuse to see her. Fractures in families can continue for decades. It is my position that girls and women who have been raped need to be given a choice. Being denied abortion in these circumstances can have serious implications for the children born of an unwanted pregnancy as well as for the existing children in the family.

A South Australian social worker and experienced child sexual abuse counsellor in the northern suburbs provided me with her views on this topic. She said:

My work with childhood sexual assault survivors often exposed me to adolescent girls experiencing pregnancy as a result of sexual assault. In more than one instance the perpetrator has been an adult relative from within their own family.

One young woman did not come forward until four months into the pregnancy because the perpetrator was a step parent who was a powerful figure within his own religious community. She had self-harmed extensively as a reaction to the abuse and upon realising the pregnancy had researched amateur techniques for performing a home

abortion. Had her mother not noticed when the pregnancy was beginning to show, she would have potentially been at risk of permanent harm.

In this case, the young woman went interstate and accessed services as the waitlist was too long in South Australia for her to be within the (current) required South Australian time frame. While this particular young woman's family had the means to fund this option, many women, particularly those from low socioeconomic backgrounds do not...

Domestic violence and the need to escape it, is a frequent barrier to women accessing an abortion in the first 23 weeks of pregnancy...There have been numerous cases of women both being denied access to abortion by the perpetrator, giving birth to the child and having both the newborn and other children placed at further risk.

Mr Speaker, I share the above situations so that you, other members and my constituents can begin to understand how serious these situations can be. I have no doubt that most people who have made a representation to me have done so because they have a sincere, compassionate concern for women and babies.

As well as reflecting on my constituents' feedback, I reflect on my own life experience in this debate. Having had two babies, I know personally what it is like to have scans and feel and see a baby grow in my belly, and I have learnt how protective a mother becomes. Because I am a mother, I am very aware of why it is very important to protect the lives of babies with this legislative change. That is why I have asked the Attorney-General so many questions about the clauses of this bill and why I have read the background reports from experts.

Abortion is for women and their partners a heart-wrenching decision, and I foreshadow further amendments in my name. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr BROWN (Playford) (16:34): I risk to speak on this bill, as I prefer to do on matters of conscience, so that my constituents may have an indication of my reasoning to judge me on as well as being able to judge me on my vote. I will be opposing this bill at its second reading. I do so not because I object to taking the statutes that govern the medical termination of pregnancy in this state and moving them from the criminal law to a standalone act. That is a reform that is indeed long overdue.

I also do not object to the reform of the laws governing access to termination before the viability date. The law should work in practice just as it does on the page. The law, as it currently reads, is a fiction. The considerations, processes and safeguards felt necessary in 1969 have now long been effectively ignored by our health system in order to achieve what our community expects of it.

If these were the only components of this bill, I would probably be inclined to support it as presented. However, there are so many more things that this bill does, things that I know a number of members will be seeking to amend, and I indicate I will be supporting the majority of the amendments that have been circulated by members. I will personally be moving amendments, including to ensure that those seeking a termination are offered the opportunity to receive independent counselling, including that provided by the Pregnancy Advisory Centre.

I will also be moving an amendment to make it unlawful to perform a termination for the purposes of sex selection. It is true that the evidence of sex selection terminations occurring in Australia is only anecdotal. However, I believe that just like female genital mutilation, which this parliament has also rightly condemned, it is a practice we know occurs overseas and one we should make clear is not welcome here. I will consider which amendments, if any, are passed before deciding which way I will vote on this bill at its third reading.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:35): I also rise to speak to the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020. As many members have indicated so far in their deliberations, this is a complex, sensitive and challenging issue for all South Australians. At the heart of it, we are talking about matters of life and conscience. Therefore, we must tread with extreme care and caution in legislating for such action and always undertake this debate with respect and decency.

I think the Attorney mentioned the need for respect and decency in her media comments yesterday in the paper, and the descriptions of the 'Wicked Witch of the East', 'murderer' and 'baby killer' are completely unnecessary from all sides of the debate. There is no place for that type of emotive language. It is not appropriate, it does not help and it does not help deal with that issues we are talking about in front of us.

Other comments—and I am sure all members have received these through their correspondence—include, 'You have no right to comment on this legislation because you are a male,' and also that my view does not have a place in this debate. We are all here as members of parliament. We are here to work with legislation and the debate that is before us, and it is incumbent on all of us to participate in the debate in a respectful and thoughtful manner.

Regardless of which label you choose—'foetus', 'collection of cells', 'unborn baby'—it cannot be denied that we were all in this position once; we all share in that common experience. As legislators, we have that delicate task of balancing the needs of the unborn child and that of the mother, finding the best ways to support them both in providing the best and safest health care available to them right across our state.

Within this bill, we are dealing with matters that impact on women, couples and their families, and at times it can be very difficult to discuss, as the member for King so eloquently put in her contribution just then. There are strong arguments from pro-life and pro-choice advocates and both are very passionate about their views. During my time in this place, just as you have, Mr Deputy Speaker, I have sat with people on both sides of the issue and had many discussions with constituents about their thoughts on abortion, its decriminalisation and on certain late-term aspects of the bill.

As the member for Playford put in his remarks just then, I do not think there are too many in this entire house who do not support moving the bill from the criminal code to a general healthcare code. But that, in essence, is not what we are actually dealing with in this draft legislation before us. I think there is a raft of other measures in this debate.

As I said, this bill has generated strong views from my constituents, especially around changes to gestational limits. Certainly in my community, and I think across South Australia, there is very little support for what is called late-term abortion and allowing for the gestational limits to change that would allow potentially termination to birth, and especially a termination on a child in utero who is capable of being born alive and surviving independently of their mother. This step, I believe, is too far for many South Australians and, in fact, most Australians in general think it is a step too far.

A 2019 YouGov Galaxy poll found around 69.8 per cent of Australians were against abortion taking place after 22 weeks. The bill does allow for abortion at any stage up until birth, if deemed medically appropriate. I ask this house to consider if the current laws regarding late-term abortion are enough and whether they actually need to be extended.

In years to come we do not want to hold the same regrets that the late Hon. Mr Millhouse had, lamenting the wide interpretations that deviated from the legislation's original intent. I personally believe that being more specific about the circumstances around gestational limits would assist in this regard, and I will be supporting amendments with respect to that.

Currently, we have legislation that deals with late-term abortion in circumstances of medical necessity, such as to preserve the life of the mother. I do not know whether this bill, if passed, would increase the number of late-term abortions in South Australia. I would certainly hope that it does not. Evidence from Victoria suggests that it will, with a 2017 Victorian mothers and babies report showing that since abortion to birth legislation was legalised in Victoria in 2008, there have been an average of 65 late-term abortions a year in that state.

Let us not forget that with late-term abortion we are talking about a gestational stage when human life is viable and a foetus can survive independently of its mother. Medical advancement continues to demonstrate that this is the case. SA Health regards the threshold of viability to be from 22 weeks. Knowing this, it is interesting to also note that the gestational limits for abortion in other countries is as low as 12 weeks in Denmark, Norway and Switzerland and 14 weeks in Germany, France and Spain.

As has already been put on the record, there are other amendments and I understand the member for Playford seeks to move amendments around sex selection. This is another concern that constituents have raised with me, and the potential danger for sex-selective abortions to occur in Australia. Obviously, in my view no-one supports this and we should never open the door to aborting a child simply because of its sex. It is discrimination, plain and simple, and it goes against everything that our society has fought for for generations.

Whilst it is a practice that most Australians abhor, there are reports that indicate that prenatal gender selection is taking place in Australia. A La Trobe University study from 2018 led by Dr Kristina Edvardsson found that in Victoria from 1999 to 2015, around 108 to 109 males were born for every 100 females in certain community groups, higher than the worldwide ratio of 105 males born to every 100 females.

In these same community groups, the ratio is even higher for mothers who have had two or more previous births, with around 122 to 125 males born to every 100 females. This is a concerning development and one that has been brought up in other states when they have debated legislation similar to this bill, as outlined in the South Australian Law Report Institute report 'Abortion: a review of South Australian law and practice', October 2019, at page 322. It is a terrible practice that continues to occur in other countries around the world. While it may not happen much here in South Australia, I would hate to see any change in our abortion laws that would lead to this practice occurring.

One issue that has been raised with me quite a lot is the issue of conscientious objection by the medical fraternity in the bill's current form. Under part 2, clause 8(1)(e), the proposed legislation requires registered health practitioners who conscientiously object, to, and I quote:

- (i) transfer the person's care to a registered health practitioner who, in the practitioner's opinion, can provide the requested service and does not have a conscientious objection to the performance of the termination or providing advice about the performance of the termination; or
- (ii) provide the person with information on how to locate or contact such a registered health practitioner.

The bill, as it currently stands, forces conscientious objectors to be part of the termination process by referring the patient to a doctor who will perform the procedure or providing them with information on locating another doctor who will. Dr Joanna Howe, Associate Professor in Law at the University of Adelaide, states:

Those who argue that forcing doctors to refer for abortion is merely about providing access to healthcare fail to understand that the act of referral is no trifling matter for a doctor who believes medical termination involves ending the life of an in utero foetus.

This presents a great ethical dilemma for many South Australian doctors who do not wish to play a part in the termination of a pregnancy. The conscientious objection provisions within the current Criminal Law Consolidation Act presently protect the rights of persons, including doctors and nurses, to conscientiously object to playing any part in the procurement of an abortion. An open letter signed by some 50 South Australian doctors voices their concerns, and it goes on to say:

SA is the last remaining state protecting conscientious objection in abortion. We implore you to maintain the status quo with the existing clause written by the late Justice Millhouse.

The open letter continues to say:

The authors of the conscientious objection clause, including the AMA, insist that conscientious objection is respected by the Bill. That is entirely false because the new clause coerces doctors to act against their conscience and mandates punishment which may include deregistration. Nobody should be forced legally to do something which they find unconscionable. Let it be clearly understood that parliamentarians have demanded for themselves a conscience vote where abortion legislation is concerned. It is contradictory, even hypocritical, to demand conscientious freedom for oneself and then use that freedom to deny freedom of conscience to doctor and other healthcare practitioners.

Other sections of the letter state:

We write to appeal for the restoration of the current status quo on this matter which is crucial to the practice of medicine by good and conscientious medical professionals.

They go on to say that a referral is not needed from a doctor in South Australia in order to procure termination services. Of course, this information is available on the SHINE SA information memorandum, where it says:

You don't need a referral from a GP to access abortion services in Adelaide.

This was certainly reinforced to me when I visited the Pregnancy Advisory Centre with some of my colleagues as part of the SA Health briefings. I had an opportunity to speak to the people on the ground at the PAC who said that a referral from a GP is not required to access their services.

I believe the current Criminal Law Consolidation Act's conscientious objections are some of the most sensible in the nation, in terms of other jurisdictions. In her paper 'Medical referral for abortion and freedom of conscience in Australian law' 2019, Howe states:

The middle ground can be seen in South Australia. There, the refusal must be due to a conscientious objection, though this is not defined in the legislation. The person relying on a conscientious objection has the burden of proving their objection in any subsequent legal proceedings. An additional provision limits the situations where conscientious objections can be made. It is not available where 'treatment is necessary to save the life, or to prevent grave injury to the physical or mental health of a pregnant woman'. This is in the current Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

South Australia's approach appears to reject a pluralistic approach in that it permits conscientious objection, regardless of whether the motivation is religious or secular. There is also an element of pragmatism in that a claim of conscience could be scrutinised in the course of malpractice proceedings, thus placing some pressure on practitioners to ensure they have a defensible position in regard to conscientious objections but providing protection for deeply held beliefs. If the practitioner were unable to establish their actions were due to a genuinely held conscientious objection they would be potentially found liable for negligence.

Dr Roy Watson, who is head of Gynaecology at the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and a former Vice-President of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, also commented in the MPs' briefing in relation to this debate on conscientious objection provisions. He states:

...threatening the loss of medical licence for refusing to be involved in a process with which one does not agree, and which may even be dangerous, is not going to help us maintain a rural medical workforce when solo practitioners feel that they need to compromise their personal convictions in order to provide other essential medical services to South Australian women. We should be doing everything possible to sustain an adequate rural workforce, and this threat is detrimental to that cause.

My final words, in terms of the conscientious objection provisions, come from respected Adelaide clinician Dr Elvis Seman, medical lead of Urogynaecology at Flinders Medical Centre and Associate Professor at the Department of Obstetrics, Gynaecology and Reproductive Medicine at Flinders University. He says:

The Bill targets, stigmatises and, in effect, criminalises conscientious objectors, with the potential threat of disciplinary action including deregistration, which destroys one's reputation and livelihood. We were all privileged to train and practice in a culture which respects conscientious objectors, and countless doctors like us would not be in medicine today if the current Abortion law did not protect our right.

I will be moving amendments that simply replicate the current conscientious objections provision within the Criminal Law and Consolidation Act 1935, being section 82A(5) and section 82A(6), into the bill we are debating at the moment. These amendments are supported by many current medical practitioners in South Australia. These amendments seek to provide plurality, pragmatism and legislative protections.

I will not be supporting this bill in many of its elements because it goes well beyond the decriminalisation aspects by permitting late-term abortion, for one, and a lack of clarity around conscientious objections. That is why I will be supporting those amendments. I understand members are tabling other amendments and I will see whether I am in a position to support those as they are progressed and debated. I believe this bill fails to achieve many protections for our most vulnerable. As I said, this is a matter that requires compassion and support. I know there are some amendments from the member for West Torrens and the member for King which I hope are successful to improve this legislation overall.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (16:51): I rise to make an ever so brief contribution on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020. From the outset, I would like to thank the people of Narungga for sharing their thoughts and stories with me on this deeply emotive issue. The extraordinary volume of correspondence my office and I have received in response to this proposed bill shows how important this issue is to so many people. Overwhelmingly—but not exclusively—the phone calls, letters and emails that myself and my staff have received have been respectful and considered.

Again, I would like to thank all those who have contributed for taking the time to do so and for the manner in which they have done so. I always attempt to reflect the will of the electorate whilst casting my vote on conscience issues. My personal conscience is a consideration that I take into account, but I always do my best to reflect the will of the constituency—that is who elected me, that is who I represent and that is whose vote I am casting.

It is especially important in this instance, and I acknowledge that I am yet to be in a position to completely understand the emotions and challenges that come with expecting a child with a partner. For this reason, I greatly appreciate the conversations I have had with people who have been in this position. I acknowledge the extremely difficult situations in which women and couples find themselves having to make unimaginable decisions about terminating pregnancies due to the health of a baby or a mother. I have done my best to put myself in their shoes but I imagine there will be no substitute for lived experience.

There are parts of this bill which I believe have merit and against which I offer no objections. I am fully in favour—as have been a great deal of many other speakers—of shifting the termination of pregnancy from the criminal code into the healthcare legislation. It makes sense for pregnancy termination to be an issue of health for both mothers and babies. As I said, that makes perfect coherent sense to me. I acknowledge that there is merit in this bill for women and couples in the regions who require a termination—and I would like to emphasise the word 'require'.

I accept that there are circumstances in which the majority of society has grown to accept that a termination is necessary—for example, for victims of rape and sexual assault—but I have three concerns with this bill and without support for amendments addressing each of them, I will be unable to support the bill at the final vote. Those three concerns are: the lack of explicit prevention of late-term abortion, the lack of explicit prevention of sex selection abortion and the function of the conscientious objection clause.

Without the passing of amendments proposed by the Minister for Environment and Water I will be unable to support this bill. Without a shadow of a doubt, the single biggest complaint I have received from constituents and interested people with regard to this bill has been the concern that it will enable late-term termination. I share my electorate's view that full or late-term termination should not be permitted, nor enabled, with a few exceptions. I will require that they are explicitly excluded in order to satisfy the desire of my constituents that they do not become an unintended occurrence as a result of this bill.

I am concerned that the current wording of the bill before us, 'medically appropriate', leaves it open and ambiguous, and I prefer the very limited exceptions proposed by the member for Black in his amendments. We have heard from previous speakers that this will not occur in practice, but I would like to see it made explicitly so in legislation.

I will also support amendments filed by the member for Playford specifically regarding sex selection. While I am certain that the evidence provided by the proponents of this bill and by departmental officials is accurate, and that sex selection does not occur in South Australia, I see no harm in legislating specifically to prevent it from happening. As I have said, in my view and in the view of my community, there should be precious few exemptions for abortion, and biological sex preference should be one.

Finally, I will support amendments from the member for Waite regarding conscientious objection. I congratulate the proponents of this bill for recognising that there are health professionals who would not be willing to perform these procedures, and including an amendment as an acknowledgment of that. However, it is my view that, by compelling them to refer the mother to another healthcare professional who would be willing to perform that procedure, we would then be forcing them to facilitate that to which they conscientiously object.

I cannot support that and prefer that healthcare professionals are free to conscientiously object with peace of mind. As an aside, I sincerely hope that the amendments proposed by the member for Schubert are successful, as they represent the real-world biological differences between men and women.

As I have said, my primary concerns with this bill lie around the possibility of late-term terminations, and I would like to see them specifically excluded. I also believe that there need to be checks and balances to ensure that the parent or parents both recognise the enormity of the decision they are taking, and that they are completely safe in doing so.

Conscience votes are always extremely difficult. When I entered parliament three years ago I wanted to fix local roads, restore services to local hospitals and improve education outcomes in our electorate. Those are the things that personally inspired me to nominate for parliament and that I will continue to work on for as long as I am elected to represent the people of Narungga.

Issues that are a matter of conscience are vexed because people have passionate views on both sides of the debate. I have spent many, many hours listening to constituents, asking questions and researching this topic. Stories like the one I heard in Port Vincent recently, which has stuck with me and on which I keep reflecting, are evidence of the emotion with which many confront this issue.

I was approached by a lady with some urgency, and she urged me as her representative not to support this bill. She had been through an abortion in her younger days and had spent her life since regretting that decision. The emotion was clear as she recounted her story. She put to me the impact that taking the life of her baby had had on her mental health, and it had been a significant burden for her to bear for many years thereafter.

These are the stories of people's lived experiences that I value immensely. There have been countless other people within the community who have sought me out at a litany of other events to share their concerns. The people of Narungga elected me as their representative, and I intend to represent them as best I can in this place. I also take this opportunity to thank sincerely those MPs and interest groups who have provided briefings on this topic, and those on both sides of the debate for providing as much information as they possibly can; it has been an invaluable help in attempting to make up my mind on these issues.

As I mentioned, there are parts of this bill I can support, but without sensible amendments I cannot support the bill in its entirety. These are life-changing decisions, and life-ending decisions for the infant, and the bill requires significant, measured debate. I look forward to working with colleagues in this place to make sure that there are safeguards in place to protect the lives of unborn children, as well as the physical and mental health of parents, especially mothers.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (16:58): It is safe to say that good people bring differing but deeply held views to the table on this debate. These views are influenced by their values, their faith, their life experience and often, if not all the time, a combination of all those things. I will be supporting reform because of my values, my faith, my life, but not lived experiences.

I have been open and honest since the day I stepped foot into this chamber about my support for both decriminalisation of abortion law in this state, as well as meaningful law reform more generally. It is my view that decriminalisation and law reform are not divisible.

I have also trodden carefully as a man in this debate. I do not have lived experience, but I bring values and empathy. I do not know what it is like to carry a child, but I know what it is like to be a father. I also know what it is like to be an ally, to be an activist and, when it comes to honesty and truth in my approach to public policy, to be truthful and not to equivocate when it comes to the tough issues, particularly when we are asked to exercise our conscience.

I reaffirm today my pledge in my maiden speech, and that is my support for this bill. I reaffirm my position and my support for this bill because I see a woman not only and singly defined as a vessel for procreation but as an equal, free to exercise their choice, their bodily autonomy and deserving of a law and legal framework that reflect and protect this. I do so because I support a legal framework that supports our health and medical practitioners to provide health care and support just as they do in every other aspect of health care. I do so because I am driven by my values—in this case, that abortion should be legal, affordable and safe.

This reform will support a woman's right to seek a termination as well as and in perpetuity a fundamental right and protection for women exercising their choice in a fundamentally different path. I do so with a responsibility, one that I carry humbly but also closely, as the member in this place representing the Pregnancy Advisory Centre in Woodville Park. I speak today to pay my sincere thanks to the medical professionals, the staff, their supporters both current and past, who have dedicated themselves to the care of these women in our community. Often, these women present and seek the support of the Pregnancy Advisory Centre in the most difficult circumstances.

While we talk rightfully and sincerely about the mental health impact on women as they find their choices through termination, let's not forget, as I know we do not, the staff who work in this space who undoubtedly also pay their own toll when it comes to their own mental health and wellbeing. I do so, as I always have, to proudly stand up for workers no matter what they do and how they do it.

I also lend my voice and give my vote to a movement for change that has been 50 years in the making; 12 years before I was born this law was brought in. This reform and the movement for reform have been led by some of the most incredible women in the state, activists from all political persuasions, all walks of life, women who continue to inspire me and many of my colleagues in this place. Today, those torches are carried by organisations like SARC, EMILY's List and Labor for Choice.

To those activists I say clearly, precisely and humbly that your dedication over the years inspires me and gives cause to the way I exercise my vote in this place. For me, when it comes to health care and to women's productive autonomy, I support each and every choice equally. I put my trust in the medical professionals, women and their families. These choices are often exercised in the most difficult of circumstances. After 50 years, reform is well and truly overdue.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:03): I, too, rise to make a contribution on this very emotive issue. We know that there are many representatives in this chamber who have been lobbied for a significant period of time. Those people have gone to their representatives, their members of parliament, to express their view and, in most instances, to express an opinion. They have opinions far and wide, but they have an opinion one way or the other.

I would like to thank all the constituents in the electorate of Chaffey who have either met with me one way or another. Whether it is in my Politics in the Pub, whether it is in street corner meetings, whether it is my post office gatherings, whether it is just in conversation, people always feel obliged to come up and express their opinion.

I have had many of them. I do not have the numbers, but there are many. Those opinions have come from all corners of the electorate, remembering that I live in a regional electorate that has different measures from some others of how they view society. What I would say is that they have a view: some are pro-life and some are there for reform.

It is my view that I have given everyone my ear. I have given everyone the consideration they deserve and listened to their point of view, listened to their opinion, whether it be an uninformed opinion, or whether it be because they are part of a group—a church group, a lobby group or a community group—or just part of that community. It is my responsibility to give them a listening ear and make sure they walk away satisfied that I have given them the opportunity to express their point of view.

It has given me the capability to speak to a vast collective of opinions and to those who have been through it. My mother is 82 years of age and I have even had sit-down conversations with some of her friends, nursing colleagues of hers from yesteryear. They have told stories of the women who came in in early days for an abortion for one reason or another. Again, those reasons are many and varied as to whether the abortion was through circumstance.

A lot of women in the early days were forced to the hospital by their husband or their partner because they did not want that first child, or they were of a view that they did not want that child, which was number—I am not going to say the number, as there are different reasons for that number. Of course, as the member for Cheltenham has just said, there has been a significant amount of pressure put on women, whether it be due to mental health, whether it be as an upstanding community person, or whether it just be out of the fear of what has been part of their history with childbirth. Sometimes women have been persuaded to have an abortion; sometimes they have made their own collective decision.

Some of those sad stories from those I sat down with have also come from the very young. I have quite a young family: my youngest daughter is 18 and my eldest son is 30. I have also had the opportunity to sit down with my children's friends as a collective to have that conversation so that they can either express their opinion or they can express an experience they have had, whether it is with a family member or friend or someone within their social circle. Everyone has a story to tell of the impact it has had on them, and I think it has been said far and wide that this bill is long overdue.

My view is that we now make this a health issue, of the like of a healthcare code, away from a law bill, and I think that has merit. What I would say is that listening to all the issues around what was or what is the current law proves to me that there are many and varied reasons for women to have an abortion. Whether it is early in the piece or whether it is later in the piece, they have to be

supported by the health system and they have to be supported by their collective family or community should they have to make a decision one way or the other.

I recently sat down with one of my family members and consoled them at length. A pregnant girl had to make a decision on what to do because the baby had a serious medical issue. We talked through it, and she decided to go ahead with the pregnancy. I think she was given the support that I could give her through circumstance. My advice was that it would have to be a health professional who would give her some level of assurance that she would be satisfied when that child was born.

Again, as someone having a listening ear, I have an opinion, but as a collective here in this chamber we have the responsibility as legislators to make the decision on behalf of our constituencies. Morally, we also need to make a decision on what we think is best for modern-day society because it is evolving. I think in today's society we have to reflect on not just what public pressure is telling us but what morally is right for a legislator to make that decision.

I have spoken to many health professionals in order to get their opinion, making sure that I am listening to a collective of opinion. I am listening to a collective of mothers, mothers-to-be, couples and married couples who have made a collective decision along the way. I must say that through this exercise I have sat down with hundreds of people, whether they be couples or individuals. It has certainly given me a much clearer understanding of what it is going to mean to them and the pressures it puts on us as legislators to make a decision in the best interests of not only our communities but today's society.

That is something that has kept me awake at night because I truly care about the common good of today's society. Speaking to many doctors, nurses and healthcare professionals, they all have a story to tell. They have given me a collective of stories and opinions, whether they be professional or whether they be private. You can ask a doctor about the experiences that he or she has had. They will always give you their professional opinion, but normally they will also give you their personal opinion, and those opinions come with a wealth of experience.

The bill is there to accommodate what we think is reform needed here in South Australia. I did hear one of the members saying that if a woman cannot get the care and what she wishes here in South Australia, she will travel interstate. That is something that was not presented to me by individual people. I think it weighs quite heavily on us as legislators to maintain a steady course in making that decision with that in mind. I have seen a number of MPs come to this place this last week with amendments to the bill, and I think that is healthy, robust democracy, and some of it is applaudable but some of it is not. That is something we will work through in the committee process.

I will also take the opportunity now to listen to the remainder of members. I think I have listened to every contribution here in the chamber from MPs. For different reasons, they have had their opinion swayed by their community, swayed by their personal opinion and also some, I am sure, swayed by personal experience. That is also very healthy, that we have a wide and varied understanding of the different situations because one size does not fit all. Again, I will continue to listen to the contributions here on this very important day.

I must say that I have had a number of phone calls today with people expressing their view that this is an important day for South Australia. Yes, it is. It is an important day for the democratic system and it is also an important day for the South Australian parliament to make a decision, one way or the other. It will be presented, and it will be something that will go down in the history books as providing what today's society is looking for. It is looking for leadership, it is looking for a decision and it is also looking for South Australia to fall into line with the national agenda. I will listen carefully and continue to be a part of the debate.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (17:15): I will be very brief. I want to make sure that my comments are on the record for my community to understand where I am coming from in making a contribution on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020. As the member for any community, but particularly my community, I make sure that I consider and respect the views of my electorate. I take that trust very seriously, particularly when it comes to complex issues such as this one.

Over the last number of months, as many here have already spoken of, I have listened to both sides of the debate and attended every forum that I can, and if I cannot attend I make sure that Kate Hill from my office attends and then we have discussions and briefings about it. I would also

like to thank all those who took the time to contact my office or have come to see me in my office, or allowed me to do a home visit to their home and sit at their kitchen table to discuss this very important issue and hear their personal stories and opinions and views on this.

I really want to put on record the respectful nature in which that has occurred. I have heard other MPs here talking about some pretty ordinary behaviour, but I would have to say I have not experienced it in my electorate. In fact, everybody has been respectful and we have had a robust discussion around the legislation. Many of the points that I would make are echoed in the member for Narungga's contribution. In fact, I thought it was a brilliant contribution to this place.

One of the fiercest critics I have is my daughter, Jordan Bell, who is nearly 18. Unfortunately, I am seeing a tendency that she may want to come into this place at some stage, which is something I will probably be discouraging. As an 18 year old, she certainly has a lot of opinions which lead to robust discussion, which for a father and daughter to share that interest to the point where she is reading *Hansard* and she is picking—

Members interjecting:

Mr BELL: Yes, it is quite scary, as I said. But it is really healthy for a father and daughter to be able to argue different points of view. She will call me a 47-year-old white male and ask what right do I have to have an opinion on this, and I will push back. She is not the elected member, so when she is she can have her own opinion.

Up until 23 weeks, I support nearly everything in the current bill. I would like to see the amendment on sex selection put in there, but up until 23 weeks I am very supportive. I genuinely believe in the right of somebody to choose the journey that they are on and not have a 47-year-old white male, as my daughter would say, putting my opinion on that. However, there is a critical point, and that is the point of viability outside the womb, and I do not think this bill satisfies my concern around this. When people say it will not happen, as a legislator—and I will put a legislative hat on—it is no comfort to say it will not happen if indeed it can happen. It might be a very rare exception or a very good lawyer—we need those, of course—but it is the point of a legislator to try to move forward as robustly as we can.

I guess I am really saying to the house that if these amendments can be passed—the ones I am really looking at are sex selection, defining of late-term abortions in specific terms and purpose-built abortion clinics that are for profit—and are addressed with the conscientious objection, I would be able to support this bill in an amended form.

If it goes through unamended, I am putting on record that I will not be supporting it, even though I fundamentally believe in most of the reasons that people will espouse. It should not be in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. It should be in the health area, but I have to make a decision as a legislator going forward that what people say will not happen then cannot happen.

There are many other things we could talk about. I am passionate about adoption. I think we need to change our attitude in South Australia to adoption and really look at the New South Wales model, which went from two or three a year, which is similar to ours, to now 150 to 180 adoptions a year. I am really interested in support for expectant mothers to make very difficult decisions. I heard the member for Chaffey talking about the support he has been able to give to a family member. There are a lot of people out there who do not have that support around them or somebody who is capable of guiding them in the right direction.

Whilst I have put my points on record, I really would like to thank Kate Hill from my office. She has gone above and beyond. Every call has been answered and everybody has been met face to face. Even today, I think they spoke to four or five constituents on this issue because I was in Parliament House, so thank you, Kate. That is where I sit at this point in time.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (17:22): I rise today to speak in support of the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020. Termination of pregnancy has been legal in South Australia since 1970; however, in the 50 years since those laws were first enacted, there have been significant changes in our health system, including improvement in medical diagnosis and imaging, advancements in genomic testing, improvements to medical termination methods and the modernisation of health service provision, an example being telehealth consultations, which are now commonplace.

Our laws have failed to keep pace with these changes. As they currently stand, they create a barrier to safe and accessible health care for women. In particular, women who live in rural and remote South Australia are restricted in access to options that are available to metropolitan women. This bill provides a contemporary legislative framework for already existing lawful termination of pregnancy. For me, removing abortion from criminal law and regulating it as a health procedure is where it belongs. This bill reflects best clinical practice, promotes patient decision-making and respects individual autonomy of the patient whilst ensuring appropriate safeguarding and measures are in place.

In early 2019, the Attorney-General commissioned the South Australian Law Reform Institute to inquire into modernising the law and adopting best practice reforms in relation to lawful regulation of termination of pregnancy. The report was presented to the Attorney-General in October that year. The SALRI report made 66 recommendations, including that abortion should be removed from the criminal law and treated as a public health issue. I read that report and found it to be well written and a very thorough report encompassing all facets of the issues. I would like to recognise the work of SALRI and the diverse stakeholders who participated.

This bill repeals abortion from the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and will create the Termination of Pregnancy Act to regulate the termination of pregnancy as a lawful medical procedure. The bill is based on adapting our legislation to ensure it is effective in reflecting contemporary practices and services. We have seen dramatic changes in health technology. During a pregnancy, a woman may have a choice of a range of tests, including the Harmony test and the nuchal test and scan. They may make the decision to go ahead with CVS or amniocentesis, and our genetic testing capability has progressed rapidly in the last five years to the extent that it is now possible to test for many genetic syndromes.

Currently, a routine morphology ultrasound is completed at 20 weeks. If an abnormality is identified on the ultrasound, it may represent an isolated, treatable congenital abnormality, or it may be the earliest evidence of a genetic syndrome. The information gained from these tests and scans enables a woman to make a complete and informed choice about the health of their pregnancy. While advances in medical technology give us more information, currently there can be significant time pressure on a woman to make what is likely to be one of the hardest decisions of her life. It is important for us to give women time to talk with their families and their medical professionals. It is a time for them to make a decision to maybe continue with the pregnancy or maybe to make a decision to not.

Under the bill, a termination of pregnancy may only be performed after 22 weeks and six days, where two medical practitioners consider that, in all the circumstances, the termination is medically appropriate. It has been raised that this bill could lead to an increased number of late-term abortions. I do not support this belief. What this bill does is enable a medically appropriate model for late-term abortions, which recognises the very difficult decisions that are being made during this complex situation. It gives women, their partners, their families and their qualified medical and health professionals time to process and consider the options.

Under current legislation, there is no referral required from a GP to access public services, and women can self-refer. However, all women who access a termination of pregnancy are required to attend in person at a prescribed hospital clinic on at least two occasions. This is particularly challenging for regional South Australians, with a limited number of prescribed hospitals able to offer termination of pregnancy services.

In 2017, less than 20 per cent of women were able to have a termination in their regional area, with the rest needing to travel to the metropolitan area for the service. Under this new bill, in the cases of early termination, whilst there is still a requirement for a physical confirmation of the pregnancy by a doctor, an ultrasound can be conducted locally to confirm the pregnancy. These results are then returned to a telehealth provider and, upon confirmation, a subsequent consultation would be scheduled.

It is expected there will be a greater proportion of early medical abortions, particularly in regional areas, as women are able to have a termination of pregnancy closer to home. This is because of the removal of the prescribed hospital part of the existing legislation. This does not mean that there is likely to be an increase in termination overall in South Australia.

This bill preserves the right of a registered health practitioner to conscientiously object to provide or assist in the termination of a pregnancy. It creates a new major indictable offence for unqualified persons who perform or assist in a termination of pregnancy. It expands definitions of acts of abuse within the act to specifically include both coercing a person to terminate a pregnancy and coercing a person to not terminate a pregnancy.

This bill contemporises and consolidates existing legislation to ensure that terminations are legislated through a health perspective. It harmonises legislation to bring consistency with that already operating in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. I would like to thank all the stakeholders involved in bringing the bill in its current form today.

I acknowledge there are strong, deeply held views in this parliament and in our state about abortion, and I speak in support of this bill with the understanding that everyone in this house should be respected for their position.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (17:31): I acknowledge from the outset that any time the parliament discusses matters relating to abortion many people have strongly held views about this. As such, this private member's termination of pregnancy bill is a conscience vote for Liberal members. Previous members have spoken of the very difficult and sometimes heartbreaking personal decision that principally women, but oftentimes their partners, have to make. It is not a decision taken lightly; it is an emotional decision that can cause anxiety and grief both at the time and long afterwards.

From my perspective, I have been incredibly fortunate to have been able to raise a family of four children with my wife, and I have not had to face some of the challenging and heartbreaking decisions that others have spoken of. Having four children has been one of the most influential aspects of my life. Undoubtedly, it has reinforced for me the need to value all lives and protect children.

I am also very mindful that it is very important as a member of parliament to respect all views in my electorate and use them to assist me in coming to difficult decisions, such as on the bill before us. My office has received a large volume of differing views since the legislation was introduced into the other place and, even prior to that, since the South Australian Law Reform Institute report into abortion was presented to government in October 2019.

I want to thank all those constituents who took the time to write to me and speak with me. I acknowledge that these contributions were heartfelt and would have been difficult and highly emotional on occasions for those people. As I have said before, being a father of four, it was hard not to be moved on many occasions.

The bill before us considers changing the present abortion laws in South Australia. The present abortion laws were introduced in 1969 and made abortion legal under certain circumstances, and it is presently dealt with under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. At the time, South Australia was the first jurisdiction in Australia to do so. It is worth noting that relatively fresh in the mind of those legislators at the time was that in 1959 the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration of the Rights of the Child. Part of this declaration stated:

The child, by reason of his or her physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth.

The abortion laws that were legislated in 1969 sought to protect the rights of two parties: the rights of the mother and the rights of the unborn child. Section 82A allowed for the pregnancy of a woman to be terminated if the continuation of the pregnancy would involve greater risk to the life of the pregnant woman or her physical or mental health than if the pregnancy were terminated, or if the child were to be born it would be seriously physically or mentally handicapped. The legislation also took into account the medical practices at that time that held that a child was capable of being born alive if the mother was pregnant for at least 28 weeks and only allowed terminations beyond this for the purpose of preserving the life of the mother.

These laws have been in place now for 50 years and society in South Australia has in the main accepted the operation of these laws. As time has progressed, there has been residual stigma attached to terminations for both women and medical practitioners by leaving it within the criminal code. Hence, one of the major reasons put forward for the Termination of Pregnancy Bill is the

decriminalisation of abortion by removing laws in relation to the termination of pregnancy from the criminal law jurisdiction and instead placing them in health law and practice.

Decriminalisation of abortion by converting the existing laws from the Criminal Law Consolidation Act into a standalone health act such as this makes laws that can then allow them to be treated as health law, and that is a reform that I support. Equally, most constituents I have received feedback from during this process are also supportive, if this were the approach. The bill that we are debating also looks to update aspects of the legislation to take into account modern medical practices and is largely based upon the report prepared by SALRI.

One of these measures allows for telemedicine to be used for consultations and certainly the use of videoconferencing during COVID has clearly demonstrated that this is a technology that has great benefit and overcomes the tyranny of distance on many occasions. I am supportive of such a measure and believe it would be of great benefit to women from regional areas, as has been outlined by some of my colleagues who represent regional electorates. Also, when looking at the bill overall, I am reminded of the comments of Robin Millhouse, who was the Attorney-General when the existing abortion legislation was passed in 1969. In 2014, Robin Millhouse stated:

I deeply regret that the medical profession—and the lawyers—interpreted the law too widely.

He went on to say:

It has become abortion on demand. I did not intend it to be that.

This being the case, I feel it is important to ensure that if the Termination of Pregnancy Bill is passed, it does not allow for actions in the future that we do not intend to occur now. From my electorate's perspective, the community as a whole does not want abortion up to full term when the foetus is viable and the mother's life is not at risk nor do they want sex selection of an otherwise healthy baby.

At present, the legislation defines a viable gestation as being 28 weeks or more. Modern medical practices have meant that babies born prematurely between 22 and 24 weeks are able to now survive, albeit with the assistance of contemporary medical care. The bill enacts 23 weeks from which a foetus is gestationally viable. Hence, if there are amendments to the bill to safeguard the rights of a healthy foetus over 23 weeks, then I will support the bill.

Clause 6 of the proposed bill deals with terminations by a medical practitioner from 22 weeks and six days. The SALRI report provided South Australian statistics that in 2016 showed 90.2 per cent of abortions were performed in the first 14 weeks and 9.8 per cent between 14 and 27 weeks. The proportion of abortions performed from 20 weeks was 2.8 per cent. These later term abortions are small in percentage terms and, many times, are because of congenital anomalies, and the decisions taken by women and their partners are heartbreaking. The SALRI report acknowledges this complexity, stating:

During the later stages of pregnancy, abortion is an exception to a woman's general right to determine what medical procedures she will undergo and what relationships she will enter.

To address this, the bill proposes that two medical practitioners consider in all circumstances that the termination is medically appropriate.

The proponents of this bill assert that medical professional standards and ethics would not allow the termination of a healthy viable foetus beyond this 23-week term and I accept that most would not but legislative safeguards need to be put in place. Further, the Australian Medical Association of South Australia stated with respect to late-term abortions:

...the proposed legislation will make no change to current practices which involved intensive health and psychological support for a woman facing such a decision.

However, Dr Joanna Howe, Associate Professor in Law at the University of Adelaide, counters that, stating:

The current legislation prevents medical practitioners from advising on the possibility of termination after gestational viability.

This necessarily affects current practices as it means other forms of intensive health and psychological support are available to pregnant women but abortion is not available unless it is to save the life of the mother.

If the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020...were to be implemented, this would make a change to the current practices as it would enable medical termination to be offered by practitioners after gestational viability for a wide range of reasons pursuant to clause 6 in the bill.

Thus, it is incorrect to the AMA to assert that 'with respect to late-term abortions...the proposed legislation will make no changes to current practices'.

Dr Howe then goes on to state:

The Victorian Mothers and Babies Report of 2017 shows since abortion to birth was legalised in Victoria in 2008 there have been an average of 65 late term abortions a year solely for maternal psychosocial reasons. These are not reasons to do with fetal abnormality or maternal illness, or situations of rape or incest.

To me, Dr Howe's statements clearly demonstrate that the law has a significant role to play in determining how the medical professionals have acted in the past and may act in the future. Importantly, it is my view that it is necessary to legislate against practices relating to the termination of pregnancy that the community as a whole do not want.

It is therefore important that the bill be amended so that terminations of healthy, gestationally viable foetuses over 23 weeks are ruled out so that it more explicitly protects the rights of both the mother and the unborn child. There should be no ambiguity that, even as medical practices and standards evolve over time, we do not allow two medical practitioners to say the termination of a healthy gestationally viable foetus is medically appropriate because there are no laws being broken.

If I could now move on to clause 8, which deals with conscientious objection of health practitioners to either perform or assist in a termination or also provide advice about the performance of a termination, in the proposed bill clause 8(1)(d) outlines that, in such cases, the health practitioner must immediately notify the person, and clause 8(1)(e) requires the health practitioner to transfer the person's care to a medical practitioner that does not have a conscientious objection or provide the person with information on how to locate such a health practitioner.

As we have discussed, people have strongly held views against abortion and this includes doctors. One of my constituents, Dr Cathy Peterson from Glenelg, met with me in regard to this clause, and she stated, 'I am totally in favour of informing the woman in front of me of my position.' However, Dr Peterson is opposed to the second part of that two-step legal obligation, stating:

...as to me, both referral and provision of information are effectively the same, ethically they have me participating in an act that I object to—killing a human that can sustain its own life outside the womb. This information is also easily available with a simple internet search, and no referral needed, so why is this clause necessary?

Another practising doctor in Morphett, Dr Elvis Seman, explained to me in graphic detail the process of terminating a pregnancy in South Australia after 17 to 20 weeks, via dilation and evacuation, and also 20 to 23 weeks, by injecting potassium chloride or digoxin directly into the baby's heart to cause a fatal heart attack.

Dr Seman outlines that it is more than just religious beliefs that give rise to some health practitioners opposing abortion. It is their understanding of the process and the fact that studies are starting to understand that babies in the womb feel pain from at least the second trimester that gives rise conscientious objection. Dr Seman argues as an alternative:

In the case of a viable child in the womb (23+ weeks gestation), the safest and most rapid delivery for both woman and child is Cesarean section. This can be accomplished in 30 minutes from decision to delivery. In contrast, most elective abortion procedures performed after 22 weeks require days to accomplish and carry a greater risk of immediate maternal death than vaginal birth or Caesarean section.

Dr Joanna Howe, whom I referred to previously, also adds:

In short, to refer for abortion is not a passive step. It is to begin the process of procuring an abortion. Freedom of conscience demands that doctors who believe abortion ends the life of an unborn child should not be compelled to begin the abortion process.

My view is that if the effect of this clause of the bill is that practising and caring health practitioners, such as Dr Peterson and Dr Seman, are forced to leave the health profession or, equally, that young people who are opposed to abortion never enter medical practice, then society is the worse for it. As such, I will be supporting amendments that accommodate conscientious objectors and allow health professionals to maintain their moral integrity.

This certainly sits comfortably with the democratic values that are enshrined in the Australian political system and institutions. Moreover, oftentimes regulation that seeks to override conscientious

objection is generally ineffective in the face of genuine and strongly held beliefs. The freedom of conscience in the context of referral for abortion demonstrates that this parliament values human integrity and also promotes a society in which a healthy diversity of pluralistic views is tolerated. Having this pluralism in the medical profession will also ensure that there is a sufficient availability of health care for everyone, including those who are not seeking abortion.

Brooke from Somerton Park explained to me her daughter's experience of falling pregnant, going to pregnancy advisory services and feeling pressured to make a decision to abort swiftly. Her daughter made it clear that at the early stage she felt pressured and unready to decide, later informing them outright that she did not want to abort the baby. Despite this, she was contacted several times regarding meeting with a social worker.

It is my firm belief that accommodating conscientious objectors therefore avoids the creation, over time, of a monocultural medical profession where termination of pregnancy at late term may become more accepted over time and in the future allows the medical profession and lawyers to interpret the law too widely.

I close by stating that if this bill is to progress I will look to support amendments that ensure women accessing what is currently a legal medical procedure can continue to do so in a decriminalised environment, while at the same time providing protections for the unborn child and, in so doing, provide a balance that is of comfort to many people in our community who wish to protect unborn children.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (17:47): I, too, today would like to put my views into *Hansard* so that my electorate understands the reason for the way I intend to discuss this bill, the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020. Firstly, let me state right from the very start that this is a very emotional bill that has been brought to this house. It has passed the other place with a small majority.

Let me say that the right to have a child is a right for every woman in this world, and there are times when there are complications with a woman's carrying of the baby to the birth date. This has been the case over many years. My late wife and I suffered the loss of a child a couple of times due to medical complications, but both these times were very, very early in the pregnancy. However, the loss of the child on both occasions was very hard to overcome. In reality, it took us a long time to come to the understanding that it was not an abortion but a necessity for the health of my wife and the baby. But it was hard to overcome and hard to accept for many years to come.

Every baby is entitled to be born and to enjoy a life, in whatever situation. The joy of seeing a child grow is one that some people are not able to experience, due to complications with the woman, and in many cases the man also cannot produce a child. As I indicated, we thought we would never, ever be able to have a child.

This bill has been presented under government time and is classified as a conscience vote. However, even though the people across my electorate know that this bill is a conscience vote, I have gone out to my constituents to get their views on the original bill that has been passed in the Legislative Council and is with us today. As other members have mentioned, I respect the views of my constituents. I have attended numerous forums across my electorate, outside my electorate and also in Adelaide and I have had many occasions on which to get a far better understanding of the views of those people who have had experience of the very subject that we are talking about today.

I have listened to all the views from the supporting sectors of this bill and also from those who are opposed to the bill and gathered their views to get a far better understanding of the issues. I have been inundated with hundreds of emails and letters from those within my electorate, and also from people outside my electorate, giving me their views and their suggestions on the bill. I have mentioned this to people across the whole of my electorate when I have come across them and there has been an overwhelmingly large percentage who have indicated their views to me. This is a majority well in excess of 80 per cent in one direction and that direction is not to support the bill in its current form.

From discussions this morning with the government's spokesperson, related not only to me but also from our regular meeting the day before parliament with the Leader of Government Business, we were advised that the government would like all second reading speeches finished today, and I

understand that, and for the committee stage to be undertaken tomorrow with a view to hopefully reaching a final vote by the end of the sitting week.

My frustration is that I have been able to get the views of my constituents in regard to the bill that was with us before the amendments. However, with the amendments, some of which we only received late last night and some today, I question how I would be able to get to my community with these amendments to gather their views, their ideas and suggestions. I was advised I would have from the close of second reading speeches until the start of the committee stage to be able to get whatever information I required.

I understand all that, but the point is I am one of those people who likes to communicate with my electorate as much as I can, especially with a bill that has been going on for many months. Unfortunately, with the amendments that are coming through I will have to do the best I can and take those into consideration. In my opinion, this is not a real democratic proposal but more of a statement that I am making. I feel I am not able to consult with my community and I feel very frustrated about that. However, as I said, I will do the best I can with those amendments and take them on board and perhaps make a few phone calls tonight. Whilst this is not sitting well with me, I will do the best I can with the very short notice and try to consider these amendments prior to voting.

I go back to my late wife. We were considering having a family and as she did not get pregnant after a couple of years we started looking at adopting a child. In our vision, if we were successful in adopting a child who may have been admitted to a state facility, that child would be given a strong, constant and loving environment. If a child is born and the mother does not want to care for the child, for whatever reason, then that child has every right to be able to continue their life in a happy and loving environment.

From my information I am led to believe that currently these children who are born and put into foster care come under the guardianship of the minister and are able to be looked after by the relevant government departments and/or fostered out to foster-parents. I have numerous contacts with foster-parents and these people do a really great job caring and loving these children. However, there are incidents where the baby may be under care for a period and then transferred to another family, or, as in many instances, families may be separated and the children placed with different foster-parents, sometimes not even in the same town or community.

This gets back to my late wife and our desire to adopt which, according to my information, is basically non-existent in this state. The member for Mount Gambier indicated that we should be looking more at encouraging adoption and making it easier because from my information there are only two or three children per year, maybe a few more, who are adopted. I have spoken to people who want to adopt and they are saying that it is very hard. I would encourage the government to look at opportunities to make it easier to adopt a child. It takes them away from the foster-parents, it takes them away from the care of the minister and it gives them an everlasting relationship.

The other concern I have is if a child is with a foster-parent they may be there for a period of time, then that child may be transferred somewhere else, then transferred somewhere else and somewhere else. As that child grows up, does that child understand the reason for it or do they believe they are not loved and, as a consequence, as they get older and reach adolescence may have chips on their shoulders?

Getting back to the bill, I cannot agree to it in its current form; however, there is a section I believe is long overdue, and that is that the issue currently comes under the criminal code. I believe it should be under the health act, and this has been mentioned by many people I have come across, including those who are strongly against the bill in its current form. They say that section should be changed. I have no issues with the current legislation—even the church and other organisations I confer with say it has been working very well—but let's take it out of the criminal section and put it under health.

As I have mentioned previously, I have canvassed my electorate and there has been an overwhelming indication that they do not want me to support this bill in its current form. Like other members in this house, I have also received copies of emails that have been sent to other MPs, but it is the views of the people I represent that I have taken into account in my statement.

In closing, I would like to sincerely thank everyone who has contributed to the information I have been able to gather, as well as the people who look after the women who have had to go

through the experience of having an abortion, experiencing the loss of a child. It has to be very traumatic.

In some of my discussions it has been indicated that if a child is born and is not going to survive they wrap up the child in a blanket and put that child on the mother's chest for bonding. I cannot understand that. My daughter lost a little son, my grandson, 18 months old. On the day of the funeral she was in the parlour. She had the child in a blanket and she was saying, 'Dad, dad, he's not waking up.' That is a traumatic issue, and it has been with us for 12 or 13 years now.

If they do that with a mother, and that child is not going to make it, does that mother then say, 'By heck, I've made a mistake. Maybe I shouldn't have gone through with this abortion. Maybe I shouldn't have gone through with the procedure'? We have to think about the long-term impact on that woman, on her mental health for years to come.

I would also like to thank Mackenzie, the trainee in my office. We have acknowledged all callers and correspondence. I must admit that I was in my office one Sunday and the phone kept ringing, so I answered it, thinking was my partner, Lyn, asking where the hell I was on a Sunday. However, it was someone leaving a message about the Termination of Pregnancy Bill, and after 20 minutes I got off the phone. I did not answer any more phones, but there were more calls in.

When I came in the next morning we had had over 180 calls on the answering system and 130 emails, so the general public has certainly taken this issue into great consideration. This is an issue about which we, as legislators—and this has been mentioned before by the members for Narungga, Mount Gambier and others—have to very careful. Once legislation is in, where does it lead to?

I want to thank everyone. I know this is an emotional issue, and we have to show respect to people who believe in this bill and to people who do not believe in this bill. Everybody has a right to their view on this, and I ask everyone to respect their consideration of the way they are going to vote. Let's make certain we look after our children, and make certain they grow up to have a healthy life. I have to say that I cannot support the bill in its current form.

Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19:30.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (19:30): This bill raises the most essential moral and ethical questions any member can be asked to resolve. I have considered this bill carefully. I have agonised over it. I believe that women should not have to navigate the criminal code in order to understand their reproductive health rights. Accordingly, it would be better if terminations were dealt with in health legislation. Nevertheless, this bill is so deeply flawed in its present form that I cannot in good conscience support it.

I will again consider the form of this bill after amendments have been moved. If those amendments do not adequately address deep moral and ethical concerns which arise in relation to late-term pregnancy terminations, the risk of gender selection terminations, conscientious objection protections for healthcare professionals and important allied matters, I will vote against the bill, understanding that the principle at stake now is not whether termination should be legally available in South Australia: that question was resolved more than 50 years ago.

I emphasise that this is a matter about which reasonable minds can come to different conclusions and can reason differently to that conclusion. I have very, very deep respect for those who have an alternative view, but I also ask that respect be given to those who have reached the same view that I have reached.

I am grateful to those members of my community who have contacted me to make representations before this debate. I welcome that contact. I have carefully considered those representations and, as earlier remarked, have come to a considered view. I believe that those things which are vital or important in life can be said briefly and hopefully with some elegance. This is my contribution.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (19:32): I rise to discuss this bill with great trepidation. I do not like this issue. I do not like this bill. I do not like being confronted with these matters, but I accept that they are before us and we must be held to account for our own decisions.

There has been a lot of debate in the parliament about how we should approach this bill. What I have discovered in my 23 years in the parliament is that the first casualty of these debates that attract a conscience vote is usually the truth, like in any war. I have found that through the advent of identity politics you are either with us or against us, and there is no space in between for reasonable people to come to reasonable conclusions about complex matters. We are being told by some to accept this bill unamended and, if we do not, people have used inflammatory language about how we should be considered. I reject that.

I also reject the notion that those who are opposed to this bill are somehow zealots. They are not. They are people of good conscience. I have seen them in my community. There are a number of people who support this legislation who live in my electorate. Make no mistake about it: the electorate of South Australia is just as conflicted about this bill as we are in this parliament. But my constituents know me. They have re-elected me now a number of times. I have been there 23 years—24 at the next election. I think by now they know what my views are.

But I do not use my personal views in opposition to this bill because, as I said earlier to a rally outside, the truth is that in the 21st century, in agreeing with my friend the member for Kavel, yes, this matter should be completely contemplated within a healthcare provision of an act rather than the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. It is unfair on people who are being confronted with abortion that they are subject to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. It should be within the Health Care Act—that I accept.

I say to the Attorney-General and the drafters that, if this legislation had been merely about that and that reform, this debate would have been over months ago. I could be wrong, but I suspect that some proponents have seen this as an opportunity, and that disappoints me because it confronts me now with the choice of reading the legislation and speaking to experts in the field, and there have been numerous experts quoted.

The other thing about this debate is that everyone is eminently qualified in the medical profession to comment on this and we get a large diversity of views about what we should or should not do, so it is very difficult to try to understand exactly what a consensus approach is in the medical community. Is it the AMA's approach? I can list a long list of doctors who have come back to me and said that the AMA is not representing their members in this debate, and there are a large number of doctors who have said that the AMA absolutely represents their views in this debate. Who do we believe? All we have is the legislation before us. All we have are trusted people in the industry who we can speak to: doctors, obstetricians and experts—people in the field.

From reading the legislation, it is clear to me that it allows the termination of viable babies who are healthy. I think that is beyond question now. The proponents might have a legitimate reason to argue that, but I have not heard it. The only argument I have heard is that the statement I just made is incorrect. But from my reading of the legislation, and from briefing notes I received from academics about their interpretation of the law and from members of parliament who have clerked for chief justices of the Supreme Court, they have given us opinions that differ from the original version of what we are being told by the executive. So who do we believe?

I said earlier today in the caucus that the parliament today is a lot like 1890. This is what it was like before political parties. This is what the parliament would have been like, where members of parliament were elected without any political allegiance and every bill was considered on its merits—a radical concept—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Terrifying.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a terrifying concept in the 21st century, but here we are. I have to say, as a Labor MP, that I cannot support this bill. I support the decriminalisation of abortion, but I do not support the Attorney-General and Minister Lensink's views on late-term abortion. I cannot, so I have proposed a series of amendments. I am going to announce to the house now that I will be supporting the amendments moved by Minister Speirs because I think those amendments protect the lives of viable babies. Why is that important to me? I am the father of a 10-year-old daughter who was born at 26 weeks—26 weeks. My wedding ring could fit around her ankle and she is now the tallest girl in her class.

We were offered abortion services with the complications that Tia went through. I very rarely speak about these personal matters. I have not attempted to try to politicise these personal matters,

but I do so now to explain to the house and to my constituents my views on this bill. My daughter was in the NICU in the Women's and Children's Hospital for a month and in SCBU for two months before we took her home on New Year's Eve in 2010-11.

Tia was in a humidicrib next to babies who were born with their intestines not yet developed or outside their bodies. I am still friends with families who lost their children who were born hours after Tia. These are confronting issues that affect all of us. All those families were offered the same services, but I keep coming back to this one fundamental point: Tia was viable. She was viable; she could live on her own.

Can I support legislation that would have allowed me and my wife to terminate Tia's life? I cannot. I cannot do it; however, I also understand the proponents who speak of those families who choose to do so. I understand their pain and I understand what they go through. I think Minister Speirs' amendments deal with that adequately. We are talking about healthy, viable babies. They should be given every opportunity to live and I will be voting for that.

Of course, it does not always have a happy ending. It can have a very sad ending and I grieve for the families who have had those sad endings. I know, from personal experience, families who have gone through abortions—close, personal friends. It is traumatic and I in no way make a judgement about what they did. I do not, but I do point out that the current legislation that was settled 50 years ago has allowed a process of safe, legal and rare abortions to occur in this state to protect the lives of mothers. What we are seeing now is a radical departure from that, and that is what concerns me.

That radical departure needs to be dealt with and we are going to deal with it with amendments. I do not know whether those amendments will be successful, but it is difficult. The amendments I will be moving talk about three key issues for me, and I am considering a fourth. The first issue is that I had no concept about what practically happens during some abortions. I thank the Attorney-General for her frequently asked questions, as I discovered for the first time, to my horror, that some babies are born alive during an abortion.

I did not believe that because, again, I go back to my initial point about truth being the first casualty of these debates. Whenever someone tells you something and they are from a particular cohort of either pro-life or pro-choice, you assume there is bias in what they are telling you. So when someone tells me, 'Children are born alive,' I think to myself, 'Well, you would say that because you want me to vote a certain way,' but the Attorney gave me clarity on this matter. It does happen and that horrifies me—the idea that in the 21st century South Australian citizens are being born and left to die who survive an abortion. I understand there are complexities and my amendment deals with healthy viable babies who survive abortions and have a prospect of life. They should be offered medical attention. That is point 1.

I will move on to point 2. I am not sure my amendment adequately deals with it all, because again it is so difficult to do this as a private member without the resources of government. I would have hoped the government would have done this. Point 2 is that I do not want to see—and I do not think the parliament wants to see this either—the growth of a private industry around the provision of late-term abortions.

If Minister Speirs' amendment is unsuccessful and late-term abortions to birth are to be legal in this state, they should only be performed in public hospitals and not for profit. They should be approved not just by two doctors but by two obstetricians—specialists in the field, not just general practitioners. Again, I suspect that amendment will not be successful.

The third amendment I am contemplating is the trade—and, again, I did not believe this happened—in the foetal matter of successfully aborted babies, a difficult subject to contemplate and talk about, but we are confronted with it now. I understand the need for medical research—I do—and many people, on their driver's licences, opt to donate their bodies to science or give their organs for transplant or medical research. That is great, but I am deeply concerned about the idea of a trade for profit in successfully aborted babies' material. These are confronting things to talk about.

The other amendment I was considering, rereading the bill again, talks about what is a medical practitioner and what is a health practitioner and the definitions. I will flesh this out in committee, but my understanding is that a health practitioner basically could be a nurse or someone

who is regulated under the national law, but not necessarily a specialist, and can administer abortion services. I will leave that for the parliament to consider.

A medical practitioner might be someone who is not necessarily a specialist in pregnancies. Surely this parliament has the maturity to say, 'Well, if you are going to consider late-term abortions, perhaps the people who should be approving it should be specialists, unless there is an urgent need to save the mother's life.' Again there are other clauses that kick in when it comes to saving the mother's life. Again, I am very concerned about the ability to shop around and get people to approve these things.

I also want to make this statement to make it fundamentally clear: I do not believe that anyone who is thinking about a late-term abortion would walk into a doctor's surgery chewing gum saying, 'I've just changed my mind.' These are serious considerations, generally on the back of horrendous news. I have also been at the other end of an unsuccessful pregnancy, where my son was born, only briefly lived and then died. We were offered abortion services again and we refused. It is confronting to have that conversation with your obstetrician and your doctor about ending the life of your child—it is horrific. We were confronted with this over a period of weeks. My wife worked so hard to try to get that baby to viability. We got past viability, we kept on going and going, but he just could not make it.

These are the difficult questions you have to tackle, but the current law that was in place at the time dealt with our situation adequately. We were able to access all the services we needed to make the decisions we needed to make as a family. There did not need to be any change to the law. Indeed, every year there are improvements in medical science about viability, and that age is getting younger and younger. As I said earlier, 26 weeks, my son died at 24 weeks; these things move by the year.

We are attempting to say—again, we are being asked to agree—to 22 weeks and six days. There will be advances again, but the last amendment to this legislation was 50 years ago. I often wonder, without making any comment about people who support this bill or do not, whether future generations will look back and talk about the way we treated pregnancies in the 20th and 21st centuries and just think, 'They got it wrong there. They were at the early stage of their development about how they thought about pregnancies and they got it wrong'—maybe, maybe not.

The last issue I want to address is about men having a view about this issue. It is complicated. I understand that many people think that men should have no say in this matter, that this is about a woman's right to choose about the treatment of her body. I understand that. I would not like the idea of anyone else having a say about what I could do to my body. I completely understand that conceptually, but practically, in the real world, there are two people involved in a pregnancy, and fundamentally three, if not more, depending on how many people are growing inside a womb.

We have to ask ourselves a fundamental question: do those people who are in the womb deserve rights? This is the eternal question. I think yes. My faith tells me that life begins at conception. I accept that, but I also accept that I cannot legislate that, and I do not intend to because it is not where the Australian public are. The Australian public do want safe, legal and rare abortions—absolutely—but I do not believe the South Australian public want what the Attorney-General is offering. And I do believe, fundamentally, if they knew what she was offering, what the government is offering, they would be horrified. I do not believe that is where middle Australia is at. So we are somewhere in between decriminalisation and abortion to birth. I think the amendments proposed in this house meet the right balance.

I also want to reject the bullying and the threats on either side. I say to all my colleagues, all of them: vote with your conscience not your political affiliation, not your loyalty to any one person or another or a faction or another, and I will defend your right to have a conscience vote to the end on these matters. But I also say to the people who accuse me of being a religious zealot because I dare to go to church every Sunday: I do not care. I am a Christian. I profess my Christian faith and I do so openly, and I will not be lectured by anyone in the Labor Party or the Liberal Party about my faith. My faith is my own.

People talk about the Labor right doing certain things to try to manipulate things. That is not true. There are people on both sides of this debate of good conscience who are trying to do the right thing. We are ordinary people, ordinary citizens who have been given the information. We are just trying to navigate this to try to do the right thing. I do not hold a grudge against anyone who votes for

or against this bill, but my conscience says I cannot support it as it is. At the second reading speech, if the minister insists on proceeding with late-term abortion, I will vote against it.

I do support decriminalisation; I put that on the record. However, at the end, if the amendments are not passed, I will be a vote against the bill. That makes me sad because surely it is not beyond our wit to have a split bill, where we could have had decriminalisation at one end and the other measures in another bill, so we could have the reform the Attorney-General says is long overdue and then have a debate about the rest. But, of course, politics being politics, let's lump it all together and try to get it through. Well, we could have a disaster, a compromise or a defeat, depending on your perspective. I hope we can have a cordial debate and get through it. I apologise to my constituents who want me to vote a different way, but I am who I am.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge the presence in the Speaker's gallery this evening of the Police Attaché of the Embassy of Italy in Canberra, Mario Argenio, and Adriano Stendardo, Italian Consul in Adelaide, who are guests of the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

Bills

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (19:53): Can I start by endorsing all the comments made by the previous speaker, the member for West Torrens. I would like to congratulate him on his capacity to relay very deeply personal stories in a way in which I am still unable to so many years later, with the birth of my daughter who was premature and who suffered by having only my company for a considerable number of days until her mother was able to see her.

This bill has been the subject of much discussion in my community, the vast majority of which has been opposed to it, in particular to the late-term part thereof. As a result, and I guess in keeping with the way in which I intend to do business or do things, I have had an opportunity to engage in quite forthright conversation with many people, part of which has entailed the provision by me of a written statement to anyone who has expressed to me a view on this subject.

I will now read that statement into *Hansard*. It is dated 20 October. I am providing this for reasons of clarity, transparency and commitment to, as I said, anyone who has expressed a view. It is headed 'Statement regarding the Termination of Pregnancy Bill':

I have received many emails regarding this Bill, most of them advocating for the way I should vote on it.

As a result, I want to take the opportunity to unequivocally set out my opinion, so that everyone can in turn be in no doubt about where I stand.

Much of the public comment and indeed one of the major reasons posited for the necessity for this Bill is the 'Decriminalisation' of abortion, and instead having it as part of the Health Law and practice. Other reasons include the need to update the legislation in line with contemporary practices such as telemedicine, and the need to redress access inequality, especially for women from regional areas.

I have no problems either with these stated aims, or with the way in which this bill addresses them.

The Bill is largely based on a report prepared by the South Australian Law Reform Institute (SALRI).

The SALRI report recommendations are not only devoid of any moral and ethical framework, but as a consequence they are deliberately calculated to treat the foetus as an abstract thing, without any consideration of its viability or potential, let alone its nascent rights.

SALRI explicitly recommend unfettered abortion no matter what age the foetus is.

The Bill embraces this 'abortion to birth' SALRI recommendation, albeit with a minor modification that after 23 weeks gestation two doctors must agree to the abortion. That is, 23 weeks and below there are now no restraints, and above 23 weeks there will be the same controls/pre-requisites in place as is currently the case, all the way through until birth.

At 23 weeks a foetus is considered 'viable' with contemporary medical care. That is, it can live and survive by itself, from about the 23-week gestation age.

I am opposed to the abortion of any foetus in excess of 23 weeks gestation. I don't consider the 'approval' of two doctors in the Bill as any more of a safeguard than the current situation, which requires the same two-doctor approval process.

As a consequence of the 'abortion to birth' provision in the Bill, I will vote against it. If this provision is removed, and as a result a foetus over 23 weeks is protected, then I would support the Bill as an improvement over the current regime.

I trust this helps explain my position and in particular my rationale in arriving at it.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions, concerns or comments.

The practical problem I have with this bill, by way of reinforcing some of the points made by the member for West Torrens, is that what should have been a straightforward series of measures has been turned into something that, in my view, no normal person can support. The current abortion law is not, I would submit, broken, but I would concur that at the age of 50-plus years it needs a bit of a touch-up. Don't we all at that age?

It is worthwhile considering, just by way of context, that the law was made back when we made cars, TVs, fridges and washing machines. We had an oil refinery here, and we had cheap, plentiful and reliable power. We called mothers and babies just that. I note that mothers have now become 'persons' and the child or baby reference in the current act has been completely overlooked in the bill. More particularly, we had no internet and we had no ultrasound.

Back then, there was no need at all to ban abortions being done because the baby was a girl, for example, or the gender was wrong, because they usually did not know what the sex of the baby was beforehand. These days, of course, we know the baby's gender via, for example, ultrasound, and this in turn opens up the possibility of babies—or foetuses, if you prefer—being aborted because of their gender. The proponents of this bill have so far successfully voted against a ban on abortions being performed for reasons of a baby's gender. These measures are in place in many other countries where baby girls can be vulnerable, and I posit the question: why can that not be the case here?

Further questions include: why do we need to force doctors to provide written referrals against their will to other doctors for someone seeking an abortion, when the need to do so has long since been obviated by the introduction of the internet? I would invite anyone who is interested to google 'Adelaide abortion'. You can get all the information you need to access abortion services, make bookings, etc. There is no practical need for another doctor who does not wish to be involved to do so.

The other question I have is: why are we arbitrarily removing and replacing the notion of viability as the basis or the underpinning of the way in which we govern abortion? Why do proponents of the late-term parts of this bill have difficulty understanding the deep scepticism people have about relying exclusively on members of the medical profession and their judgement in this matter?

Many normal people and so-called normal MPs, me included, support the need for the existing abortion arrangements and the need to update those arrangements to decriminalise abortion and to streamline its delivery and administration. However, we do not support extremist hardcore measures such as allowing abortion because of a baby's sex or aborting a perfectly healthy baby anywhere up to five minutes before it is due to be born.

In closing and to be clear, I support many of the stated aims of the bill, including decriminalising abortion, addressing inequality of access for regional women and implementing telehealth measures. I will be supporting amendments to remove the extreme measures with an object, if they are passed, to passing those remaining parts of the bill.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (20:01): As with all pieces of legislation, I listened to the community I was elected to serve and represent and considered the detail of the legislation before us. I thank the many people who have contacted me to share their views on this legislation. I have read and listened to everyone who has made contact and tried as best as I can to understand their point of view. This is an issue where people with intelligence, people with love in their heart, can come to starkly different positions.

Clearly, on an issue like this there is not going to be a way of pleasing everybody. I know, for instance, that I will have a difference of opinion on this legislation with many of my good friends, including in this parliament. I acknowledge that the member for West Torrens has agreed to pair with me for the second reading debate as I have to go and help with a family illness later, which highlights how different people can come to different conclusions.

As always, I strive to come to the conclusion that I believe in my heart is the best outcome for our state. As per other conscience issues, I do not feel that I automatically fit into one camp or the other, but I take the issue at hand, listen to the community, examine the legislation, look at the amendments, apply principles and try to seek the best outcome. I do acknowledge when it comes to an issue like this that particularly involves the health of women that, as a man, there are certainly things I will never experience. That is not to say that men cannot have a view—and certainly in this parliament—but I do think very clearly about the different experience women have in life.

When I walk through a park at night, I generally feel safe and that there is no risk to my safety. In my workplace or in the community, I am not discriminated against on the basis of my gender. I have never been a schoolchild who felt uncomfortable or missed participation because of the natural part of life of having a period. Likewise, I will never give birth, I will never breastfeed and I will never conceive, and I will never be faced with the difficult choice of an unwanted pregnancy.

I do know what it is like to be an expectant dad, to be nervous about scans. I know what it is like to support a woman. These are very important, but they are obviously different from experiencing many of those things that a woman experiences directly. But it is my job as a member of parliament to empathise and try to understand what these women face in these difficult situations. These are clearly women who are facing difficult situations, and I have faith in our fellow human beings to know that these decisions are not taken lightly or flippantly, as some of the commentary has seemed to suggest in the public debate.

There are a number of principles that I have taken in considering this legislation: the importance of women's access to health care, the difficult circumstances that some women face and our need to allow women to make decisions about their own bodies, and the high standards and professionalism of our doctors and other healthcare practitioners. I have determined based on these principles that abortion should be safe, should be legal and should be accessible for those who need it, and therefore it should be removed from the criminal law. Let's be clear that the evidence around the world is that making abortion illegal, as some of the people who have contacted me I think very clearly would like to do, does not stop abortion but just makes abortion practised unsafely.

As I said, I have read all the material, the letters, the emails, the petitions and more that I have been sent. I have spoken to people who are concerned about certain aspects, some of which they have heard from the campaign material and some of which, from my research and my understanding, I do not believe is necessarily borne out by the bill before us: firstly, the argument that this is an extreme law. Of course, we are one of the last places in the country to enact that law. This is legislation that in fact, in a number of ways, is more conservative than what is in place in other states around the country.

Many people I have spoken to are surprised by those facts, having been told we were going out on a limb here in South Australia, supposedly supporting extreme legislation. They are surprised to know that similar or even further laws are in place in other states, such as New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. From the evidence before me, I do not believe we have seen in those states the kinds of problems that are being predicted to happen here.

Secondly, there are arguments that this legislation allows on-demand abortion until birth. From what I have seen that is simply incorrect. The legislation very clearly states that two doctors must deem a late-term termination as medically appropriate in all the circumstances. On demand is not medically appropriate in all circumstances. Doctors cannot keep their registration who act so recklessly, so against medical practice and standards.

Further, the bill outlines that doctors must have regard to the medical circumstances and the professional standards and guidelines that apply to the doctor. As per the experience in other states that have already legislated similar provisions, there are going to be very limited situations in which this applies. In fact, I believe the largest likelihood of this legislation is that we will see earlier abortions

rather than moving abortions later by allowing broader and easier access to abortion drugs. They are currently significantly restricted to being available only in a hospital. There will likely be a significant reduction in surgical abortions being necessary.

While I have no doubt that there are some people who are against this bill and are across the detail, others have seen just some of the campaigning advertisements and have not got the total picture of what is actually being proposed. Asking people whether they support abortion on demand up to birth elicits one answer. Asking people whether they support protections, where two doctors would have to sign off on such an abortion being medically appropriate in all the circumstances, and I believe would get a different answer from the community.

That is not to deny that there are difficult moral questions involved—moral/ethical questions, questions of faith that are deeply held by people that certainly I and everyone in this house has had to grapple with and consider as part of this. No doubt for some this will be about the detail as we get into the committee stage. I appreciate those members who have submitted some amendments, and there are some that I may consider when we get to the committee stage of the debate.

As part of the preparation of this debate, I appreciated the opportunity to visit the Pregnancy Advisory Centre, which is where the majority of terminations in South Australia happen, and meet their hardworking staff who provide some of the more difficult and complex health services we have in our state. However, I quickly learnt about how those staff, but more importantly the women who come to the clinic, have been let down by short-sighted penny pinching by this Liberal government. The staff there told a very confronting story, a *Yes Minister* style of bungling that is having real consequences for women every single day.

The staff told me that in early 2019 the air conditioner to the PAC operating theatre completely broke down. The theatre was unusable from that point on. The expected cost to repair the operating theatre was \$100,000, but the government, the local health network, the bureaucracy, the minister, refused to pay the money to fix the air conditioning. That meant that that operating theatre has had to be closed.

It means that women are now forced to go from the Pregnancy Advisory Centre to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital standard elective surgery theatres to get surgical abortions happening now. Women receive those, lined up in the same pre-surgery and post-op areas, as other men and women—significantly, usually older people getting their elective surgery operation, getting their hip operation, getting their knee operation—women in very desperate, difficult circumstances. This reduces their privacy. This reduces the amenity for these women, having to share a very small number of toilets. This reduces the capacity of the clinic from 16 people per day down to 12 people per day.

People who were against abortion might say, 'Well, that's a good thing,' except for the fact that this means waiting times are getting longer. Because it takes longer now to get through, that means people are therefore having those terminations later than they otherwise would have. I do not think anyone would want to have those terminations later when they could be earlier.

This is clearly an unacceptable situation that has continued for the past two years. Here we have one part of the government advocating this bill for women's rights and another part of the government advocating against late-term abortions, and they are all part of a government that is reducing the access and increasing waiting times, meaning that abortions are needlessly happening later, all for a cost of \$100,000, which is, in the context of the state budget, a very small budget compared to advertising for SA Water fees or land tax reforms.

Sadly, the equipment and infrastructure have now been stripped, so it is much more expensive than \$100,000 to fix the services in the Pregnancy Advisory Centre. I have been trying to obtain documents via FOI on this subject since August 2019—18 months ago. The government have refused to provide access to these documents for that significant amount of time, despite the fact that we have a ruling from the Ombudsman, given in July last year, saying that they should release those documents.

Since July, the government have been told to release documents about this closure and they have refused to do so, clearly in a political attempt to deny the public and this parliament information about what is going on in that regard before this important debate. In 2019, Stephen Wade, the health minister, told estimates:

A plan for a permanent solution for both its procedural and ambulatory components of care is being developed, with constructive input from both staff and community stakeholders.

That is now proved to be completely bogus. Since then, nothing has been done. There is no permanent solution, there is no input from staff and stakeholders, and the latest plans released for The QEH development show that this supposedly temporary move to the operating theatres of The QEH with everybody else now looks set to be made permanent.

Another principle I take to this debate is that we should be doing everything we possibly can to avoid people being in the situation of needing to consider a termination to begin with. I suspect that many people on both sides of the debate would agree with that. This means sex education. This means sexual health programs. That means available contraception. Let's be clear that these programs have meant that the number of abortions in South Australia has actually been going down over the past 20 years. In fact, there was a reduction in the number of abortions of over 1,300 per annum from 1999 to 2017, despite an increase in the state's population.

Unfortunately, sexual health programs have taken a significant hit in South Australia in the past two years under this Liberal government. In the first Liberal budget, there was a ruthless cut made to sexual health programs. SHINE SA took the biggest hit. They were forced to close their only clinic in the northern suburbs and close their only clinic in the southern suburbs because of these cuts from the Liberal government. This ultimately meant a reduction in access to sexual health programs, a reduction in sexual education and a reduction in contraception services such as contraceptive implants.

The Marshall government was warned clearly at the time that such a cut was likely to lead to increased rates of unwanted pregnancies in our most vulnerable communities in the northern and southern suburbs. The AMA said at the time:

We believe the Government has not realised the impact this cut would have, and we are urging it to review its decision. If not, we fear the results: an increase in rates of sexually transmitted infections; a rise in unplanned pregnancies...

While addressing this legislation, this is only one piece of the puzzle. I implore the government to reverse those cuts, reopen those clinics in the north and the south, and ensure appropriate services are made available to help reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies in the first place.

Today, the Deputy Premier and other government MPs have talked about the need for having a respectful debate. In fact, the Attorney-General said, 'I find it personally disappointing that some have deliberately inflamed tensions and sought to use abortion as a political weapon.' Sadly, that principle is not being adhered to by her own party that she is the deputy leader of.

In fact, it saddens me to inform parliament that behind the scenes, a Liberal Party strategist told *The Advertiser* that they will use abortion as a political weapon in the lead-up to the next election. Chief reporter, Paul Starick, wrote in *The Advertiser* last week:

The Liberals are prepared to unleash social media hell for Mr Malinauskas if he votes against abortion reform, targeting swing voters in battleground electorates like Adelaide and Elder (inner southern suburbs). 'If he votes against abortion we will target young women voters. There will be a strong plan to very firmly portray him as a leader who's out of step with young people,' a Liberal strategist said.

That is disgraceful. Shame on them. To use a conscience vote issue like this as a party political attack is a new low for the South Australian Liberal Party. For a party to say that they will 'unleash social media hell' is a clear threat at somebody's vote and it should be decried by all members of parliament. The Premier and Deputy Premier should take action against their own strategist in their own party for making such a threat. Everybody's view in this debate should be respected.

Lastly, in dealing with this legislation and particularly in my role as the shadow minister for health and wellbeing, I want to pay tribute to the thousands of health professionals who work in our health system caring for women and helping them with their pregnancy and often consideration of some of these difficult decisions. I know that your jobs are not easy, the pressure is significant and the standards of professional behaviour to which you abide are strenuous. Thank you for what you do every single day.

Deputy Speaker, today I have outlined my perspective, my principles and the approach I am taking to this legislation. I will be supporting the legislation to take abortion out of the criminal law and to catch up with the legal framework in other states.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (20:16): I will speak tonight on the bill to share a brief outline of my views on this matter, and particularly for the interests of any constituents of mine who are interested. A number, I would say, probably in the order of 500 or 600, have expressed a view on both sides of the issue and I have written back to them, so I will paraphrase some of that information and add one or two other brief comments.

In brief, I am keenly interested in the views of my constituents, particularly in matters related to votes of conscience, if you like. I seek to read all the correspondence I get, I listen to the arguments, I obviously bring my own views and experience to the table and I apply my judgement to the legislation at hand.

Every single piece of correspondence from a constituent, whether it is a relaying of ideas that they have had suggested by others or whether it is drawing on their own personal experiences and expertise, is a piece of correspondence that conveys to the local MP their views and has value and merit, and I take the time to read and consider them, particularly as sometimes there are new things that you have not necessarily considered. That, of course, is also true sometimes in the debate.

I think there have been some useful contributions through the course of this debate and I look forward, particularly should the bill pass the second reading, to hearing more in relation to specific proposed amendments, which will obviously change the tenor of the application of the proposed legislation to certain aspects of the bill, which I will go into in a moment.

It is important, as some have already identified, to identify in relation to any vote on any bill that the decision in question is between supporting the new proposal or supporting the existing and continuing without any changes. Sometimes it is important to remind ourselves in that context of what is already in the existing law so it can accurately be compared with the new proposed law.

I identify that a number of the pieces of correspondence I have received suggest a reflection on a preferred alternative course of action rather than comparing the proposed law with what is already in legislation. Tonight, as some have said, the principle at stake is not whether abortions will become available, which was considered in the parliament in 1969. For more than 50 years, terminations have been widely available during the first 28 weeks of pregnancy according to the current statute.

Provision also exists in the current law for terminations to take place after 28 weeks in circumstances where a medical practitioner is of the opinion formed in good faith that the termination is immediately necessary to save the life or to prevent grave injury to the physical or mental health of the pregnant woman.

The bill being considered by the parliament this evening, and potentially over the course of this week, proposes several key changes we are being asked to consider: firstly, the framework for the legislation to be moved from the Criminal Law Consolidation Act into a standalone piece of legislation, the Termination of Pregnancy Act; secondly, the time frame for the standard consideration of a termination to be allowed to be reduced from 28 weeks to 22 weeks and six days; next, terminations taking place within 22 weeks and six days to require one doctor rather than two to be treating the patient.

The framework within which a termination could take place after 22 weeks and six days would require, according to the proposal, two medical practitioners to be of the view that the proposed procedure is medically appropriate, and I will come back to this matter which has obviously attracted the majority of consideration by those expressing opinions through the course of the debate. Also, the bill proposes a right for a medical practitioner to conscientiously object to participating in the procedure being enshrined in the legislation and also a new major indictable offence to be created for unqualified persons performing or assisting in the performance of a termination.

Obviously, the proponents of the bill have argued that the legislation essentially updates the existing rules in line with modern medical technology, providing a consistent framework within which members of the community can be clear about what the rules are and how the termination might take place within what rules and, of course, not necessarily just within a public hospital. I have sought

further information about the sorts of circumstances within which a termination after the prescribed period might be authorised and there has been much discussion about that during the course of the debate.

Of course, the circumstances in question are usually described as where the mother's life is in jeopardy, similar to those envisaged in the current section 82 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. But we also have a number of amendments now tabled that would limit the application of this bill to those circumstances or similar ones. We will consider those tomorrow, I expect, assuming the bill is allowed a second reading by this house, which is of course a matter for all 47 members to consider in the coming little period.

I reflect that while much of the correspondence has suggested a vote for or against the bill, I would encourage anybody reading this contribution who has expressed such a view to reflect on the fact that the bill as a whole, as it will be defined by the third reading, depends on what happens in those amendments that will be potentially considered during the committee stage of the debate. I think that many of the things that are proposed in this bill are reasonably uncontroversial and, indeed, some would be described potentially by all sides of the debate as positive steps forward.

So that is my assessment. By and large, it does modernise the legislation in line with current medical practice and technology. Indeed, the reduction in gestation time before the stricter provisions for late terminations from 28 weeks to less than 23 weeks is a significant step that recognises the potential for a successful birth after that time as a result of advances in medical technology over the last 50 years. For that reason, along with others, I propose to support the bill at its second reading vote.

Obviously, many people in the community have raised with me their concerns about the lack of definition in the legislation, about what circumstances the medical practitioners would need to consider before carrying out a procedure after 23 weeks. Alternatives to the mechanisms described in the bill for the procedures, as I say, have been tabled to be discussed if the bill passes the second reading, and there may yet be more amendments to come to hand overnight. Like all members I am sure, I will give serious consideration to those amendments during the committee stage of the debate.

There has been an enormous amount of expertise in the legal and medical recommendations of people with great levels of community mindedness and expertise in these areas that have been proffered to all members of parliament, indeed on both sides of this question, over what are the appropriate legal frameworks for what would happen after 23 weeks. I want to offer my thanks to those members of the community, the professions and from all over the community who have provided that counsel to me.

I will obviously be casting my vote for or against amendments as I see is in the appropriate best interests of the people of South Australia and that record, together with these comments, will give some reflection of my views on this matter for those constituents who may be interested.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (20:24): I rise to speak on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. As many other members have already commented, this is a difficult bill for probably all of us; it certainly has been for some speakers today. It is a difficult bill for me. It is a complex bill. It is an amalgamation of a principle that I think every parliamentarian—in both houses, both here and in the other place—completely supports, that is, finally modernising the long-outdated legal treatment of abortion as being existent in some sort of grey area between the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and some vague provisions in other health-related legislation.

To my relatively unpractised understanding of how abortion services are provided in South Australia, it seems that, by and large—not entirely but by and large—the current actual provision of abortion services works reasonably well. A number of speakers from all sides of the chamber have recorded officially for the record their appreciation of the work that is done at the Pregnancy Advisory Centre in Woodville Park and of course in those other public healthcare facilities that also provide termination services but perhaps not quite to the same extent as the Woodville Park facility.

I am speaking principally of other public hospitals across the metropolitan area. It is also true that there are some non-public healthcare facilities, mainly a small handful of country hospitals that are not publicly owned or operated but are privately owned and operated, that conduct some of these terminations, but I will come back to that in some time.

The bill is an amalgamation of updating the law, which is long overdue I think we all agree. It is also combined with an attempt to significantly rewrite and redefine when terminations can occur, by whom they can be done and under what circumstances. It is a significant broadening of the current arrangements. As far as I can tell in the bill, it has been left up to the best judgement of medical practitioners to conduct terminations, in particular what we are referring to, perhaps colloquially, as late-term abortions.

These have certainly been the topic of the vast majority of representations that I have received. I am speaking in particular of those representations that I am grateful to have received from people who actually reside in the electorate that I represent in this place and not the deluge of representations that I have had from people who live in other places, including those very interested people who have taken it upon themselves to contact me from other jurisdictions around the country. I recognise their interest, but of course I am principally interested in what my constituents think, rather than what others would think had they been a resident in South Australia.

I am grateful for those representations I have received. I have to say, regardless of whether they have been in favour of this bill or against it, nearly all, with only a very small number of exceptions, have been very respectful and put their views to me in a way that genuinely seeks to enlighten me as to not only their views but what influences their views. I am very grateful for that.

I will try not to speak too euphemistically on this for much longer, but we have probably all been in receipt of some representations that have not been so magnanimously communicated to us. To those who may be paying close attention to this debate and who may have been the author of such communications, I might take the time to remind them that, while as elected representatives we should expect to get those representations from time to time and perhaps grin and bear it as we must, there are people employed in our electorate offices who perhaps do not deserve the fulsome—

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —advice—thank you, member for Morialta—that has been provided to our electorate offices. I am very grateful for the very calm and resilient way my electorate staff have received some of those representations.

It has been put to me that the vast majority of those people who reside within my electorate who have chosen to communicate with me to express their views on the bill are against the bill. Of course, I recognise that there has been a concerted campaign—not just in my electorate but across a range of other electorates—by some people with a particular interest to try to drum up support against the bill, and some of those representations reflect that. Nonetheless, that is certainly the advice I have had.

Other people I have spoken with who have raised the bill with me have expressed some concern and alarm at how this bill has been represented in the media. Almost to a person those people have said they do not like the concept of termination at a very late stage, up to and including perhaps when an otherwise successful birth may occur. I have to say that to an extent I share that concern.

While I understand what the authors of the bill have sought to do in trying to ensure that the parliament and the people of our state can have faith in how late-term abortions may happen, by requiring that not only is it based on a medical practitioner's advice but in fact it is based on the advice of two separate medical petitioners, the way in which the bill is worded is that it should be deemed by those medical practitioners as 'medically appropriate', which is the term used in clause 6.

I have listened carefully to some of the contributions that have been made by other members. That 'medically appropriate' in clause 6 is followed up quite quickly in clause 6(2)(b)—that it will not only consider the relevant circumstances, as you would expect, in 6(2)(a), but 6(2)(b) provides that it would also countenance 'the professional standards and guidelines that apply to the medical practitioner in relation to the performance of the termination'.

In effect, what we are seeking to do is change the law for perpetuity, or at least change the law until it is subsequently changed by a future parliament, trusting that the two medical practitioners will deem whether a termination is 'medically appropriate' and that it will have regard to the professional standards that exist at the time. I do not know what 'medically appropriate' means; in fact, I do not think anyone in this place knows what 'medically appropriate' means.

I do not think a doctor could actually elucidate what 'medically appropriate' means. They may give some examples of what they would consider to be 'medically appropriate', but I do not believe they would be able to adequately legally define it, particularly if it came to the point when that definition needed to be tested—for example, if there were a question whether a procedure had been conducted appropriately or not. I am speaking, of course, if it were to be tested in a court of law, that place where legislation is tested from time to time.

Even in the Australian Medical Association's submission to the Law Reform Institute, at the beginning of its submission they themselves say that 'abortion is an issue with complex medical, ethical, legal and social aspects'. We are here to decide upon this bill, and I agree with the AMA in this regard, that we are to consider these complex medical, ethical, legal and social aspects; however, the bill restricts the consideration of a termination solely to those medical considerations.

'Medically appropriate', I could hazard a guess—I will not, though, because I am not a doctor, I am not a clinician, I am not a medical practitioner—but I think the fact that we cannot point to what that means, that we cannot get an accurate idea about the circumstances under which that termination may occur, would necessarily give us all pause for thought about what the circumstances actually would be in practice for a late-term abortion.

Of course I agree with the entreaties that have been made to date that somebody does not simply decide in the third trimester that suddenly they want an abortion. Of course I do not think anyone realistically expects that to be the case. I am very sympathetic to the argument which is very reasonably and frequently put that, with current medical technology, when a woman is expecting a baby, is pregnant, and is going through the range of tests that usually happen at 20 weeks, if there is something that is found in the course of those tests they would want a period of time to contemplate whether they needed to avail themselves of a termination.

Certainly, a number of representations have been put to me where that advice might not have come at 20 weeks; it might have come a little bit later—a week or two weeks later. Of course, somebody should have the opportunity, as time goes on, to think all of those issues through, and that might not be able to be done by 22 weeks and six days or, as the AMA suggested in their submission, at 24 weeks or by what I understand to be the case in practice at the moment, 28 weeks; it may be beyond that.

In that case, then you would think that it is not unreasonable that there is a time frame that is available. That is really the thing that I am finding difficult to weigh in my own mind about whether we have a much broader, greater provision for late-term abortions than what the current practice is in this state. I find that very difficult, I have to say.

I also find it difficult because this bill broadens what is currently happening in South Australia—and that is where terminations are nearly exclusively occurring in public healthcare facilities, with the exception, as I said, of those ones which have been conducted in regional areas, in country hospitals which are not owned or operated by the state—and merely requires that they occur in facilities which are regulated by state and national law which are prescribed facilities.

As the member for West Torrens and other members have said, this means that a much greater proportion of terminations will be able to occur in private facilities. This alarms me greatly. Yes, of course, like everybody else I have great faith in our medical profession and in doctors, but there will be a conflict for a medical practitioner when somebody approaches them in their private clinic, which is being operated by them necessarily as a business—to provide a living for themselves and their families—and there is a choice between offering a termination, which they can provide for a fee, or perhaps providing another option which does not have that outcome.

I am really uncomfortable with that conflict because I do not believe that conflict exists at the moment with termination services. This bill, perhaps looking to just provide as broad a brush as possible, provides for that possibility, and I am grateful that there is an amendment on file which seeks to address that, because, other than those small number of terminations which occur in country hospitals, I am aghast that we would be opening up a private industry where private clinics can be conducting these terminations with the inherent conflict that that has for those doctors.

I am also deeply uncomfortable, by default or perhaps by no fault of the way the bill is drafted, that abortions generally but particularly late-term abortions will not only be available, if they are

medically appropriate, but presumably if they are requested and approved for the purposes of gender selection. I am aghast at that. Despite the assurances that 'that won't happen; people don't do that; and, in fact, if you raise that that's actually a cultural slight on some cultures and beliefs', that is rubbish. The fact that we would have a bill or a potential law which provides for that I am not comfortable with.

As the member for Mount Gambier said, we all have a responsibility to decide what will be laws. We decide not based on assurances or intentions. We legislate to define the parameters of what is possible and hence legal and what is prevented and hence illegal. We necessarily have to be specific and we necessarily have to be precise about that and we have a provision in the bill that, perhaps unconsciously, allows for an abortion, let alone a late-term abortion, for gender selection purposes.

I must admit that I am interested, but I am perhaps less settled, in my view on conscientious objection, because on my first reading of the bill it seemed that the bill attempted to provide for a regime where doctors can exercise a conscientious objection, and to the drafters of the bill I think that that is a good thing. However, I was somewhat surprised that I still received many representations, particularly from some doctors, and have also seen amendments on file around conscientious objection. I am looking forward to hearing more about that in the course of the debate.

I think that this is not just the third conscience issue I have had to deal with since I have been a member of parliament for nearly seven years now. We have actually had several more, but perhaps there have been three significant conscience matters in the last five or six years. The first one that I had to confront was about voluntary euthanasia. I am not afraid to say that I initially approached that debate not being in favour of voluntary euthanasia.

I received a lot of representations, particularly from my own constituents and also from people who worked in palliative care and in other parts of the medical profession. A number of colleagues, both on my side of the chamber and the other side of the chamber, worked very hard to put up a ream of amendments to try to tighten what had initially been proposed into a bill. When it came to the second reading, I made my contribution and indicated that, should those amendments be supported, I would be happy to support that voluntary euthanasia regime, hence I voted for it at the second reading.

When we came to the prostitution debate—I was going to say last year, but I do not know if it was last year as 2020 was such a blur for us; it might have been 2019—I was tempted to vote for that bill at the second reading, even though I was still deeply uncomfortable with the bill. I voted against it at the second reading because I looked at the amendments on file and I realised that, even if all of those amendments passed, or even if the amendments that I was in favour of passed, that bill still would not satisfy me in order to have a regime of decriminalised or legalised prostitution in South Australia.

So I come to this bill, where we have a bill that will be voted on at the second reading. We have a range of amendments on file. This is probably the first time, out of these major issues of conscience, where I still do not genuinely know whether to vote in favour of it at the second reading. I still do not know that those amendments can satisfy me.

I think that the Minister for Water has placed on file amendments that seek to tighten the scope of late-term abortions, and I am grateful for his efforts in that regard. I did not think I would be thinking this, let alone saying it, but I am not sure whether that amendment goes far enough for me still. I would have liked a little bit more articulation about the circumstances under which there could be late-term abortion.

But I think I can say in summary in the closing contribution on this debate that I am trying my best with this bill. It is still leaving me very uncomfortable. I do not think I can support it, despite the good work of members who have filed amendments. I wholeheartedly agree with the decriminalisation. I had always considered myself to be a supporter of choice and a woman's choice for abortion, and it does genuinely grieve me that I do not think I will be able to support this bill.

Personal Explanation

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (20:44): I rise to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell, if it is a personal explanation in accordance with standing order 108 then leave will be required. If it is a matter of the member believing to have been misquoted or misunderstood in the course of the debate, that is a matter for standing order 116.

Ms HILDYARD: Standing order 116.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell has the call.

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Speaker, I have realised that in my speech on this bill I unintentionally said that two women who experienced difficult pregnancies chose to have a termination. One of these women did not, and I wholeheartedly and sincerely apologise for my error and any distress whatsoever that my error caused.

Bills

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (20:45): I would like to make a contribution this evening on the abortion legislation that is currently before our parliament. I indicate straight up that I will not be supporting this bill at its second reading, but it is my sincere hope that this bill will be amended in such a way that I will feel comfortable supporting it becoming law at its third reading.

In saying that, I do acknowledge that a number of hurdles have to be gone through. There are a number of amendments—not only the amendment that I have moved but amendments from colleagues on both sides of this house—that would have to be passed before I felt comfortable seeing this legislation pass.

I will not be voting for this bill at its second reading because I believe it is out of step with the will of the South Australian community. As a local MP representing Adelaide's southern suburbs, I have been contacted by many hundreds of people who have raised concerns about this bill, while I have only been contacted by a handful who would like to see it passed in its current form.

I am acutely aware, as many members no doubt are, that there are many passions involved in this debate, and I am conscious that by taking a sample from my electorate, peppered with various anecdotes and particular biases and motivations, I might not be getting a particularly scientific or rigorous sample of exactly how my electorate feels. However, I am confident that I have the measure of the people I represent in the seat of Black and I feel that the majority of those will be pleased to hear that I am making attempts to amend this bill and to improve this legislation.

I want to outline clearly the position from which I approach this legislation. I enter this chamber as someone who accepts that there is a place for abortion within our medical system. I believe that abortion should not be classed as a criminal act and that South Australia's legislation should and must be modernised to move the act of terminating a pregnancy from the criminal code to a more appropriate place within health laws. I am of an unwavering belief that this is where the act of abortion should be codified and that it is appropriate for a framework for safe abortions to be provided as a legislated medical procedure in the 21st century.

Further, I strongly believe that the majority of South Australians are comfortable with abortion being legislated as a health procedure. I believe that, like me, the majority of South Australians believe there is a place for abortion in society. While they perhaps would prefer there were not as many abortions carried out—I know it is something that people do not necessarily want to turn their minds to on a day-to-day basis—they accept the existence of abortion and that the ability to terminate a pregnancy, for a variety of reasons, is part of life in the society in which we live.

However, I believe there are some threshold issues for this bill which must be discussed. The most significant of those is the capacity of this legislation to create a pathway to late-term abortion. While I have just mentioned that I believe most people in society, and certainly most people who make representations to me, feel there is a place for the availability of abortion in some form, I strongly believe that the majority of South Australians are uncomfortable with late-term abortion—

that is, abortions which could occur after a child would ordinarily live with or without medical intervention outside of a mother's womb.

As such, I have concluded that most South Australians want their parliament to create a legislative framework in which late-term abortions are carefully governed, appropriately restricted and are by and large an option of last resort. It is for this reason that I have chosen to move an amendment in my name to secure a legislated gestational limit within the bill, whereby abortions will not be able to occur beyond 22 weeks and six days. That is the medically accepted age—and it is accepted in this legislation, it is accepted by our Department for Health and Wellbeing in South Australia and it is accepted by our Attorney-General—at which a baby is known to be able to survive externally from a mother's body.

Within the amendment will be what I deem to be sensible exceptions to enable an abortion to take place for a number of reasons, including if the life of a mother or an unborn child were to be at risk, or if a medical emergency were to unfold. My amendment clearly limits this new abortion law, and it does so because I believe the term, which is currently held within this legislation, being 'medically appropriate' is simply too wide. I do not know what 'medically appropriate' is. The member for Lee just made a very similar statement.

I hear arguments from those who would disagree with this amendment and disagree with my stance on this legislation that we need to trust the experts, the medicos, the doctors who have gone through years of training and developed a particular set of skills that enables them to make an interpretation as to what medically appropriate is and so be able to therefore deliver an abortion at this late term.

I actually think we should be defining the parameters through which our doctors do their jobs. I think that is okay, and I know we provide parameters for many people to do aspects of their jobs, and we provide those parameters across a whole range of different careers and professions within legislation, depending often on the sort of risk that that job poses to the health and safety of individuals or groups within our society. I see absolutely no problem at all in creating a safe and sensible framework to help our medical experts make a decision around the provision of a late-term abortion.

Some speakers who have made presentations to this house have said in their contributions that the law currently, after 28 weeks, allows abortions to occur for mental health reasons or psychosocial reasons or however we want to describe that, but I do not believe that that is the case. It is very much my understanding from the current law that an abortion can only occur after 28 weeks, which is an outdated threshold not based on the modern available medical science, to save the life of the mother or another unborn baby, not for any other reason and certainly not for mental health or psychosocial reasons.

My central reason for pursuing improvements to this bill to limit late-term abortion is that I believe that at a certain point in a pregnancy a threshold is crossed between an unborn baby being 100 per cent reliant on its mother for its survival to a point where medical science—or perhaps not medical science, depending on that phase of the pregnancy—enables that child to have a fighting chance of living externally from the mother's womb.

At that point, my thinking deviates from the principle that a woman can and should have autonomy over her body to a point where another human life is involved in that decision. It is a simple biological fact that we have two, or potentially more, lives to consider: the mother, who clearly has many rights and many decisions that should be respected and upheld, but then also an unborn child who, unlike the mother, cannot express opinion, cannot protect itself and is the epitome of vulnerable.

This, I believe, requires the state to provide extra layers of protections to give that unborn child a chance of survival. I do not believe that my position is extreme in any way. Anyone who has held a premature baby I believe should be able to reach a conclusion that if that baby were within the mother we should not be confronted with a situation that that child could be aborted for particular reasons that are not governed by legislation.

It makes me feel incredibly uncomfortable that a child who could survive outside the mother's womb could be terminated because of psychosocial reasons. We know that this is not commonplace. I am not saying that the laws that are before the parliament, if passed in their current form, would

create some sort slippery slope that would see hundreds of late-term abortions occur in South Australia. I do not believe that is the case by any means.

We do know that if we look to other jurisdictions, and particularly data from Victoria, there are late-term abortions occurring for reasons which are held under that banner of psychosocial. That makes me feel exceptionally uncomfortable and that is why I have presented an amendment to this house to provide that framework for our medical professionals to make these decisions and to, importantly, limit the pathway to late-term abortion in this state.

I also intend to support a range of other amendments on matters including sex selection abortion, something that I find to be quite abhorrent in its concept. I am told and assured that it really does not happen in South Australia. If that is the case, if it does not happen in this state, why not create another layer of protection? Why not translate it into legislation? That is why I will be supporting the member for Playford's amendment around sex selection abortion.

I will also be looking very carefully at and I am very likely to support enhancing the requirements around conscientious objection. I believe strongly in providing people with the freedom to make those decisions according to their conscience in the workplace. I am given some assurances that the current legislation supports conscientious objection, but there are also proponents of amendments who tell me that the conscientious objection clauses within this legislation ought to be strengthened, and doctors tell me that.

I know that the AMA has one view of this, but there are many doctors who have come to me and said, 'The AMA does not represent us.' It has taken a particularly legalistic view around this legislation, perhaps even an ideological view, and they do not believe that they have been represented by that peak body. They want extra protections.

It is my intention to support amendments that will provide medical assistance to a child born as a consequence of a so-called failed late-term abortion. I will support that amendment if my own amendment is unsuccessful, and that amendment is being moved and has been drafted by the member for West Torrens. It is my intention to support amendments that will expand reporting and data collection around the occurrence of abortions in South Australia, and I will also support a further amendment by the member for West Torrens that will seek to ban the sale of foetal matter.

This is an immensely challenging piece of legislation before the parliament. Conscience issues always are. I was elected in 2014. I am in my seventh year as a representative in the House of Assembly, and you do wrestle with social conscience issues that are brought before the parliament. I have recently been mentioned in the paper as a devout Christian.

I have never actually described myself as such in a specific sense, but I am someone with a Christian faith and that does influence me to an extent in terms of making these decisions—absolutely. It is the way that I grew up. It is part of my personal character, my DNA, but I did say in my maiden speech before this place that I came here as someone with a faith but not as someone who wanted to lecture parliament, or lecture society or the electorate I represent, in a pious way.

I, of course, will be shaped by my faith from time to time in the decisions that I make before this place, but equally I will be shaped by many other things. I will be shaped by friendships, by connections, by research, by where I grew up—and I have obviously grown up in two countries on opposite sides of the world. I will also be shaped by personal experiences. We have heard a number of personal experiences, as is often the case with conscience issues, shared with the House of Assembly this evening and today, and the member for West Torrens' personal experiences of his own family particularly spoke to me.

My experience around the value of life really comes from the very premature birth of my younger cousin, Rachel, who was born in September 1997. She was a couple of months early, and 24 or 25 years ago being a couple of months premature was a real fight for survival. Medical advancements even in the last quarter of a century have jumped forward substantially.

I remember meeting Rachel for the first time in mid-October, after she had been transferred from Dumfries hospital, the big regional hospital, to the local country town. I went in and I met her for the first time. She was the smallest thing I have ever seen. She remains the smallest thing I have

ever seen. My aunt said, 'This is Rachel and you are going to be really good friends.' We are really good friends. I am 12 years older than her.

We send each other a Snapchat of something every day, and seven months ago she sent me a Snapchat of her newborn. She is someone who means a great deal to me and she fought for life for her first few weeks. She was the smallest human I have ever seen. We still call her 'wee Rachel'. She will always be called 'wee Rachel'. I will send her the YouTube video of this speech to embarrass her.

When I met her, I was instilled with a sense of a value for life. She could have remained in the womb for another eight weeks, but for particular reasons of medical emergency that was not to be the case. Instead, she was born those couple of months premature, and she has had an immensely fulfilling life for the last 24 years, to the point where she has had her own son, Jack.

It gives me a great sense of grief—and I really struggle with this—that someone of her size and state of development could be aborted under these laws. I do not think people would make such a decision lightly. I do not think, as the member for West Torrens foreshadowed in his speech, that people would just wander into an abortion clinic and say, 'I've changed my mind. I want to get rid of this baby,' in a late-term state.

I do not think people do that. I think in every abortion, and particularly in late-term abortions, those decisions are undertaken with immense emotion and difficulty, but I want to create a set of laws that South Australians can rely on, that have the protections in place so that those decisions are made in a medically appropriate way, but in a way that is acceptable and accepted by our society in South Australia.

The current laws before us at the moment do not satisfy my conscience, and I think it is okay to say that. I am quite proud to live in a state where I can say that, where we can have these discussions in a relatively compassionate, structured, democratic, evidence-based, cordial way. It has not always been cordial in this debate. I have seen emails and statements, particularly on social media, that have not reflected well on the people who have sent those emails on both sides of the debate.

I hope people will support my amendment. That will then create a situation where I can feel I will be in a much greater position to support this bill at its third reading. I do hope that, no matter what people think and wherever their conscience leads them to cast their vote for both amendments and the second and third readings, it is done with love, compassion and decency.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (21:05): I want to express my thanks this evening to all in my community who have written, called or dropped into my office to share with me their views about the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2020 before us tonight. I have read every piece of correspondence—and there are many—both for and against.

I want to put on the record that when I vote it will be after careful consideration of each of the points that have been raised. It will follow having attended numerous briefing sessions, having asked many questions and having listened to church representatives and considered points raised by members of the legal profession and the Australian Medical Association, after having spoken to doctors and other medical professionals regarding the process and having heard from and spoken with many parents, grandparents and young people in my electorate.

Also, it will be after recollection of conversations over the years with friends, former colleagues, acquaintances and constituents who have been faced with very difficult decisions regarding continuing or ending a pregnancy, all for very different reasons. Many of them are desperately wanting a baby but facing devastating consequences. I am sure no woman makes the decision without significant consideration and often great heartache.

I support the intent of the bill where it repeals abortion from the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and creates a new standalone act, the Termination of Pregnancy Act, to regulate the termination of pregnancy as a lawful medical procedure. In relation to voting on the bill, I will carefully consider each amendment that has surfaced over the past 48 hours, and possibly more to come, as it is debated in this place before making my decision on how I will vote.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (21:07): I rise to make a contribution on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill, mostly out of respect for the large number

of my constituents who have made the immense effort to fill in my survey and questionnaire as well as those who have met with me—church leaders, community groups, constituents—and those who have rung and emailed my office. In particular, I would like to note that 951 constituents from the Adelaide electorate took the time to fill in my 10-question survey. I am truly grateful for their comments and their time towards our democratic process.

The overall statistics from those who completed the survey were 699 (74 per cent) in favour of the bill as it stands and 252 (26 per cent) against. That does not mean I do not believe there could be further improvements, and there are concerns that have been raised with different issues. I would like to put on the record just some of the direct comments that have been made to give the house a bit of an idea of the variations of comments that have been coming through.

To quote, 'Contraception, education and counselling should be discussed and prioritised above amending the existing process to terminate a pregnancy.' So I am very interested in a possible amendment to ensure that information is provided at the consultation time when people seek advice. Another of my constituents said, 'As a primary school teacher, I have seen firsthand how some parents struggle with that extra mouth to feed, and the whole family, including already born children, can be negatively impacted by the birth of an additional, unwanted child.'

Another constituent said, 'The law should support women to make a decision in a safe way, providing information, emotional and medical support where needed, but not bringing judgement or opinion to the table.' Representative of many people, another constituent conveyed how very thankful they are for the opportunity to have their views heard and for our country's democratic process that is available to them. To quote parts of another constituent's long contribution:

I have a belief that life starts at conception...Therefore, abortion at any stage is, in my opinion, terminating a life...I have counselled a number of women who have presented with general guilt and associated depression as a result of having an abortion.

That is another reason why I am considering an amendment. I have one drafted. That requires information to be given to a woman when she is making a decision.

As a member of parliament, many people share very personal stories, and it is a great honour for people to trust us with that information. I had one very personal meeting with a woman who indicated to me that she was married and already had two children. She had a job, she was fully capable of making a decision and she made a decision to terminate a pregnancy. She was not given any alternative information, or any information about possible mental health effects or physical health effects, and she went ahead with the termination. For years now she has lived every day feeling guilty about that decision, and she implored me to ensure that information is given when a woman goes in for a consultation with a doctor.

Another constituent expressed their thanks for the opportunity to comment. There are hundreds and hundreds of comments. Another comment was, 'Make adoption better/easier so that females who are pregnant in situations that are not tenable, to see adoption as a third option.' Many in this house would be aware that adoption is something for which I have been strongly advocating. It is an amendment that will be discussed and debated in the Children and Young People (Safety) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, which should be coming to the house in March. It has already been tabled. That is an opportunity to give people hope that, if they are unable to care for the child, there are other families who would love the opportunity to care for a child. To quote another constituent:

The proper provision of information should be mandated as abortion trauma is increased if full information is not provided.

Another constituent states:

I am a medical practitioner and am quite concerned about the proposed bill, particularly in regards to the right to conscientiously object. Conscientious objection by its very definition should not include referring a patient to someone who will perform the procedure.

Overall, there are general areas of concern for people in my electorate, noting again that 74 per cent are in favour of the bill as it stands, but I do believe that you can always improve something. There are some amendments that have been tabled that I am considering supporting. One of those is to do with a failed abortion, particularly a late-term abortion where a baby is viable. Medical support should

be made available to that baby so that it can live. With improved adoption laws, that baby would have a chance of having a family.

I am against sex selection, so that is an amendment that I am looking at supporting. The conscientious objection amendments also look like they would satisfy some of the extra concerns of people in my electorate. I am told that the anaesthesia used in medical abortion for late term, which was one of the recommendations by several of my constituents, is more a medical practice procedure than a statutory law change requirement, so I will look at how we can let that be known to the AMA.

The psychosocial reasons used for late-term abortions in Victoria certainly have been of concern to several of my constituents. I think there are amendments already tabled that might help in that area, particularly for a late-term abortion. So the provision of information, I think, is important, and making sure that this does go through to the opportunity to debate clause by clause and consider all the amendments so that we can make the required changes, because I think the highest agreement is the fact that the abortion law should be in the health act, and it should not be illegal. So that is all for today.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (21:15): I wish to make a contribution to this debate because I believe I owe it to my community to make myself accountable to them so they have an understanding of how I form my views and also an understanding of why I voted in a particular way when I do vote at the end of this debate.

I would like to make some comments about the debate itself because I think it is important that the community understand what we have been asked to vote for, or against. I do not intend to address specific arguments for or against any elements of this bill. I think they have been canvassed quite widely today and, to be completely honest, I am not sure I could actually add much or enlighten the parliament any further than has already been done so.

Mr Cowdrey: You're underselling yourself, Tony.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you. I think the members have canvassed those, and I do not think my contribution, as I said, would actually add more to that. Another thing is that I cannot directly or indirectly speak about an experience. Obviously, as a bloke, I am not experienced in abortion, but neither is a partner of mine or a family member. I have no indirect experience of abortion, so I cannot speak from that perspective as well. My contribution will be around the general principles that I will adopt or follow in assessing this bill or any amendments.

A lot has been said in this debate with a great deal of sensitivity and respect, which I agree with. I think it is certainly an issue which engenders quite a bit of emotion, and I think we have to be respectful of different points of view. Having said that, some of the ways people have framed the debate and the use of language in this debate are also, in my opinion, not respectful or sensitive to different points of view, and I will explain what I mean by that.

All language we use is not neutral—we know that. The use of language is a very powerful tool. Language can be used in ways to, if you like, set the narrative in a way that actually engenders debate and enlightens people about what is being said, etc., or language can be used in a way to limit the debate. I have seen and I have heard both in this chamber today, from my perspective. I should say that these are my opinions. I will not present things as facts because these are just my opinions on how I think this debate is going.

To be able to expand and inform the debate, we need to all acknowledge that we believe in something but also we have to acknowledge we may be incorrect. I think that anybody who speaks with 100 per cent certainty on this issue is not being genuine, in the sense that they are being respectful to the views of others, because there has to be some doubt. In saying that, I have some doubt about my own views, which I will be expressing shortly.

The other thing I need to mention—and this has been touched on by one of the speakers a bit earlier—is that people might say, 'Why would a person who has not experienced an abortion have a say in an abortion debate?' If we do believe in gender equality, I think that both men and women have a right to have an opinion and a view about any issue and an opportunity to express that view should be provided. I think that would foster greater gender equality than saying, and I have read this in the paper, 'What would men know?' etc. I think we do have a contribution to make, but as an MP the reality is that I have a duty to vote a particular way in this debate, so it is in that context that I make that contribution.

As the member for Port Adelaide has, in my opinion, correctly asserted, this is a moral issue and by 'moral issue' I do not necessarily mean a moral issue based on faith or religion but a moral issue which can be based on secular principles as well. Not only do people of faith have morals, people right across the board have morals or moral positions and our moral framework determines how we see the issue. I believe it matters not how our moral framework is formed, but what is important is that each person has a world view which is valid.

In the debate I have heard today, I have tried to understand the different moral and world views and how they are formed, and certainly from that position I do not come from a position of absolute. I do not think this debate is black and white; it is more grey than black and white and that is the challenge we face. Because there is a lot of grey area in this debate, I think somebody else's opinion is just as valid as my opinion and I respect that. In the end, I may vote differently from some people but it does not mean their view is not appropriate.

As has been said earlier, I think it is very important for people on both sides of the argument to understand—and I say this because all of us have had representations on this issue from constituents, and some put them a bit more forcefully than others—that people of goodwill and compassion and mutual respect can arrive at different conclusions on an issue, particularly an issue that is central to our shared humanity.

I will give you an example: one member has expressed the view that not supporting this bill unamended imposes additional burdens, impediment and complexity for women. That is a view that has been expressed and that is a valid view for them. Equally, another person might say that what is proposed in amendments can be seen as safeguards rather than an impediment or complexity, etc.

This is true of a lot of other issues. For example, later this year we will be debating the euthanasia bill. That bill, as I understand it, as has been introduced in the other chamber, is based on the Victorian model. As I understand it, the Victorian government and the people who are supporting the Victorian model in this state assert that it is the one with the most safeguards in the world. I think it is very important to remember that because that comes up a bit later.

It has also been said that this bill is based on best clinical practice. I do not dispute that. Best clinical practice today is different from best clinical practice 20 years ago and best clinical practice in 20 years' time. If there is no legislative provision, then that is a question of public policy made by not lawmakers but other parties. We have doctors and lawyers, etc. who make those decisions. The reality is that in all walks of life when judgements are made by people there will always be possible errors in those judgements.

The bill also refers to 'medically appropriate' and defines that in a certain way. Having spoken to a number of people, that means different things to different people and, therefore, that grey area is something we need to address. The other issue being raised is conscientious objection. That would seem to be a reasonable thing in a Liberal democracy but, equally, what conditions are attached to that? Some doctors have expressed a view that if they want to express their conscientious objection, they are limited when they are forced to refer a person to a person who undertakes abortions, and I can understand that. It may not happen, it may happen, but I can understand that perspective for that person.

It has also been said, and this has been said today and I have read it in the media, that as MPs we should trust women and their medical teams. That is an extremely powerful statement to make, that we should trust women and their medical teams. Again, that is not neutral language. That language is not neutral; it is not a neutral position. It implies that if you oppose this bill you do not trust women and their medical teams. It is designed to frame the debate in a way that creates a 'them and us'—you are either with us or against us. I think that is very unhelpful if you are trying to open up the debate to have a meaningful discussion about that, because I think it is quite possible to have that discussion.

A few minutes ago, I mentioned the euthanasia debate. The proponents of the euthanasia debate talk about safeguards and conditions, etc., and they see that as a strength of the proposal which will come before us. One could argue, 'Don't you trust people who want to end their own life and their doctors?' Why attach conditions to it? Why frame a bill which says the person who wants

to end their life, for whatever reason, cannot do that privately with their doctor? Nobody is actually arguing that. Even the proponents of the euthanasia bill in this place are not arguing that. So in the same way, I think to frame the discussion to trust women and their medical teams is designed not to help the debate but to make sure the debate goes one way, and I find that unhelpful.

The parliament has often, and will continue to do so, inserted conditions on a particular public policy matter, and there is nothing wrong with that. We are trying to find a balance of the different competing views in our society and trying to come up with something that society generally supports. We make our own judgement where that position is on that continuum. We make our own judgements about that, and I accept that. Also, when you think about it, all our laws are premised on the basis that we do not trust people.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We can trust you. Because all our laws are based on the fact that we do not trust people to do the right thing and that is why we have laws because people do the wrong thing. That is unfortunate. That is just a reality.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Not all of us.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We have laws because people like you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —may not do the right thing all the time. I am trying to get to the fundamentals of what underpins this debate because I think it is very important that we put it in its context. It has also been said that amendments are designed to frustrate the bill. In the debate today, it has been said that some of the amendments are designed to frustrate the bill. But equally it could be argued that they seek to insert some safeguards.

I would like to make some comments now about the guiding principles on the abortion debate we are having. In a very simple way, the abortion debate has been ongoing for many decades, and to some extent today as well. I acknowledge that abortions are lawful in this state, and they have been since 1969. People's views of abortion range from 'all abortion is wrong' to people who say abortion should be available—and I am happy to be corrected on whether it is the right terminology—'on demand'. In between, there is a whole range of different perspectives on what is an appropriate time to allow an abortion to take place.

In terms of us as legislators and people trying to determine public policy, I will paraphrase what I have read here because I think this particular article puts it better than I can myself. The challenge for us as parliamentarians is that one of the most difficult issues is how to make a sound policy that meets the needs of most people in a given society without focusing on the extreme views. In other words, how do we come to land on a public policy position that actually reflects what most people believe or what most people are prepared to accept? That is what the challenge is. It is certainly true on social issues, which are much more volatile.

On this issue, another reality is that it is never likely that we are going to get 100 per cent of people to agree. The issue will be black and white for some but it will never be black and white for others. Some people will be on the white side and some on the black, but most people will be in the grey area. The problem is that the issue of abortion will continue in a practical sense. I quote:

This means that a good policy does not rest on extreme views but tries to cover as many points of views, although being aware of the fact that one is not able to please every person in society. This would be an impossible task. It seems that one should adopt a moderate view rather than the proposed extreme views. This is not because the moderate view is 'correct' but because one needs a broad consensus for a sound policy.

I agree with that: we need to find a consensus position on this policy. People who are on either end of the debate also need to understand that as parliamentarians we need to find some common ground in this area.

I now come to the views expressed to me by my community. Like other members, I have received a great deal of correspondence and representation on this matter. I divided this correspondence and representation into four categories: firstly, those people who are in my electorate and those who are outside my electorate. That has been quite deliberate because my first obligation is to people in my electorate—

Mr Cowdrey: What do you do with the other ones?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: They do influence it, but my first responsibility is to the people who vote for me or those who do not vote for me, as the case may be. I have also considered all representations within my electorate, and there are those who support the bill and those who oppose it. Based on the representations I received from my own electorate, certainly a majority of people oppose the bill in its current form.

There is some common ground, as mentioned by other members of parliament, in the issue of shifting the provisions from the criminal code to the health act. There seems to be very little opposition to that. I support the proposal to move the abortion provisions to the health act. I do not and will not support any amendments that seek to wind back the clock. Any provision that tries to go backwards I will not support either; I think that would be inappropriate. I will listen to the reasons given for the various amendments that are before us and that may come before us tomorrow.

I also indicate that I will vote in support of the second reading speech, to progress to the committee stage, as I believe the proposed amendments are worthy of consideration. People might say, 'Well, if you don't support the bill, why support that?' I think it is important that the amendments get a chance to be aired and debated. Certainly, based on what I have heard so far, I am likely to support some of the amendments and to oppose others.

What I can say is that I do not support the bill in its current form. Sadly, if the proponents of the current bill do not accept some of the proposed amendments, I would be forced to vote against the bill. I hope that does not happen. I hope that we can actually find common ground and advance the debate further, that we can all support an amended bill for what I think would be the common ground or that we support what we can actually do to advance the debate further. With those comments, I would encourage people to support the second reading speech on the basis that we should actually debate the amendments; I think they are worthy. We will go into committee and have a real debate then.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (21:34): I will be quite brief. As has been said, there is a lot of grey in this area; as has been said, we need to find a common ground; as has been said, we need to try to get the best for everybody. I do not believe that. To be quite honest, every single one of us is charged with making a decision. I do not believe in abstaining on issues like this.

I do find these issues very difficult and very challenging. I will support the second reading stage because it is impossible to make a decision on all the issues that come together, all the amendments, all the possibilities, if you do not support the second reading stage in a conscience vote. It is incredibly important to let everybody have their say. Every single one of us is not charged with finding the middle ground: every single one of us is charged with making a decision on what is put in front of us, amendment by amendment, on whatever is left at the end of the third reading. That is very, very important.

This is not something we can squib on; simultaneously, this is not something on which any one of us can think we are automatically right. It is challenging stuff, but at the end of the day we need to make a decision on behalf of our electorates. Some people have done polls, some people have calculated the number of responses they have had, pro and con, and said, 'Well, whatever that is, that's what I'll do.' I think it would be inappropriate to only do that.

We are elected, we are members of parliament and we need to consider what our electorates want. We also have a responsibility to have our own personal views also worked into that. To be perfectly honest, it is a bit of a cop out if somebody just wants to say, 'Well, I got three-quarters, 75 per cent, voting one way and 25 per cent voting the other, so that's what I'll do.' All that does is encourage campaigns. All that does is probably encourage digital campaigns.

I do not think any one of us should squib on our responsibility to make a decision. I will vote for the second reading so that every single member in this chamber who wants to put an amendment forward will have the opportunity of putting that amendment forward, if enough people vote for the second reading. I will consider every single one of those amendments on its merits and will vote for

every single one of those amendments on its merits, as I see fit, based on my own assessment and my understanding of what my electorate wants. We will come to the third reading and I will make a judgement then.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (21:37): I rise to make a very brief contribution to this debate. I do not wish to hold it up because I think the important work is to be done in the committee stage.

Like many speakers before me, like the member for Stuart, I would like to indicate that this is not an easy decision to make; none of these decisions are easy to make. They come after much soul-searching and no small amount of heartache. You really feel the burden in these situations, trying to make the right decision for your community and for South Australians generally. None of us come to this lightly, but I do think it is important that, however briefly, we clearly put our position going into the debate because, as I said, this is not the debate, this is the preliminary stage.

I will support the second reading of the bill. I am likely to support the bill, certainly the spirit of the bill, as it stands. I think it is an important legislative change to remove these provisions from the criminal code to the health area. Much like the member for Stuart, I will consider each amendment on its merits.

I am a little disappointed that those amendments came so late. Members of the media were asking us how we felt about the bill and I freely told them that I supported the spirit of the bill but that there would be amendments coming, and I did not know what those amendments would look like. I assumed they would be the same as the ones in the upper house, but I really had no idea. It is impossible to make a decision until you read the fine print of those amendments.

I indicate that I am likely to be supporting the amendments that the member for Playford, I think, brought in around gender selection. I am not convinced that the bill makes it any easier to select on the basis of gender than it is now. I have had discussions with people wiser than me in the health area who tell me that it does not make much difference to the bill; it is simply a signal that that is what parliament expects. We do not want gender selection for any reason other than a serious, genetically based reason. There should be no reason at all why any gender selection should be considered medically appropriate, and I think an amendment just simply makes that clear. I will be supporting that.

I will be looking at various other amendments. I confess freely that I am still debating within myself and with others the merits of some of the late-term amendments brought in by the member for Black, the Minister for Environment. In terms of my problems with those particular amendments, I think that rather than that very rare occasion when there is a very late-term abortion, which I accept is very rare, the bill is currently drafted in order to facilitate some flexibility around that middle period, around the 23, 24-week mark when people are still making decisions, women are still weighing up what they need to do in certain situations.

I think that is the flexibility we need, and I do not think the member for Black's amendments really give us that. My inclination is not to support them at this stage, but I will be very interested in that particular part of the debate tomorrow.

I just want to say in closing that I have taken this very seriously, and I have spoken to people in the know, people who have consulted me about what I will be doing, people from all sides of the debate who have approached me in good faith. Obviously, I have spoken to the experts like Chris Moy, who also introduced me to Rosalie Grivell, the chair of the local Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, but more importantly I spoke to people in my electorate with whom I have a friendship but not always a lot of agreement.

I count among those my friend Pastor Lindsay Mayes, formerly from the Elizabeth Church of Christ. He is currently leading a Baptist mission in another electorate. Sadly, I have lost him; I do not see him as much as I used to. He came to see me, and we had a very robust discussion, a very fruitful discussion. I will be sending him a copy of these rambling remarks just to let him know that he did have an effect on the way I view this debate. Ultimately, I do not think I will make him entirely happy with my decision, but I hope he understands. I have had many detailed conversations with him about why I will be taking the course of action I will be taking.

I look forward to the meat of the debate, where the rubber hits the road, tomorrow. I look forward to looking at all these amendments on their merits, but I do want to put on the record that I do support the bill.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (21:43): I, too, wish to get on the record some thoughts around the bill. As many have acknowledged through debate so far today, this is a complex and vexed issue that none of us are treating lightly. It has been said many times already today, but for completeness this bill does not seek to make abortion lawful in South Australia. This was settled near 50 years ago. Women in South Australia have had access to safe and lawful abortion services over that time.

I also do not know anyone who would like to see South Australia return to the days where sepsis and infection were rife in the absence of a public health service. I, like nearly everyone I have spoken to, support the shift of this legislation relating to abortion from the criminal code to the health code. That being said, I do acknowledge and share the concerns raised in the many representations made to me as the local representative of my community, the overwhelming majority outlining concerns with the changes to gestational limits or the late-term aspects of the bill and some other aspects. I thank all members of my community who have contacted me outlining their concerns or support of all or aspects of the bill.

While I acknowledge the intent of what is proposed in this bill, that late-term abortions would happen only under very rare circumstances and only if deemed medically appropriate in all circumstances by two medical professionals, in short my reservations are similar to what has been outlined by other members today. It is not that I necessarily believe this will happen, but there is potential for the expansion of the intent I just outlined due to the largely undefined term of 'medically appropriate'. From the perspective of this chamber, we can only contemplate if and how the definition of 'medically appropriate' could perhaps shift into the future.

I also strongly believe that it is our responsibility as lawmakers not just to make clear what we deem is appropriate under law but also what is not. For this reason, I find it very difficult to simply dismiss the issue of sex selection. While I do not believe that this is happening in our society today, I have no issue with this parliament specifically outlining opposition to this concept into the future.

I recognise the time of night and will keep my comments brief due to that, but I hope that these words provide some context to my decisions through debate. I will be supporting the bill at second reading to continue debate and to allow consideration of amendments. I will be carefully considering all amendments that have been filed and flag now that I will be supporting some that I believe improve the bill and address the concerns outlined by my constituents.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (21:46): The decision to have a baby or not is one of the biggest decisions that a woman can make, and indeed not all women get the option to choose. Reproductive issues are among the most stressful, the most emotional, the most heartbreaking and the most confronting that a woman and her loved ones will experience. It follows, of course, that legislation dealing with reproductive issues and the termination of pregnancy will be among the most testing for us here to contemplate.

We have seen in this chamber today—and maybe right now—just how emotional this issue is for many if not all of us. Indeed, it is a heartbreaking issue for me. My heart goes out to all those women and families who have had to deal with the difficulties and complexities and raw emotion that comes with such matters. I want to say that I respect whatever decision you have made in the interests of yourself, your family and your unborn child. No-one can really understand your experience and what you have wrestled with unless they have lived it themselves, and even then the circumstances that women must contend with in this space are many and varied and no two experiences are the same.

Many of us here will have lived experience with fertility issues, others will have partners or loved ones who have had to grapple with these issues and others will have no lived experience, but at the end of the day as legislators we are all here and we will each cast a vote on this very important issue.

People of good intention can arrive at different positions, and I certainly respect my colleagues and their decisions in this place, no matter what they decide to do in this debate. I know we have all spent a great deal of time researching this issue to arrive at our varied positions today

and no-one has approached this lightly. We are each influenced by a range of political, policy and personal aspects in considering this bill and the amendments.

For my part, I have extensively consulted with my electorate, examined feedback from stakeholder groups, spoken with people at street corner meetings and tram and train station visits and held personal meetings with each member of my electorate who has requested a personal call or a sit-down meeting with me and, yes, in case anyone wondered, I do personally read every letter that Badcoe constituents send me, even those inbox-clogging mass proforma emails we have all been getting. Even during my election campaign in 2017, people were raising this issue with me—people who were pro life and people who were pro choice.

Sometimes we think our communities are not engaged in what we get up to in this place but this issue surely demonstrates that people are paying attention and will get involved in issues if they feel strongly about them. That is one aspect of this debate that has been encouraging. I have also attended briefings and met with stakeholders on all sides of this debate in an effort to fully inform myself and make this very difficult decision.

Central to this bill is that it removes termination of pregnancy procedures from the criminal code and instead ensures terminations are governed under health regulations. This change would bring South Australia in line with every other jurisdiction in the nation. Although no woman has been charged under this act for very many decades, it is not sufficient to have laws on the books that do not actually reflect what we as a society want and to open the possibility for criminal charges to be laid against women or medical professionals.

In my conversations with my electorate, no-one has expressed to me that they think a woman should be gaoled for seeking a termination; in fact, people from a broad range of perspectives in my local area agree that this rightly fits in health legislation, not the criminal code, and I support this approach. It is, however, worth noting that this bill creates a new offence for unqualified persons who perform, or assist in performing, a termination. This aims to protect against dangerous and unsafe practices which may be carried out by people who are not authorised or qualified to carry out terminations.

On the issue of medically induced termination, 'medical abortion' refers to the procedure that uses pharmaceutical drugs to induce an abortion. It is usually utilised in the early stages of pregnancy. Medical terminations are currently permitted in South Australia if two medical practitioners examine a woman and approve the medication being supplied. Treatment must be undertaken in a designated hospital.

This bill provides that a single registered health practitioner can authorise a medical termination and prescribe or administer the drug. It removes the requirement that the treatment needs to take place in a hospital and this bill would permit medical terminations for women who are no further along in gestation than 63 days. Among other things, this would mean that a woman is able to obtain a medical abortion in a general practice setting. The current requirement to visit a hospital on at least two occasions within 48 hours can present difficulties for women who live in rural and remote areas.

As a person who has spent the majority of my life living and working in regional and remote parts of Australia, access to healthcare services, including termination, is a critical issue in my decision-making. To me, allowing easier access to medical termination is a benefit in this particular reform. My perspective growing up in regional and remote communities has informed how I view this bill and how I will consider the amendments before us.

In relation to abortions up to 22 weeks and six days under our current law, any woman seeking a termination of pregnancy needs the approval of two medical practitioners. Under this bill, a pregnant woman whose gestation period does not exceed 22 weeks and six days would only need to consult one medical practitioner. Setting this gestational limit would align South Australia, as I understand it, with current clinical practice in other jurisdictions. This measure of needing only one medical professional assists women in regional and remote areas who may not be able to easily access multiple doctors in their community, especially GPs who are willing to assist them.

In relation to late terminations—arguably the most contentious facet of this bill—I am genuinely interested in the amendments presented and I hope the quality of the debate will assist this parliament in its deliberations, including my deliberations. In relation to conscientious objection,

I do believe in the right for medical professionals to conscientiously object to performing or assisting in the termination of pregnancy. I think respecting each other's views in this space is very important and that respect should be extended to medical professionals.

This bill provides that a health practitioner may conscientiously object to performing or assisting with an abortion and it requires a conscientious objector to immediately notify the patient of their objection and refer them to a practitioner who can provide the service. The practitioner's right to conscientiously object does not override their duty of care to the patient. I note there is an amendment in relation to conscientious objection and I will consider it. There is a raft of other amendments that I am looking forward to hearing further explanation and debate on and I will consider my position on those amendments. I thank the members who have taken the time to formulate those amendments so that we may consider them here.

When it comes down to it, fundamentally I do support a woman's right to choose. I support a woman's right to choose what is right for her and her body, but I do not think that choice is easy or without consequence. I do think, though, that we are lawmakers with the power to prescribe laws to whatever extent and detail the parliament can reach agreement on, and we need to place some faith in women and their medical professionals. I know for many women that this will be the most difficult decision of their life, and we as a parliament should not make it even harder.

While we should certainly regulate the provision of termination, legislation cannot account for every possible scenario and every possible dynamic that is faced when grappling with the decision to terminate a pregnancy. There needs to be a degree of flexibility among the rigorous controls when it comes to law around termination of pregnancy. Equally, I do not think we as a parliament should seek to encourage abortion with our reforms, including late-term abortion, but rather seek to provide a mechanism to deal with the most rare, necessary and desperate cases in the most compassionate way possible.

As a feminist I believe in choices for women. It is at the core of the reasons I chose to enter politics. It is therefore only logical that I must support the right of women to have choices in health care and the choice to determine their own needs when faced with the harrowing decision of termination. That does not mean those choices are easy, it does not mean that there are not consequences to those choices, and it does not mean that a woman must or will choose one option over another; it simply means that the choice is there.

This has been a gruelling deliberation process, and I would like to thank my electorate. On the whole, my constituents in Badcoe expressed themselves firmly and passionately but not aggressively, and I thank them for the respect they have shown me and my staff while raising these issues with me. I have appreciated hearing from them. I know that my position on this bill certainly will not satisfy everyone in Badcoe. A significant number of people will feel disappointed in me, and I am sorry that I cannot be all things to all people, but I do think the position that I am taking reflects the view expressed by the majority of my electorate that abortion should be safe, legal, accessible and rare.

I would be lying to say that the decision sits entirely comfortably with me. These are not pleasant matters to examine, and there are brutalities about abortion, but it is the decision that I can live with and that my conscience can sustain. Having said that, I want electors in Badcoe who advocate a different position to know that I have carefully considered, researched and wrestled with every point they have made.

My position has not been arrived at lightly, nor without great detailed and lengthy consideration on my part. I hope that, if nothing else, these constituents who may have wanted me to vote differently will acknowledge that they have an MP who opens her mind to all points of view as a starting position on conscience matters and gives people the time of day to express their opinions, an MP who seriously contemplates and works through those diverse views in our community in order to form her own position.

I would like to thank my colleagues, who come from a range of perspectives, for their assistance to me in understanding various amendments and different perspectives. I would also like to acknowledge my sub-branch: grassroots members of the labour movement. I have appreciated

hearing the varied views our sub-branch has about this matter. Their contributions have been listened to as constituents and as engaged members of the labour movement.

I would also like to thank my predecessor, who held the seat of Ashford, Steph Key. Steph repeatedly and passionately advanced this matter before this house throughout her 20-year career. All those who came before us who have helped to inform and stimulate public and parliamentary debate on this issue deserve recognition. Steph deserves acknowledgment for her many years of work on this matter, and I trust that she is following this debate intently, so thank you, Steph.

In summary, I have resolved to support this bill, and I do look forward to hearing debate on the proposed amendments and considering my position on each of those proposals.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (21:59): I would just like to say thank you very much to all the speakers; there have been very many. I do not know that we have had a debate for a very long time in this parliament where we have had such a breadth of speakers and such a number.

Can I start by saying that I have listened carefully to those who have made a contribution in debate and the very many views expressed and concerns identified. I have followed a number of debates interstate over the past few years and the comprehensive assessment of interstate issues raised through the SALRI process, which of course the institute undertook to consider its deliberations for the recommendations which it has put to me as Attorney-General and from which I have the base of the bill that is before you today.

From that, I cannot think that there is actually any new issue that has not been canvassed in those issues interstate. That could mean a number of things. If I were to highlight a number of areas that I think have been thematic in the issues of concern raised in respect of the bill as it is presented, even with extra provision, which I would see as a level or threshold of extra protection in a medical model, there are issues as to the interpretation and construction and application and protection or lack thereof of the conscientious objection matters about whether there is adequate prescription or definition and exactly what circumstances should apply or be allowed to apply in respect of an abortion after 22 weeks and six days under this new threshold.

Thirdly, not uncommon has been the aspect of whether abortion is being used as a means of sex selection of children to be born of the union. Less common have been aspects of counselling and how that might assist. The question of how to deal with a circumstance legislatively, in this instance, of providing for resuscitation and intervention to support a child who might be born alive post a termination procedure is not novel. It has been raised in other debates but has not been accepted.

A final area in relation to the transfer of foetal hearts is an aspect which is completely novel, from what I am aware of, in this debate. Obviously, in terms of the transfer of foetal matter, I recall in this parliament we canvassed this question of how we deal with the use of embryo material in research. It is again a very controversial area. In relation to that aspect, that has been raised. The transfer and/or sale of product is uncommon and, I think, novel, for me at least, in all the areas that I have looked at in relation to this new termination bill. These issues have been raised.

Can I say that for all the diversity of views that have been expressed they are very personal, of course, to a number of our members who have had experience in relation to aspects of this type of legislation, that apply to this type of legislation, and I respect that. We have also heard from people such as the member for West Torrens, who shared his very traumatic time with his own children. That is a very sad situation. None of us come to this parliament without some level of experience, exposure, set of values, level of faith, diversity of faith, diversity of interest.

We all come with some experience, and sometimes it is very raw and brutal to have to deal with it in the debates that we have to deal with here when it is either a recent or an extreme experience that someone has had. Dealing with termination of life, whether it is pre-birth, neonate or in a dignity in dying bill, really challenges us.

I do respect that, and I do acknowledge that it is really difficult, especially perhaps for new members who have not had the experience of the enormous interest that these types of pieces of legislation engender in our community and in our electorates. That is sometimes in itself unnerving. Then, as the member for Badcoe says, there is the incapacity to satisfy and accommodate the blessing of all the different views in one's electorate.

Of course it is difficult, and one could say that that is one of the tasks that we have to do here, that is, ultimately to make hard decisions to assist others. This type of area, which has the attraction of a conscience vote, the freedom to have a conscience vote for all of us here in this parliament, is one that is most vexed and sometimes quite distressing. I do acknowledge that, and I thank those who have worked through that to be able both to participate in the debate and to consider the matters.

In all those circumstances, we have been discussing this for the last 10 hours and there have been more and more amendments identified and foreshadowed. Certainly, I think I had 110-1, which I think was Paula's amendment. I have indicated that I would be happy to support those, but there has been a myriad of others now that have come forth. I think there are still some in early form that I have not seen the final drafts of, and of course members have not.

I know the member for Frome raised the fact that there is a very late entry of amendments. I am not responsible for that, nor do I cast any negative aspersion on any others for that. I think with debates such as this it is inevitable, and we do need to remain, as members, nimble to be able to review and consider those matters. Some will want to confer with people whom they have sought advice from on these matters during the debate, and I respect that.

When I ask members to consider the bill for a second time, if that is successful, I would propose that we would go to clause 1 and then adjourn further consideration. I am proposing that this will be after question time tomorrow at the earliest, to enable members to digest what has been presented, not only tonight in the contributions but also in the amendments that we now have, and apparently a few more are coming.

I have heard a number of members indicate that they will support the bill unamended, and others say that they will not support the bill whatever happens in any amendment and therefore will not support the second reading. I would urge members to consider supporting the second reading. A good number of you have indicated that you will do that, because you are interested in developing some discussion and dialogue as to the resolution of in some way advancing 21st century termination law.

It may not come to pass, but I would urge members to support the second reading to facilitate that, because unfortunately this is one of those situations where it is actually black and white—not the issue, but the reality is that after 51 years we have a bill before us that it seems has universal agreement that it needs to be modernised, decriminalised, however you want to put it. There is a process for a number of things that people are not unhappy with and they see the merit in advancing, but there are aspects of it that could frustrate or undermine their view of being able to support any amendment at all.

So we are either back in 1969, with aspects that are really resulting in South Australian women having to go and seek terminations interstate, to be able to avail themselves of law reform structures that are all around the country but not here; some may be of the view that that might be bad luck or, and I am of this view, it is important for us to deal with this hard issue and to be able to bring us into some kind of 21st century management of this issue.

I would not have brought the bill through the institute or brought it to this parliament if I did not think it was important that we address it. It is not easy; I totally understand that. Comments have been made tonight about trying to keep debate dignified. It has been unpleasant. I have received a number of descriptions myself, which I have acknowledged. I do not like it myself. I think I am pretty tough in politics, but it is not pleasant. I think someone described in their contribution tonight that they or somebody in their conversation had been described with 'zealotry'. Again, this does not help. Abuse or personal reflection on somebody as to their view on a matter does not assist this resolution.

We do need to be able to consider whether we fundamentally want to bring the structure surrounding the prescription of termination into the 21st century or whether we are going to leave it in 1969. I would urge members to support the second reading and let us explore some of those pressing issues that have been raised by many of you, which I acknowledge and which I am more than happy to work with you to explore. With that, I commend the bill for that consideration.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move that the committee report progress.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

*Resolutions***ONLINE GAMBLING**

The Legislative Council concurs with the resolution of the House of Assembly contained in message No. 45 for the appointment of a joint committee to investigate and report on online gambling and will be represented on the committee by three members, of whom two shall form the quorum necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee. Members of the joint committee to represent the Legislative Council will be the Hon. C. Bonaros, the Hon. T.A. Franks and the Hon. T.J. Stephens.

The Legislative Council informs the House of Assembly that it has passed the following resolution:

That it be an instruction to the joint committee that the joint committee be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence or documents presented to the joint committee prior to such evidence or documents being reported to the parliament.

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.

*Bills***EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 22:16 the house adjourned until Wednesday 17 February 2021 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME**

348 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 November 2020). From the 50,000 Great State vouchers available, how many \$100 vouchers and how many \$50 vouchers were allocated?

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

A total of 59,939 vouchers were allocated. This consisted of 39,899 vouchers allocated to the \$100 voucher (CBD and North Adelaide) and 20,070 vouchers allocated to the \$50 voucher (regions and suburbs).

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

349 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 November 2020). At what stage of the process do accommodation providers receive money from the state government for the Great State Voucher scheme?

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

Accommodation providers receive payment once a consumer redeems their voucher and completes their stay. Accommodation providers issue bulk invoices (covering all consumers who stayed at their accommodation during specific periods) to the South Australian Tourism Commission and payments are processed through Shared Services SA.

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

350 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 November 2020). How does the South Australian Tourism Commission verify that Great State vouchers are being used by the individual who registered for the scheme?

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

When consumers registered, they were required to provide personal details, including their name which appeared on their Great State voucher. Accommodation providers were asked to ensure that redeemed bookings matched the registered unique voucher number and consumer name and upon check-in, requested consumers provide identification. The Great State vouchers were non-transferrable, and this appeared on each voucher.

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

351 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 November 2020). Why was the Great State Voucher scheme only available online?

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

To protect consumers' private information in adherence with the South Australian Tourism Commission's Privacy Policy, the online nature of the process allows for user authentication for audit purposes and to prevent fraud.

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

352 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 November 2020). How were accommodation providers advised of the Great State Voucher scheme?

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

Eligible accommodation providers received an email from the South Australian Tourism Commission inviting them to register for the Great State Voucher scheme.

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

353 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 November 2020). When were accommodation providers advised of the Great State Voucher scheme?

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

Eligible accommodation providers were advised of the Great State Voucher scheme on 14 September 2020.

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Waite)** (10 November 2020).

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The stadium at Springbank Secondary College was constructed in 2001 as a partnership between the then peak body for basketball in South Australia, Basketball Association of South Australia, and the Department for Education.

A long-term joint use agreement was established at that time to allow the community and basketball clubs to use the facility outside of school hours. This agreement has since transferred to Basketball SA, being the current peak basketball organisation in the state, and provides Basketball SA with the ability to allow the use of the stadium by the Sturt Sabres Basketball Club. Since the opening of the facility, the club has used the stadium as their home base.

Basketball SA's long-term agreement for the stadium is due to expire in 2021. Following consideration of a request from Basketball SA to exercise its option to extend the term of the agreement for a further 20 years, this has been granted.

The extension of the agreement will allow Basketball SA to continue discussions with the Sturt Sabres Basketball Club for continued use of the facility as its home base

Estimates Replies

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (26 November 2020). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

The table below provides details on contractor expenditure above \$10,000 incurred between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 by the Department for Innovation and Skills.

Vendor	Description	Value \$	Method of Appointment
4th Harmonic Pty Ltd	Support for the establishment of the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre located at Lot Fourteen.	198,000	Direct Negotiation
Acer	Masterclasses in eLearning for training providers.	40,662	Selective ITS
Acer	Masterclasses in Australian Core Skills Framework (ACSF) for training providers.	46,528	Selective ITS
Action Learning Institute	Masterclasses in Action/ Project based learning methodologies for training providers.	29,882	Public Invitation to Supply (ITS)
ArcBlue Consulting (Aus) Pty Ltd	Provision of probity advisory services for the Skills Digital Transformation Project.	15,180	Request for Quote
Axant	Undertake a benchmarking project for South Australian Start-ups.	13,000	Request for Quote
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Manage and coordinate the transition of ICT services to the Department for Trade and Investment.	56,008	Request for Quote
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Review of risks and impacts of common information technology systems and services being shared between the Department for Trade and Investment, Department for Energy and Mining and Department for Innovation and Skills.	64,830	Public Invitation to Supply (ITS)
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Development of key principles and strategy to guide the Department's Information Technology future state following the transition of ICT services to the Department for Trade and Investment.	110,138	Public Invitation to Supply (ITS)
Bonita Kennedy	Provision of services to assist with the preparation of the records management disposal schedule.	30,000	Request for Quote
Chamonix IT Management	Senior Software Developer to perform activities related to system enhancements and small project initiatives across several core business systems including; CMS+, GMS CRM Financial Integration, ATLAS and eCRM.	91,406	Request for Quote
Chloe Reschke-Maguire CRM Consulting	Event management services for the South Australian Training Awards.	10,181	Request for Quote
Cyberops Pty Ltd	Define and document the requirements and service architecture for the Cyber Range located within the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre.	100,863	Direct Negotiation
Deloitte Risk Advisory Pty Ltd	Audit review of training provider activity.	36,221	Request for Quote
Empired Ltd	Provision of services to assist with the planning stage for the implementation of the Immigration SA systems upgrade.	51,919	Request for Quote
Empired Ltd	Advice and support for a customer relationship management system for the Office of the South Australian Chief Entrepreneur.	33,640	Selective ITS

Vendor	Description	Value \$	Method of Appointment
Empired Ltd	Senior Software Developer to perform activities related to system enhancements and small project initiatives across several core business systems including: CMS+, GMS CRM Financial Integration, ATLAS, and eCRM.	16,940	Request for Quote
Equity & Advisory Pty Ltd	Conduct a pre-feasibility review of entities associated with the South Australian Film Industry.	12,500	Direct Negotiation
Expose Data Pty Ltd	Development services for the upgrade of Microsoft Power BI for People and Performance reporting.	18,000	Direct Negotiation
Forest Grove Technology Pty Ltd	Provision of services to build the Financial Planning Management System.	17,516	Request for Quote
Hammond Street Developments	Apprenticeship and Traineeship online Application System (ATLAS) integration.	206,741	Direct Negotiation
Hammond Street Developments	Apprenticeship and Traineeship online Application System (ATLAS) software support, maintenance and enhancements and development services.	38,573	Direct Negotiation
Hannan Duck & Partners Pty Ltd	Provision of advisory services to identify a possible solution for a consolidated technology stack.	54,600	Request for Quote
Hannan Duck & Partners Pty Ltd	Support for the establishment of the Business Hub on Kangaroo Island.	30,000	Direct Negotiation
Hannan Duck & Partners Pty Ltd	Provision of strategic advisory services in relation to the establishment of a case management system for small business grants.	13,560	Direct Negotiation
Hassell Ltd	Scoping Study for the International Centre at Lot Fourteen.	246,217	Public Invitation to Supply (ITS)
Haymakr	Undertake a program of market research to understand current attitudes, perceptions and awareness of entrepreneurship, innovation and future industries amongst South Australians and selected interstate audiences.	29,000	Request for Quote
Interface Consultants SA	To establish an integrated process for identifying and developing workforce capabilities to address challenges faced by the department in the current operating environment.	54,375	Public Invitation to Supply (ITS)
Interface Consultants SA	To establish an integrated process for identifying and developing workforce capabilities to address challenges faced by the department in the current operating environment.	54,375	Direct Negotiation
McGrathNicol Advisory Partnership	Advice and support to identify and manage security risks in the context of South Australia's key innovation and knowledge assets.	53,750	Direct Negotiation
Mcmillen International Pty Ltd	Provision of services, as Chief Scientist, on matters of science, technology and innovation.	100,000	Direct Negotiation
Mindset Procurement	Provision of procurement advisory and support services for the Skills Digital Transformation project.	71,155	Request for Quote
MJH Options Pty Ltd	Assistance with the preparation of a business case for the establishment of a Cyber Collaboration Centre in South Australia.	20,700	Direct Negotiation
Mrwed Training & Assessment	Professional standing of development for VET teachers, trainers, leaders and support staff employed in South Australian Registered Training Organisations (RTOs).	50,282	Request for Quote
National Disability Services	Co-design and implement a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) pilot program, for trainers and assessors of qualifications for the Disability sector.	91,148	Direct Negotiation
Pricewaterhouse coopers	Assurance Mapping Exercise to identify assurance activities across the department to	18,698	Request for Quote

Vendor	Description	Value \$	Method of Appointment
	identify gaps, risk and inadequate assurance coverage.		
Remcast Pty Ltd (trading as Adept Technology)	Risk Analysis services for the Skills Digital Transformation project.	14,229	Request for Quote
Rural Business Support Service	Provision of services to support small businesses impacted by 2019-20 bushfires.	127,778	Direct Negotiation
Symplicit Pty Ltd	Provision of services to assist with the development of the department's information management strategy.	56,581	Request for Quote
Talent International (SA) Pty Ltd	Provision of Change Management services required to implement the Information and Technology Management program.	32,752	Request for Quote
Taptu Pty Ltd	Provision of Enterprise Architecture services to support key DIS systems.	84,630	Selective ITS
Taptu Pty Ltd	Provision of Technical Architecture advice to support development of key DIS systems.	44,160	Selective ITS
The Digital Embassy	Website development and hosting for Skills SA websites.	150,454	Direct Negotiation
The Local Business Network	Investigation and implementation planning for a business migration strategy.	23,970	Request for Quote
Three As One Consulting P/L	Provision of services relating to the establishment of the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre.	97,761	Direct Negotiation
Various	Temporary labour hire.	395,197	NA

There was no contractor expenditure incurred between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 by the Department for Innovation and Skills—Administered Items.

The table below provides details on consultancy expenditure above \$10,000 incurred between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 by the Department for Innovation and Skills.

Vendor	Description	Value \$	Method of Appointment
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Provision of planning, risk and change management expertise for the Skills Digital Transformation project.	84,569	Request for Quote
Bentleys (Sa) Pty Ltd	Provision of planning, risk and change management expertise for the Skills Digital Transformation project.	62,058	Request for Quote
Deloitte Access Economics	Delivery of a strategic Creative Sector Economic Assessment.	36,635	Selective ITS
Escient Pty Ltd	Provision of advice to create a fit-for-purpose internal corporate communication and collaboration system.	20,000	Request for Quote
Fragile to Agile (Asia Pac) Pty Ltd	Design of the information, communication and technology infrastructure to support the operations of the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre.	69,200	Request for Quote
Hannan Duck & Partners Pty Ltd	A security advisor to assist in the management of information security compliance, operational controls and incident response, and to provide guidance on information security practices that require focus in the short term.	26,227	Direct Negotiation
Informotion Pty Ltd	Provision of proof-of -concept services to test the integration of the departments records management system.	21,600	Request for Quote
Pitcher Partners SA Pty Ltd	Financial Health Survey for South Australian Start-ups in response to COVID-19.	30,000	Direct Negotiation
PriceWaterhouse Coopers Indigenous Consulting Pty Ltd	Consultancy managed by the Office of the Industry Advocate to provide advice and analysis on Tauondi Aboriginal Community College future operations.	101,796	Direct Negotiation

There was no consultancy expenditure incurred between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 by the Department for Innovation and Skills—Administered Items.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (26 November 2020). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

At 30 June 2020, 8.4 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$908,066.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense \$
2020-21	8.8	1,012,305
2021-22	6.3	946,174
2022-23	6.3	861,685
2023-24	6.3	874,550

As an open and transparent Government, Marketing Communications Activity Reports and Annual Media Expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

PUBLIC SERVICES EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (26 November 2020). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

Attraction allowances and retention allowances paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 were as follows:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Manager, Client Engagement	ASO8	Retention	\$22,000 p.a.
Deputy Director, Strategic Policy	MAS3	Retention	\$18,986 p.a.
Principal Policy Officer	ASO8	Retention	\$23,322 p.a.
Associate Director, Information and Communication Technology	MAS3	Retention	\$18,070 p.a.
Business Development Manager	ASO8	Retention	\$16,604 p.a.
Chief Operating Officer	SAES1	Attraction	\$5,232 p.a.
Manager, Risk and Performance	ASO8	Retention	\$11,841 p.a.
Senior Case Manager	ASO7	Attraction	\$5,000 p.a.

Non-salary benefits for public servants and contractors include those provided for vehicles, car parks and educational expenses for HECS supported courses. The total taxable value of the non-salary benefits provided is \$230,312 (total grossed up taxable value of \$477,853) for the period 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020 which is in line with the fringe benefits tax (FBT) reporting year.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (26 November 2020). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Ministerial staff employed as at 17 July was published in the *Government Gazette* on 23 July 2020.
- The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2020:

Title	ASO Classification	Non-salary benefits
Office Manager	ASO7	
Principal Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO7	
Principal Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO7	
Executive Officer to the Minister	ASO6	Car Park
Senior Business Support Officer	ASO5	
Cabinet and Parliamentary Liaison Officer	ASO5	
Business Support Officer	ASO3	
Business Support Officer	ASO3	

[Note—non-salary benefit could be a description or value (i.e. car park)]

- Nil staff were seconded from the department to my office as at 30 June 2020.

TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (26 November 2020). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

Two (2) executive level employees have been terminated from the Department for Innovation and Skills since 1 July 2019.

I have been advised that the Department of Premier and Cabinet Policy PC027: Disclosure of Government Contracts clause 21 prohibits the disclosure of the total remuneration package value (TRPV) of executive employees (excluding the Chief Executives). On this basis, the details of the separation payments of these former executive employees will not be released as it is considered an unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (26 November 2020). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

Since 1 July 2019, the following executive appointments were made within the Department for Innovation and Skills to existing executive positions, unless indicated as new below. It should also be noted that two executive positions have been abolished during this period.

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Chief Executive, Department for Innovation and Skills	CE
Director, Commercial and Advice	SAES1
Program Director, Digital Transformation (New)	SAES1
Commercial Director	SAES1
Project Director, Enterprise Change (New)	SAES1
Executive Director, Science and Innovation	SAES2
Director, Skills Policy Reform	SAES1
Director, Skills and Workforce Projects	SAES1
Director, Partnerships and Business Development (New)	SAES1
Chief Operating Officer, Office of the South Australian Chief Entrepreneur	SAES1
Director, Creative Industries	SAES1
Director, Financial and Business Services	SAES1

The total remuneration package value (TRPV) for these executive appointments was \$2.6 million, including the chief executive's TRPV of \$360,000.

I have been advised that the Department of Premier and Cabinet Policy PC027: Disclosure of Government Contracts clause 21 prohibits the disclosure of the TRPV of executive employees (excluding the chief executives). For this reason, the details of TRPV for other positions will not be disclosed as it is considered an unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (26 November 2020). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): In response to this question and question 390, I have been advised the following:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Innovation and Skills:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Aboriginal Programs	Aboriginal Programs support Aboriginal South Australians into employment, through skills training, employer incentives and mentoring (increased funding now distributed via Skilling SA funding stream)	45	0	0	0	0
Adelaide Film Festival	Operational Funding for Adelaide Film Festival.	509	1,084	1,110	1,126	1,133
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and	2,364	742	1,984	1,984	1,984

	employability skills) in accessible community settings.(Additional foundation skills funding delivered under Skilling SA and UAN programs)					
Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre (A3C)	To establish the A3C to support cyber start-ups, scale-ups and existing enterprises to launch new products and services to global markets.	5,360	1,940	1,780	430	0
Australian Institute of Machine Learning	Build on research strengths in machine learning. It is the first machine learning institute in Australia.	2,625	0	1,300	0	0
Auto Jobs Connect	To directly connect automotive supply chain workers who have been made redundant or facing redundancy, to employers or jobs.	4	0	0	0	0
Back to Business Grants for Wine Producers	To support wine grape producers who lost crops as a result of smoke taint during the 2019-20 bushfires.	0	300	0	0	0
Boosting Business Investment Migration	To assist with achieving 1,000 business migrant nominations.	0	250	375	425	428
Building Family Opportunities	To assist long-term unemployed families to access employment opportunities by providing intensive case management (funding increased via Federal programs and mentoring support, UAN programs under Skilling SA)	8	0	0	0	0
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	2,874	0	0	0	0
Bushfire Response—Small Business Loss of Income Grant	Provide up to \$10,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the significant 2019-20 bushfires.	3,710	17,997	0	0	0
Commercialisation & Entrepreneurship	Provide once-off grants to support projects associated with innovation, commercialisation and entrepreneurship.	53	39	94	151	54
Group Training Organisation Support Program	Funding provided to Group Training Organisations (GTOs) in lieu of Payroll Tax Exemption.	1,977	2,136	2,800	2,245	2,259
Cyber Security Node	To support the development of the SA Node of Australian Cyber Security Growth Network.	50	30	30	30	30
Defence Industry Workforce & Skills Action Plan	To partially fund the salary and other expenses associated with the Director Defence Industry Workforce and Skills (resource fully funded and positioned in Defence SA)	43	0	0	0	0
Digital Game Development Program	Fund was established to support South Australia's entrepreneurs and businesses to create high quality digital games.	75	0	0	0	0

Disability Sector	Grant for activities to support individuals and businesses to build their capability and capacity to meet the demand for services under the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) (programs now funded under Skilling SA, including Building Capability Program)	10	32	0	0	0
DOME	Paid to DOME (Don't Overlook Mature Experience) to deliver training and employment activities to support mature aged jobseekers. (increased funding under Skilling SA to support mature aged job seekers/existing workers)	100	0	0	0	0
Equal Remuneration Order	Cabinet approved supplementation paid to not for profit organisations to cover CPI increases for community sector workers.	412	400	0	0	0
EXCITE Strategy	To establish Innovation and Translation Intermediaries within South Australia's Innovation Districts and Neighbourhoods.	0	881	1,880	1,878	1,876
Gig City	Connect businesses within key innovation precincts with extremely fast broadband speeds of one gigabit per second and up to ten gigabits per second available on request.	523	1,804	349	349	356
Jamfactory	Operational Funding for Jamfactory.	1,070	250	1,100	1,111	1,118
Jobs First	Jobs First Employment Projects are tailored activities developed in partnership with employers, industries and regional stakeholders to assist job seekers to obtain and sustain a job.	48	0	0	0	0
JobTrainer National Partnership Agreement	To ensure job seekers can reskill and upskill for in-demand jobs, school leavers are provided a pathway into their careers, and businesses are able to get the skilled workers they need.	0	35,232	49,708	0	0
KOJO Innovation Grant	To Support the establishment of an integrated studio business with Stamoede Ventures (SV) using and exploiting intellectual property from SV (SV IP).	300	0	0	0	0
Local Finance Management Scholarships	Scholarship program to provide post-graduate research opportunities in finance and related sectors by investing in research projects exploring new innovations, products or problems in the finance and fintech sectors.	90	660	250	0	0
Longitudinal Study	Funding for undertaking a Longitudinal Study over 5 years to assess the impact on former automotive workers as	200	0	0	0	0

	a result of the closure of GMH and Toyota.					
Lot Fourteen/FIXE	Rental subsidies for the Innovation, Incubation, Start-Up and Growth Hub to be domiciled at Lot Fourteen site.	1,578	1,630	1,669	0	0
Maritime Skills Centre	Support skills and training requirements of the Air Warfare Destroyer Project workforce.	198	0	0	0	0
Medical Devices Partnering Program	To assist Flinders University with the continued operation of its Medical Device Partnering Program to undertake research and experimental development and other activities that support the development of innovative medical and assistive technologies with an identified clinical need, sound technical solution and viable market opportunity.	550	0	0	0	0
Migration and Population Growth	To accelerate the growth of regional businesses that are struggling to fill job vacancies by supporting skilled migrants to settle and secure employment opportunities on offer in regional South Australia and assist local jobseekers to be work ready.	110	0	0	0	150
Minor office rental payments to TAFE SA	Rental payments made to TAFE SA for the use of several regional offices.	4	0	0	0	0
Music Development Office	Facilitates the development of the South Australia's music industry by supporting both creative and business development.	2,507	1,603	1,609	1,616	1,626
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	To support South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	600	3,756	3,784	3,675	462
National Infection Control Training Fund	To support the accelerated uptake of the new nationally accredited Infection Prevention and Control Training skills set (or equivalent nationally accredited training), for customer-facing employees in any industry.	0	2,760	0	0	0
Northern Economic Plan: Small Business Development Fund	To support business expansion in the City of Playford, Port Adelaide-Enfield and Salisbury with a focus on the creation of jobs.	53	0	0	0	0
Office of the Chief Entrepreneur minor grants and sponsorship	Minor grants and sponsorships provided by the Office of the Chief Entrepreneur	103	0	0	0	0
Other Grant Programs	Contribution to ongoing costs and mandate the use of the available systems to resource the customer experience work including implementation of the Ombudsman's Complaints	9	57	46	38	39

	Handling Framework by the end of 2017.					
Research Commercialisation and Start-up Fund	To support South Australian businesses to collaborate with researchers and universities to solve industrial problems, commercialise new products and services and attract research infrastructure investment into the state, as well as to encourage the establishment and growth of start-ups.	5,400	9,934	7,913	9,494	9,554
Retrenched Workers	Assists non-automotive workers exiting a company as a result of retrenchment or company closure by providing funding for career services and training.	6	0	0	0	0
Rip It Up Initiative	DIS contribution to Whole of Government Electronic forms platform.	32	33	33	34	35
SA Film Corporation	Operational Funding for SA Film Corporation.	4,754	4,838	4,931	4,988	5,098
Science and Research Fund	Dedicated Research and Development funding to support the State's research community to compete successfully on a national and global scale.	2,640	1,650	100	0	0
Skilling South Australia	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services.	27,026	50,989	44,818	14,160	11,588
Small Business Initiatives	Support for small business to grow capabilities and expand operations.	75	75	140	144	145
Small to Medium Enterprise (SME) Business Advisory Services Scheme	To assist small to medium enterprises in South Australia to access business advice to support the development of sustainable business strategies.	0	5,000	0	0	0
Sponsorship— Business SA	Sponsorship provided to Business SA for the Protecting your Business from COVID Criminals (webinar)	5	0	0	0	0
TAFE SA Campus facility costs	To reimburse TAFE SA for facility costs associated with the Tea Tree Gully Campus.	290	0	0	0	0
TAFE SA Capital	Support provided to the TAFE SA Capital program.	14,842	16,176	16,580	16,996	17,420
Tauondi	Once-off payment to Tauondi, a Registered Training Organisation funded to assist Aboriginal people with skill development, job preparation and brokerage into jobs.	1,000	0	0	0	0
TechInSA	Operational/wind up funding for TechInSA	1,499	182	0	0	0
Trainee Apprenticeship Support &	Program aimed to support trainees, apprentice and/or employers to maintain or increase participation and	3,326	3,950	3,890	2,929	2,948

	provide support for the training sector.					
Training Fund & other VET Support	Subsidies for TAFE SA and non-government training providers for the provision of VET and associated services.	275,622	257,939	211,961	211,050	209,479
US Ignite	Foster development of next generation applications that provide transformative public benefit using new technologies like software-defined networks.	25	0	0	0	0
Workforce Development	To provide support for industry-led projects that address current and future workforce and skills development needs.(now funded under Skilling SA)	33	0	0	0	0
Workforce Mobility and Micro Credential	To support the development and pilot of micro-credential training in priority sectors and also includes funding for the development of suitable online platforms.	3	3,150	0	0	0

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Innovation and Skills—Administered Items:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Student Transport Concessions	To support Student Transport Concessions. Payable to the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT).	13,998	16,145	16,549	16,963	17,387

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2018-19 into 2019-20 and 2020-21 for the Department for Innovation and Skills:

Grant / Program Name	2018-19 \$000	2019-20 \$000	2020-21 \$000
Skilling Australians Fund	-14,785	14,785	0
Small Business Job Creation Fund	-150	150	0
Local Finance Management Scholarship	-250	250	0
Research and Commercialisation Start-up Fund	-1,502	1,502	0
Digital Gaming Fund	-75	75	0
Science and Research Fund	-560	560	0
Gig City	-1,767	735	1,032

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2019-20 into 2020-21 and forward years for the Department for Innovation and Skills:

Grant/Program Name	2019-20 \$000	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000	2022-23 \$000	2023-24 \$000
Skilling Australians Fund	-8,977	8,977	0	0	0
Loss of Income Grant	-10,758	10,758	0	0	0
Local Finance Management Scholarship	-410	410	0	0	0
Research and Commercialisation Start-up Fund	-1,909	1,909	0	0	0
National Infection Control Training Fund	-260	260	0	0	0

Grant/Program Name	2019-20 \$000	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000	2022-23 \$000	2023-24 \$000
Workforce Mobility	-315	315	0	0	0
Entrepreneur Settlement Services	-150	0	0	0	150
Gig City	-87	77	10	0	0

The Department for Innovation and Skills—Administered Items did not have any carryovers associated with grants in 2018-19 and 2019-20.

The following table details the new commitment of grants in 2019-20 for the Department for Innovation and Skills:

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	The Australian Wine Research Institute Limited	Support the expansion of services within the Bioplatforms Australia Metabolomics facility.	3,300,000
Research Commercialisation and Start-up Fund	CareApp Group Pty Ltd	Development and delivery of the CareApp software application with improved functionality and increased capability.	250,000
Research Commercialisation and Start-up Fund	University of South Australia	Establishing a facility in South Australia to test face masks.	91,000
Research Commercialisation and Start-up Fund	Flinders University	Establishing a facility in South Australia to test face masks.	359,000
Music Development Office	Eureka Enterprises Pty Ltd	Support for the continued operations of the Governor Hindmarsh.	300,000
Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre	Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre Limited	Costs associated with the establishment of a cyber collaboration centre at Lot Fourteen.	8,960,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	JM Stanton	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	15,660
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Australian Redgum Gallery	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Jonathon William Gloyne T/A Roo Lagoon Homestead	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Tilbrook Enterprises Pty Ltd T/A Bush Organics Kangaroo Island	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Lobethal Freightliners	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	40,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	KI Bush Getaway Adventures	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	40,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Rhys Buick	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	10,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	KI Fish and Chips	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	1,255
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Peter Rogers Transport Pty Ltd	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Bell Springs Animal Lodging	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	28,000
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Heritage Horse Power	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	25,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Tru Blu Concrete	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	25,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	RD & MA Baxter Pty Ltd T/A New Era Vineyards	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	25,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Dorrestijn, Yaeda	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Robert Arthur Peterson	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	25,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Matthew Andrew Peterson	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	19,534
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	The trustee for Jim West Family Trust t/a Odyssey FNQ Pty Ltd	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Kangaroo Island Queen Bees	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	25,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Tilbrook Estate	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	TRIC YA WAT EVA Island Style	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	David Ness Contracting	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Bushfire Response— Small Business and Not for Profit grants	The Chase Café	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires.	50,000
Music Development Office	South Australian Contemporary Music Company Limited	Umbrella Festival Funding	130,000
Music Development Office	Australian Independent Record Labels Association Limited	AIR Independent Music Awards and Indie-Con Australia conference	475,000
Skilling South Australia	PEER	Building Capability Project	45,425
Skilling South Australia	Regional Skills Training	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Regional Skills Training	Building Capability Project	48,000
Skilling South Australia	Da'Vange Group	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Regional Skills Training	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Cother Consulting	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Cother Consulting	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	PEER	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	PEER	Building Capability Project	49,250
Skilling South Australia	PEER	Building Capability Project	47,973
Skilling South Australia	PEER	Building Capability Project	48,450
Skilling South Australia	Carey Training	Building Capability Project	49,615
Skilling South Australia	Cother Consulting	Building Capability Project	50,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Skilling South Australia	Hessel Group	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Hessel Group	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Career Employment Group	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Civil Contractors Federation	Building Capability Project	30,000
Skilling South Australia	Flexible Construction Training & Assessment	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	National Retail Association	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	ButZigus Pty Ltd	Building Capability Project	45,128
Skilling South Australia	Licensed Club Industry Training	Building Capability Project	46,526
Skilling South Australia	Academy IT Pty Ltd	Building Capability Project	49,600
Skilling South Australia	PEER	Building Capability Project	49,750
Skilling South Australia	PEER	Building Capability Project	49,600
Skilling South Australia	Academy IT Pty Ltd	Building Capability Project	49,250
Skilling South Australia	Community Centres SA	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Community Centres SA	Building Capability Project	35,998
Skilling South Australia	Tauondi Aboriginal College	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Tauondi Aboriginal College	Building Capability Project	50,000
Skilling South Australia	SG Learning and Development Pty Ltd	Building Capability Project	14,480
Skilling South Australia	Da'Vange Group	Building Capability Project	50,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Aberfoyle Community Centre Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	42,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Alexandrina Connect Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Anglican Community Care Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	61,600
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Anglican Community Care Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	23,100
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Bagster Road Community Centre	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited	70,630

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
		foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Baptist Care (Sa) Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Baptist Care (Sa) Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	23,100
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Beach Road Artworks Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	56,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Catherine House Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	36,500
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Catholic Church Endowment Society Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	56,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Centre for Equality Limited	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	27,279
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Christie Downs Community House Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	19,600
Adult Community Education (ACE)	City of Salisbury	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	56,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Community House Port Lincoln Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible	21,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
		community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Corporation of The City of Marion	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	112,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Eastwood Community Centre Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	14,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Elizabeth Community Connections	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	34,759
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Encounter Centre Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Eyre Futures Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	56,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Hackham West Community Centre Inc.	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	63,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Junction Australia Ltd	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	15,120
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Marionlife Community Services Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Mid Murray Support Service Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	20,093
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Midway Road Community House Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited	21,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
		foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Milang And District Community Association Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Morella Community Centre Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	112,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Mount Barker Family House Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Murray Bridge Community Centre Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	41,153
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Muslim Womens Association Of South Australia Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Northern Area Community And Youth Services Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	20,925
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Overseas Chinese Association Of Sa Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Paralowie R-12 Community Centre Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Parks Children's Centre Community Development Group	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible	12,530

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
		community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Plaza Youth Centre Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Pooraka Farm Community Centre Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	112,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Reynella Neighbourhood Centre Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	15,400
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Riverland Division of General Practice Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	31,500
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Southern Yorke Peninsula Community Telecentre Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	12,628
Adult Community Education (ACE)	The Hut Community Centre	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	70,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	The Junction Community Centre Inc	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	UnitingSA Ltd	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	23,100
Adult Community Education (ACE)	UnitingSA Ltd	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	34,493
Adult Community Education (ACE)	UnitingSA Ltd	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited	21,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
		foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Vietnamese Community In Australia/ South Australia Chapter Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	29,750
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Vietnamese Community In Australia/ South Australia Chapter Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Woodcroft Morphett Vale Neighbourhood Centre Incorporated	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	20,951
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Zahra Foundation Australia	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	21,000
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Zahra Foundation Australia	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	10,500
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Zahra Foundation Australia	Grant agreement to pay ACE providers to deliver accredited foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings, in conjunction with TAFESA and Private RTOs.	10,500
Skilling South Australia	Colmer Brunton	Periodic market research to evaluate the impact of advertising promoting skilled careers and gauging employer attitudes and awareness of apprenticeships.	208,748
Skilling South Australia	DXC—IT Career Pathway	For 20 participants to receive accredited training for this project to gain employment and enter into an approved training contract in IT sector	214,400
Skilling South Australia	PricewaterhouseCoopers Consulting (Australia) Pty Ltd	Pathways for South Australia Program	1,098,200
Skilling South Australia	The Fourth Force Pty Ltd	Braveheart Warehousing	810,755
Skilling South Australia	Clip Joint Academy of Hairdressing Pty Ltd	Salon Connected Pre-Apprenticeship	67,200
Skilling South Australia	Australian Nursing & Midwifery Federation (SA Branch)	Sterilisation Services Traineeships	34,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Skilling South Australia	Plumbing, Electrical, Electronic, Refrigeration, Vocational Education & Training	Business Administration Pre-Traineeship Women in Trades Pre-apprenticeship & Industry Education Mature-age Pre-apprenticeship Program	281,000
Skilling South Australia	Plumbing, Electrical, Electronic, Refrigeration, Vocational Education & Training	Tradesperson to Trainer Program	21,300
Skilling South Australia	Barunga Village Inc	Barunga Village Traineeship Program—Intake 2019	50,000
Skilling South Australia	Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation (SA Branch)	ECH Existing Workers Cert III IS Traineeships project	59,400
Skilling South Australia	Monarch Pharmacies Pty Ltd	Monarch Pharmacies Pty Ltd and Skilling Australia funding EOI	60,060
Skilling South Australia	Australian Fisheries Academy Ltd	Maritime Operations Integrated Learning Traineeships	161,500
Skilling South Australia	CHM Alliance Pty Ltd	Sunpork Induction Training Program	7,750
Skilling South Australia	The Quality Training and Hospitality College Pty Ltd	Apprentice Today, Chef for Life V2.0	185,050
Skilling South Australia	Iluka Resources Ltd	Iluka JA Technical Frameworks	102,600
Skilling South Australia	Baptist Care SA Incorporated	Building Business and People	287,500
Skilling South Australia	Career Partners Plus Inc	Getting on With Business—Care Sector	98,460
Skilling South Australia	Hessel Pty Ltd	Upskilling the Childcare Sector with Higher Level Traineeships	74,000
Skilling South Australia	UnitingSA Traineeship Opportunities	UnitingSA Traineeship Opportunities	118,850
Skilling South Australia	The Trustee for Mickamob Trust	Community Services Pre-traineeship Program	71,000
Skilling South Australia	Craeer Employment Group Inc	Entry to Butchery Apprenticeships	135,600
Skilling South Australia	Upskilled Pty Ltd	Allwater SA Leadership & Management	85,610
Skilling South Australia	Academy IT Pty Ltd	Pre-traineeship for the IT Sector	39,000
Skilling South Australia	MEGT Australia Ltd	Cybersecurity Traineeship Program	170,100
Skilling South Australia	Carey Training Pty Ltd	TAPS Plumbing Pathways Program—Carey	29,800
Skilling South Australia	Community Corporate Pty Ltd	Diversity Works!	47,500
Skilling South Australia	James Watt Electrical Pty Ltd	Platinum Solar and Storage	19,800
Skilling South Australia	RM Williams Pty Ltd	Enterprise Leadership Development Program	59,862
Skilling South Australia	Hardware Australia Ltd	Hardware and Timber Industry Traineeship Project	70,000
Skilling South Australia	South Australia Tourism Industry Council Incorporated	Tourism Industry Traineeship Program	132,420
Skilling South Australia	Kangaroo Island SeaLink Pty Ltd	Upskilling and Retaining SA People within SA Tourism and Hospitality	101,200
Skilling South Australia	Auctus Training Pty Ltd	Prepare to Care	140,800
Skilling South Australia	McMahon Services Pty Ltd	Upskilling Demolition Workers	7,200
Skilling South Australia	Churches of Christ Life Care Inc	Building Workforce Capability at Life Care	205,200

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Skilling South Australia	Independent Tertiary Education Council Australia	Statewide Building Trainer Capacity Project	234,150
Skilling South Australia	Independent Brewers Association	Pilot Craft Brewing Traineeship Program	46,200
Skilling South Australia	Plumbing Electrical Electronic & Refrigeration Vocational Education Employment & Training Inc	Pre-apprenticeship employment ready pathway	587,700
Skilling South Australia	MyBudget Pty Ltd	MyBudget upskilling and education program 2 (Repeated)	50,750
Skilling South Australia	Automotive Sales Pty Ltd	NET Training Program	144,350
Skilling South Australia	Statewide Group Training SA Inc	Civil Construction Apprenticeships	26,130
Skilling South Australia	Civil Contractors Federation SA	Women in Civil	63,216
Skilling South Australia	Civil Contractors Federation SA	Civil ConneXions Summer Training Program	44,960
Skilling South Australia	Regional Development Australia Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula Inc	Skilled Farmers on Eyre Peninsula	111,600
Skilling South Australia	Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia Ltd	Skilled workers, healthy communities	144,000
Skilling South Australia	My Care Solution Pty Ltd	New Careers in Aged Care	36,750
Skilling South Australia	Baking Associations of Australia Limited	Rise Above with Skilling SA	51,055
Skilling South Australia	Gratis Australia Pty Ltd	Bridging the Gap in Disability Services	73,372
Skilling South Australia	Traineeship and Apprenticeship Placement Services Inc	Steel Frame Careers—Repeat Project	116,000
Skilling South Australia	Indi Services Construction & Engineering Pty Ltd	Power Industries & Building Services Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	52,975
Skilling South Australia	Catholic Education Office	Transitioning VET Students to Apprenticeships	122,000
Skilling South Australia	On The Run Pty Ltd	Building Capability—2020 Vision	80,000
Skilling South Australia	Carey Training Pty Ltd	Roof Plumbing Pathways Program	10,665
Skilling South Australia	Australian Organics Recycling Association Limited	Skilling for SA Composting Operators	64,714
Skilling South Australia	Workskil Australia Incorporated	New Employment Services Trial Staff Development	67,350
Skilling South Australia	Mk2 Recruitment Pty Ltd	Mk2 Recruitment R2P Alliance Training Project	53,815
Skilling South Australia	CKI Utilities Development Ltd	SA Power Networks Employee Development	36,750
Skilling South Australia	The Dynamic Engineering Solution Pty Ltd	Leadership Development @ Supashock	38,285
Skilling South Australia	Skilled Select Academy Aust Pty Ltd	Introduction to Barbering	32,100
Skilling South Australia	Adelaide Training and Employment Centre Inc	Steel Frame Installer—Industry Endorsed non-accredited Training	64,325
Skilling South Australia	GP Links Wide Bay Ltd	Developing the Future Leaders for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities within South Australia	143,700
Skilling South Australia	Carey Training Pty Ltd	Jordan Plumbing – Pre-Employment Course	23,245
Skilling South Australia	Carey Training Pty Ltd	Complete Personnel Pre-Apprenticeship Program	53,740

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Skilling South Australia	MEGT Australia Ltd	Empowering Career Options SA	102,245
Skilling South Australia	The Trustee for Mickamob Trust	Community Services Pre-traineeship Program—2 (2019-20)	79,950
Skilling South Australia	The Da'Vange Group Pty Ltd	Aboriginal Child Protection Workforce Project	45,130
Skilling South Australia	Australian Meat Industry Council	Pre-Apprenticeship Pathways Program	35,345
Skilling South Australia	Australian Nursing & Midwifery Federation (SA Branch)	ATSI Cadetship Project	61,460
Skilling South Australia	Lendlease Engineering Pty Ltd	Rail Industry Upskilling	42,000
Skilling South Australia	GP Links Wide Bay Ltd	Skilling Medical Assistants in General Practice	56,000
Skilling South Australia	Statewide Group Training SA Inc	Civil Construction Apprenticeships (Repeat)	26,130
Skilling South Australia	Australian Nursing & Midwifery Federation (SA Branch)	Sterilisation Services Traineeships—Repeat	40,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	6414Anderson, Cameron Norman	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	818 Investments Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	A Jamieson Nominees Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Aaron Martin Construction	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	7,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Adam Michael Baida	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Adrian Kirk Gibbs t/a A.Gibbs Constructions	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Advanced Commercial Plumbing	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	AFL Sports Ready Limited	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	23,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	AJ Fasteners Pty Ltd / AJ Hill Family Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Alice Car Centre Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	All Mac Building	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Andrew Crash Repairs	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Andrew Tony Pappas	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Antonio Romeo	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Architectural Interiors Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Ashley Shane Murrell t/a AYM Construction	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Beiler Constructions / Fox Trading Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	BHP Billiton Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	16,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Bianco Walling Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	BIEAWSKI, STANLEY	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	BMS Electrical Services Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Bordertown Bakery Pty Ltd t/a Mitchell's Bakery Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Brian John & Carolyn Marie Peterson	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	11,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Bright Earth Electrical Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	9,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Bungala Aboriginal Corporation	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Bury Plumbing Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	ByrneCut Australia Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	6,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Cabinet Creations Riverland Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Career Employment Group Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	19,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Christopher Robert Heinrich	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Community Accommodation and Respite Agency Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	1,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Connex Solutions	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	11,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Connex Solutions Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	11,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	CSIRO	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	D&R Electrical Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Daly Salon	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Daly Salon	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Darren John Sparrow	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Dasacal Pty Ltd ATF Beckley Family Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Datacom Connect Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Davenport Builders Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	24,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	DESA Australia Pty Limited	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Diona Group	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Dodson Auto Garage	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Feathers Hotels Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Finniss Equine Retreat Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Flight Centre—FCTG Accredited Training	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	FM Glenelg Nominees Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Furnell Plumbing Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	24,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Gadaleta Steel Fabrication Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Gawler Construction	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Girdham Constructions Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Glassco Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Global Gym Equipment	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Green Family Trust t/a Arid Land Communications	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Group Training Employment	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	36,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Imara Investments Pty Ltd ATF WK Martin Family Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Inner Western Workskil Inc t/a Status Employment Services	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Inner Western Workskills Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Intract Australia Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	16,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Intract Australia Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Jason Lawrie ATF Jason Lawrie Family Trust & Pettigrew Family Hotels	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	JLB Management Consultancy Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Jolimont Dell Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Kauppila Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Kowald Pty Ltd t/a Kowald Industries	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Leed Engineering and Construction Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Lennon Solid Plasterers Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Life Without Barriers	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Lincoln Glass & Aluminium Service Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Lobethal Abattoirs Pty Limited	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Local and Co Investments Pty Ltd / Presto Eatery	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Lorikeets Hair and Body	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Mane Electrical Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Marcamp Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	1,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Martin Colwill / Adelaide Upholstery and Sewing	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Material Logistics Handling Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Matthew Flinders Home Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Matthew James Flintham	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Maxflow Plumbing SA Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Maxima Group Training	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	13,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	May Painting and Maintenance	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	McCracken Ford Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	MEGT (Australia) Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	60,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	MG Plasterers Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Mission Australia	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Mr Fast Fix	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	MTA Group Training Scheme Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	30,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Murraylands Training & Employment	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Nail'd Carpentry	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Nathan Albert O'Shea	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	National Aboriginal Cultural Institute—Tandanya	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	National Aboriginal Cultural Institute Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Next Generation Roofing Services	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Ngarrindjeri Lands & Progress Association Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	26,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Ngarrindjeri Lands and Progress Association Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	32,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Ngopamuldi Aboriginal Corporation	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	74,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Ngopamuldi Aboriginal Corporation	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Nicholas and Patty Zahos	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Nikolaos and Pagona Zahos	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	NWR Constructions	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Outside Ideas CLC Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Outside Ideas Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Oz Minerals Prominent Hill Operations Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	P&T Moto Pty Ltd / Northern Motorcycles	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Paint and Panel Services Pty Ltd & R&E Gilio Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Pangula Mannamurna Aboriginal Corporation	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	PEER	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Penbro Pty ATF Penbro Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Peter Kittle Holden / SA Progress No 1 Limited	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	PFD Food Services Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Piacentini and Son t/a Jacinth Ambrosia Mine SA	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Port Adelaide Construction Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Port Adelaide Construction Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Port Augusta Collision Repair Centre Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Programmed Property Services	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Progress Rail Australia	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	20,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	R&R Plevin t/a R&R Plevin Builders	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	RAW Recruitment	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Reconciliation South Australia	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Rezz Hotel	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Robyn Wedd Nominees Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,500

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Rocksolid Building Co	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Royal Zoological Society of South Australia Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	6,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	S & B Thomas Engineering Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	SA Power Networks	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	SA Power Networks	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	30,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	SA Structural Metal Works Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	20,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	SA Water	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	6,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	SA Water Corporation	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	1,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Seven Point Pork Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Shane Christopher Williams	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Shannon Anthony Ursino	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	SJT Carpentry	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	11,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Smith General Building	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	1,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	South Australian Sports Federation Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Station 95 Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Sunraysia Murray Group Training—Berri	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,500

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Swan Hill Bus Lines Proprietary Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	T & J Constructions	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Tauondi Aboriginal Corporation	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	TDR Electrical SA Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	6,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	The Geoff Green Family Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	The Maxima Group Incorporated	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	6,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	The Playford Hotel Pty Ltd / Adelaide	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	The Trustee for Goliath Electrical Business Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	The Trustee for J&M Walsh Family Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	1,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	The Trustee for Richards Family Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	The Trustee for Rodweel family Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Todd McAlister	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	12,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Trainee & Apprentice Placement Service	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	16,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Trainee & Apprenticeship Placement Service	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	8,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Trent Christopher Malres t/a Trent's Plumbing and Gas	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	1,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Trimatic Management Services	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	9,000

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Trudy Seidel Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Tubbul Pty Ltd t/a Caffe Belgiorno	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	4,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Unity Roofing Pty / Unity Roofing Trust	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Utilities Management Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Warradale Hotel Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,000
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Whiteheads Timber Sales Pty Ltd	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	10,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Workskil Australia Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500
Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program	Workskil Australia Inc	Support Aboriginal South Australians to gain and retain Training Contracts through employer incentives and mentoring.	3,500

There were no new grants committed in 2019-20 for the Department for Innovation and Skills—Administered.