

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 5 September 2018

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A.L. McLachlan)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

**The PRESIDENT:** We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

### *Condolence*

**CORNWALL, DR J.R.**

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:16):** By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of the Hon. John Robert Cornwall, former minister of the Crown and member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service.

Firstly, let me say that the public record of Dr Cornwall was a considerable one in terms of experience. My first recollection of Dr Cornwall was a time in Mount Gambier where he was a well-known veterinary surgeon and stories about him were legendary. He was, of course, at that time, a supporter of the Australian Labor Party. I think he ran in the federal seat of Barker on one or two occasions as a candidate before successfully becoming a member of the pre-eminent chamber in Australian politics, the South Australian Legislative Council.

His term in the South Australian Legislative Council extended from July 1975 through to January 1989, a 14-year career in the Legislative Council. He was first elected in the middle, almost, of the Dunstan decade, as it was known. We were having elections every two years or so in that particular decade: an election in 1973, 1975, 1977 and 1979. It was one of the reasons why, ultimately, this parliament finally decided to move to fixed four-year terms due to the experience of South Australian politics in the 1970s.

In the middle of all that, in 1975, which was in part the election mounted on the back of federal government and state government decisions in relation to the takeover of country railways, the Hon. Dr John Cornwall was elected to the Legislative Council. He had a lengthy career as a minister. He first was a minister for lands, and repatriation, and environment in the period May to September 1979.

In 1979, there was a brief three years of the Tonkin Liberal government, when he went into opposition, and then on the re-election in 1982 of a Labor government he became the minister for health for most of that period—from 1982 through to 1988—and from 1985 to 1988 he was also the minister for community welfare.

In speaking about the mercurial Dr Cornwall, and reading through the information that has been provided by the parliamentary library, I thought perhaps that lots of the descriptions were 'South Australia's most colourful 1980's MP dies', but the InDaily article, which summarised under the heading, 'Controversial crusading health minister John Cornwall dies', highlighted the fact that he reconciled in his very late years, with many of his former ministerial colleagues, longstanding burning differences that he had had with them about his leaving the cabinet and leaving politics. It is a nice yarn in terms of old political friends reuniting in Dr Cornwall's latter years.

But, in that particular article about former colleagues who had served with him in the cabinet, I was struck by the fact that at least two or three of them used one particular adjective to describe him. I have used the term mercurial; others have referred to him as colourful. It was interesting that both, for example, former cabinet colleagues Chris Sumner and Kym Mayes used the phrase 'irascible bugger' or 'irascible' and then went on to say why they had described him as irascible.

Chris Sumner, in lauding Dr Cornwall (and I think the InDaily article said that at times he had had a tempestuous relationship with Dr Cornwall), said:

He was a very effective minister in the Bannon government and a great supporter of public health. He had significant and ground-breaking achievements in the banning of tobacco advertising, assessment and remedying of the lead levels in Port Pirie that were affecting children's health, and in the decriminalisation of marijuana for personal use. His somewhat irascible nature led to some intemperate behaviour, which resulted in adverse findings in a defamation case that led to his resignation. There was also controversy about the funding of a Christies Beach women's shelter, but these matters should not in any way detract from his significant contributions to the South Australian health system and community.

Kym Mayes, former cabinet minister, also paid tribute to Dr Cornwall, saying:

He was a bloody good minister, a difficult but likable bloke, and someone I was better for knowing. He was an irascible bugger, but Jesus he was a good minister.

He tells an interesting yarn, which I think gives a fair indication of the approach John Cornwall took to politics and even political comrades within the Labor Party. Mayes is quoted in the InDaily article as follows:

Mayes told InDaily he was on a caucus committee helmed by Cornwall, when the former firebrand kicked him out for several weeks after an argument over services funding. 'He refused to let me enter the caucus committee. He was an irascible bugger, but Jesus he was a good minister', Mayes said.

Mayes recalls being bottom of the food chain in the cabinet as the 13<sup>th</sup> ranked minister, and said:

It was often hard to hear deliberations at the end of the cabinet table. On one occasion I asked Cornwall to repeat something he'd said. He looked down the table and said, 'You're so irrelevant it doesn't matter.'

Mayes laughs. So he told the story in a deprecating way against himself.

That was John Cornwall. John Cornwall was my first significant political foe in this Legislative Council. I was elected in 1982, when he first became minister for health, and we had many a good spar over health-related issues. He was a mercurial character. He had significant mood changes. He could go from being almost uncontrollably intemperate in terms of his behaviour, and then within an hour or so he would be the smooth, charming John Cornwall that he could be if he chose to be. That mood swing could be almost instantaneous.

I remember one exchange in the early days, which was one of the early hits against John Cornwall. He had funded some health commission-related market research, but had done it through Rod Cameron. Of course, Rod Cameron, being the Labor Party's pollster, had managed to put in some political party-related polling in relation to the popularity of the minister, voting intentions, etc., which was obviously of assistance to the state Labor secretary at the time in the early eighties.

This became a very significant political issue. Dr Cornwall denied that it was the case; I had had information that it was. Ultimately, it was *The Advertiser* that was of great value at the time. I remember placing a classified ad in *The Advertiser*, stating, 'Have you been polled recently and asked questions about voting intentions in the following manner?' Believe it or not, a woman from Fleurieu Peninsula rang in to Parliament House and said, 'Yes, I got asked all these questions', and that led to a very significant series of motions of no confidence against John Cornwall at the time because, in essence, he had misled the Legislative Council by denying that the taxpayers had funded political market research through the South Australian health commission.

I remember that he had a wonderful command of the language. He was able to abuse and use it very effectively. At one stage, he railed across the chamber—I suspect I was sitting possibly where the Hon. Mr Hanson is sitting now—and said something about the Hon. Mr Lucas, namely, 'He is just a pain in the perineum.' I was only a young fellow from Mount Gambier, and I thought it did not sound too good, but I did not know where my perineum was actually. I took a point of order, but I did have to go off and check the dictionary and find out where my perineum was. Eventually, when I found out, I knew that I should have been offended that he could have abused me in such a clever way in the Legislative Council.

He had a wonderful command of the language. He was a wonderful debater, a combative opponent, a fierce intellect and passionate about the causes that he believed in. As the Hon. Chris Sumner comments in relation to health issues and lead poisoning at Port Pirie, and tobacco sponsorship of sporting events in particular—was it the grand prix at that stage?—he was a

passionate opponent of those issues and took up the battle against the major tobacco companies at the time. He was a passionate supporter of the causes that he and his party believed in.

In some cases, the party was not always 100 per cent behind him. There were some wily old foxes in the then Labor cabinet who did not always agree. I think the InDaily article refers to the at times tempestuous relationship between him and the former leader of the government in the Legislative Council, Chris Sumner, who was also a fierce intellect and a wonderful debater. Their challenges were considerable, sometimes quietly in the chamber, but also behind the President's chair. One could sometimes hear interesting, fierce debates going on between the two ministers in relation to what the priorities might be and what the position might be.

There are many other stories one could tell about Dr Cornwall, but now is not the appropriate time to be recounting those particular stories on the public record. All I can say is that I pass on my condolences to his family on behalf of Liberal members. I knew his daughter Deborah relatively well, who I think is still a working journalist in Sydney. She remains one of the few journalists who I can recall ringing me on Christmas Day for a comment on a particular issue. She is still a prominent journalist in the Sydney and New South Wales media. On behalf of Liberal members, I pass on our condolences to his remaining family, his friends and his acquaintances.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** I rise today to second the motion and to speak on behalf of the Labor opposition to the condolence motion in relation to the Hon. Dr John Cornwall, member of the Legislative Council from 2 July 1975 until 31 January 1989. The Hon. Ron Roberts, I think, took his spot for the Labor Party in the Legislative Council. I would like to join with the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council and say that our thoughts and, for those who pray, our prayers are with the Hon. Dr John Cornwall's family and friends in what is a difficult time.

Dr Cornwall was briefly the minister for lands, the minister for repatriation and the minister for the environment. He lost these portfolios when the Labor Party lost the 1979 election. He later became minister for health, a portfolio that he was very well known for, and held that for approximately six years. He was also minister for community welfare, a portfolio he held for about half that time, a period of approximately three years.

While he held those portfolios, he commenced reforms in many important areas. At the time of Dr Cornwall's retirement, premier Bannon singled out a few of these areas. He singled out domestic violence, child sexual abuse, drug and alcohol abuse, tobacco-related illnesses, mental health, unemployment, homeless youth and aged care as some of the areas that Dr Cornwall concentrated on and had significant achievements in.

I, too, have been reading with interest some of the articles, obituaries and commentary that have been written following Dr Cornwall's passing. He achieved a great deal in his time, in addition to the areas that John Bannon singled out. He was a champion of the federal Medicare program. Under Dr Cornwall's stewardship, South Australia led the nation in reducing cigarette advertising. He had a significant influence on Aboriginal health and moved towards Aboriginal health services being provided and run by Aboriginal people.

He helped bring to the fore and to the public's attention the ill-effects of lead poisoning from the Port Pirie smelters. He brought in new organ transplant laws, which have probably saved the lives of countless people in South Australia by now. He agitated for the general public to be better educated and aware of the emerging HIV and AIDS epidemic that would sweep not just Australia but the world. There are many other areas where he made reforms or made South Australians and Australians much more aware.

As the Hon. Rob Lucas pointed out, he was well known for never letting anything or anyone stand in the way of achieving his goals if he thought he had to try to achieve something. As a minister, I am informed that he was once admitted to hospital suffering from what was described as exhaustion. I must admit that I enjoyed reading the description of him in the paper in 1983, as he was described as 'snapping with the force of a giant clam when criticised'.

Dr Cornwall also published two books, *After Work, After Play, After All: a political memoir*, and *Just for the Record: the political recollections of John Cornwall*. These books, and *Just for the*

*Record* in particular, I think are good reading for those of us who are new to this side of the chamber in opposition. It contains some fantastic advice about quickly learning the jargon. In *Just for the Record*, Dr Cornwall wrote:

Two telephone calls to your office on any subject are translated as 'My office has been deluged with complaints about the Government's latest folly'. 'Doctors who cannot be named for ethical reasons' are always available for comment.

For that one, the influence of Dr John Cornwall has obviously rubbed off on the now Leader of the Government. I think we all remember in opposition the anonymous faxes to Liberal Party headquarters. It is a tactic that is well tried. They are good lessons for opposition. If you hear us on this side talking about being deluged with complaints about the government's latest folly, we know where that advice has come from.

I think one of the better descriptions comes from a tribute a former member of this place, the Hon. Ian Gilfillan, gave when Dr Cornwall retired from parliament. It gives a strong sense of the person that John Cornwall was. Ian Gilfillan said:

Although he was a personality which from time to time stirred up reactions of aggravation and frustration, in the mainstream he was a man who was larger than life in his aims and goals. He achieved more than many of us will achieve in our lifetime in politics.

Once again, I extend our thoughts and best wishes to Dr Cornwall's loved ones and commend the motion to the chamber.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:34):** I rise to speak on the condolence motion of John Cornwall, in solidarity as a member of a select and privileged class. John Cornwall and I have both had the privilege of serving this state as Minister for Health. John Cornwall was Minister for Health for six years from 1982 to 1988, shortly before his retirement. Dr Cornwall's tenure as minister included notable achievements in public health services in South Australia. He had a vision for the delivery of health services and worked tenaciously to make that vision a reality.

In this 140<sup>th</sup> year of the Children's Hospital, it is appropriate to acknowledge Dr Cornwall's role in bringing together the former Children's Hospital with the hospital devoted to women, the Queen Victoria Hospital, to make what today is now known as the Women's and Children's Hospital. While Dr Cornwall seemed to lack diplomacy generally, in this project he managed to win around the Friends of the Queen Vic who had mounted a campaign against any closure of the Queen Victoria Hospital.

Another significant area of focus for the former minister was strict regulation of advertising by tobacco companies. In particular, Dr Cornwall acted to remove tobacco company sponsorship at sporting events and to restrict tobacco advertising in cinemas. Dr Cornwall did not take a narrow view of health. He recognised that improved service delivery in the community and improved preventative health services drive better outcomes for health consumers.

The last area of focus which I would like to highlight is Aboriginal health. Dr Cornwall worked to devolve health services to local Aboriginal communities, recognising that Indigenous community input into the health services they use is vital. Dr Cornwall established programs to encourage the training of health workers specifically in the area of Aboriginal health, contributing to the process of greater cultural sensitivity in the delivery of health services, which is still a work in progress. Today, I pay my respects to Dr Cornwall and express my condolences to his family on their loss. Vale Dr Cornwall.

**The PRESIDENT (14:36):** I add my own condolences to the Hon. Dr Cornwall's family. I ask honourable members to stand in their places and carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

**GILES, MR B.L.**

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:37):** I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of Mr Bryant Lionel Giles, former member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service.

In speaking on behalf of Liberal members to this condolence motion, I note from the public record that Mr Giles, at his passing, was at the ripe old age of 90 years. He was born in 1928 and was elected for a brief period to the House of Assembly in South Australia, to the state electorate of Gumeracha, in 1968 and was there for the duration of the Hall government, which only survived to the election of 1970, as a result of Dartmouth-Chowilla and other related issues.

Mr Giles actually won the seat upon retirement of Sir Thomas Playford, and, as I said, was the new member for Gumeracha just for that very brief period. I did know Mr Giles well. I believe I met him occasionally in my early years in the Liberal Party. When he was elected, he was described as an orchardist and grazier and was educated at Adelaide High School.

He was a member of the council of the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society, a member of the South Australia Apple and Pear Selection Committee of the SA Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association, and he was also a member of the Onkaparinga Adult Education Council. He obviously fitted the bill in terms of being a local person with widespread community networks in and around the then electorate of Gumeracha. Obviously, that was a principal reason, together with his own qualities, that saw him being elected.

The parliamentary library was good enough to provide all of us with copies of his maiden speech. The issues that were of great concern to him, unsurprisingly, related to generally the apple and pear industry and related issues. He argued passionately in his maiden speech for the need for greater use of biological control of pests, as opposed to, as he said:

Chemical companies offer far more inducement to qualified research officers than do most Governments, so their services are lost to us for this purpose.

That is, the services of people with knowledge and expertise in terms of biological control of pests.

I have to say, having read his maiden speech, I know a lot more about biological control of pests—in the past anyway. I am assuming a lot of these things have now been well and truly controlled. I learnt about how sterilisation saved a lot of money in preventing the spread of screwworm, which had been costing \$40 million a year in cattle loss in parts of America. It was completely eradicated through the use of irradiated flies. I also learnt that evidently certain insects excrete a scent when they are ready to mate. One of these insects is the gypsy moth, and he states:

The female moth carries a great load of eggs and is too heavy to leave the ground. When she is ready to mate the males are attracted by a scent. Entomologists have synthesized this scent and are able to use it to attract males to lures or traps where they meet their death. One-thousandth of a gram (or a milligram) is sufficient to act as a lure. This reduces the number of the male members, and this automatically reduces the number of fertile eggs. Surely and effectively, the number of [gypsy] moths is decreased.

There are a number of examples that Mr Giles evidenced in terms of the use of biological controls to control pests, as opposed to the use of chemicals supplied by chemical companies in terms of trying to protect the product of his particular industry then, the apple and pear industry. It was obviously an issue that he had a lot of knowledge about and he shared it with the House of Assembly. Given that he was only there for two years, there is not much of an indication of a long collection of speeches in a variety of other areas.

On behalf of the members of the Legislative Council and on behalf of the members of the Liberal Party, I place on the record our condolences to the surviving members of his family and his friends and acquaintances.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42):** I rise to second the motion and speak on behalf of the Labor opposition on the motion expressing condolence for Mr Bryant Giles, the member for Gumeracha from 2 May 1968 through to 29 May 1970, after which that particular seat, as happens from time to time, was abolished and he retired.

Mr Giles took over the seat of Gumeracha and had to fill the very big shoes of Sir Thomas Playford, the very long-serving 33<sup>rd</sup> premier of South Australia. He was a powerful advocate for industries in his electorate, including dairy and beef cattle, sheep, cherries, apples, pine forests and also the Woodside Army camp. He spoke about these things in his maiden speech, as the Treasurer has mentioned. Many of these industries still remain an important part of that part of the Adelaide Hills and its surrounds. He was a champion of South Australian agriculture generally.

Before entering parliament, I understand he was a member of the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society, chairman of the Lenswood branch of the Agricultural Bureau, a member of the apple and pear section of the SA Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association and he was also a great supporter of the CFS and of adult education. I think he was chair of the adult education branch in the Onkaparinga district.

From what we have been able to read and what we have heard about Mr Giles, it paints a picture of a man who was dedicated to his community, dedicated to education and dedicated to the furtherance of the agricultural industry in South Australia, which remain as important today as they were back when he served. I extend our thoughts and best wishes to his family. I commend this motion to the chamber.

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:44):** I rise briefly in support of the motion and also to associate myself with the comments of the Treasurer. He and I may be the only ones in this chamber who ever met Mr Giles. Certainly, I met him in that period of 1968 to 1970, in the company of my father, when Mr Giles was the member for the relatively small seat of Gumeracha. As I understand it, he did seek to continue in the parliament.

Gumeracha was one of some seats that became part of the new seat of Kavel, and he was unsuccessful in getting the preselection for that new seat. As has been mentioned, he did have the privilege, like some we know, of never serving in the parliament other than in government, even though it was only for two years. There are plenty of people, as I reminded some lower house colleagues today, who served a very long time without ever being in government.

In the latter part of his life he was living in the South-East and I bumped into him on a number of occasions in that part of South Australia. He retained a great interest in politics in general but also in the industries, which have been mentioned by the Treasurer and the Leader of the Opposition, that he was passionate about, particularly horticulture and primary industries in general around this state and the nation. With those words, I offer my condolences to the family of Mr Giles.

**The PRESIDENT (14:46):** I add my condolences and extend them to his family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*Sitting suspended from 14:47 to 15:00.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The PRESIDENT:** May I acknowledge in the gallery a delegation from the Tongan parliament. Welcome to the Deputy Lord Speaker, the Chair of Committees and the Deputy Clerk. Welcome to the Legislative Council.

#### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

*Parliamentary Committees*

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:00):** I bring up the sixth report of the committee.

Report received.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Review under Section 74A(4) of the Police Act 1998—Report, 2017-18  
Torrens University Australia—Report, 2017

## Regulations under the following Acts—

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Act 1987—General  
Freedom of Information Act 1991—Fees and Charges—General  
Judges Pensions Act 1973—General  
Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974—General  
Public Corporation Act 1993—Supported Community Accommodation Services  
Shop Trading Hours Act 1977—General  
Southern State Superannuation Act 2009—Miscellaneous  
Spent Convictions—Prescribed Screening Unit  
Strata Tiles Act 1988—General  
Subordinate Legislation Act 1978—Postponement of Expiry

## Rules Under Acts—

Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Legal Practitioners Education and Admission  
Council—General

## By the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway)—

## Corporation By-laws—

## Adelaide Hills Council—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Local Government Land  
No. 4—Roads  
No. 5—Dogs  
No. 6—Cats

## City of Adelaide—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Local Government Land  
No. 4—Roads  
No. 5—Waste Management  
No. 6—Rundle Mall  
No. 7—Dogs  
No. 8—Cats  
No. 9—Lodging Houses

## City of Norwood Payneham &amp; St Peters—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Roads  
No. 4—Local Government Land  
No. 5—Dogs  
No. 6—Waste Management

## District Council By-laws—

## Cleve—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Moveable Signs  
No. 3—Roads  
No. 4—Local Government Land  
No. 5—Dogs  
No. 6—Cats

## Regulations under the following Acts—

Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013—Miscellaneous  
West Beach Recreation Reserve Act 1987—General

## By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink)—

## Regulations under the following Acts—

Ground Water (Qualco-Sunlands) Control Act 2000—General

Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981—Fees No. 2  
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Kangaroo Harvesting—General

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade)—

Report on actions taken following the Coronial Inquiry into the Death in Custody of Heath Ryan Jones dated July 2018  
Report on actions taken following the Coronial Inquiry into the Death in Custody of John Steve Costi dated July 2018  
Regulations under the following Acts—  
Prohibition of Human Cloning for Reproduction Act 2003—General  
Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003—General

*Ministerial Statement*

**GAMBLING REGULATION REVIEW**

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:04):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement made yesterday in another place by the Attorney-General on the subject of administrative review of gambling regulation in South Australia.

*Question Time*

**LIQUOR LICENSING FEES**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:08):** My question is to the Treasurer. Is the Treasurer committed to delivering in full all of the measures contained in his budget? In particular, is the Treasurer committed to realising all of the revenue foreshadowed—some \$3.2 million a year—with the introduction of revised liquor licensing fees informed by recommendations contained in the Anderson review, a measure as outlined in Budget Paper 5 on page 17?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:09):** The government is committed to the budget that has been introduced into the House of Assembly yesterday. The simple answer to the question is, the government is committed to all expenditure measures that are, by inference, included in the budget and all revenue measures that are either by inference or explicitly referred to in the budget.

**LIQUOR LICENSING FEES**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09):** Supplementary: has the Treasurer or anyone, to his knowledge, had discussions with any interest groups about the introduction of an extra \$3.2 million per annum in liquor licensing fees, given that he has informed the chamber that they will be happening and he is committed to them?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:09):** I can speak for myself, Mr President. I have not had any discussions with—I guess it is a broad definition of what 'interest groups' are. There can be those who are immediately impacted by having to pay it and there can be others who are impacted by potentially the costs of using the services which might be impacted. However, if the Leader of the Opposition is, by inference, referring to the AHA in particular, or perhaps clubs, I have not had any discussions with the AHA or club associations in relation to the detailed matters outlined in the budget papers.

**LIQUOR LICENSING FEES**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:10):** A final supplementary for clarity: the government is committed then to raising an extra \$3.2 million a year revenue from liquor licensing fees, as recommended in the Anderson review, if it is outlined in the budget?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:10):** I have already answered yes to that question. I can just say yes again. So if you want to ask me to clarify it, I can't clarify yes any more than saying yes.



### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:11):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister stand by his previous comments, made on 31 May 2017, that placing SA Pathology under stress will 'only damage patient outcomes'?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:11):** I don't remember the context of the statement, but I certainly do believe that SA Pathology has been through a very rough period, particularly under the administration of the former government and particularly with the botched rollout of EPLIS. That led to very significant pressures on SA Pathology staff, and the former government needs to be held accountable for that.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:11):** Supplementary: does the minister believe that threatening SA Pathology staff with redundancies, efficiency targets and privatisation if they don't meet his benchmarks will result in better patient outcomes?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:12):** The government has made it very clear that we have a responsibility to ensure that our public health services are run efficiently. That includes making sure that we pay reasonably comparable costs for pathology services as compared with interstate peers. In that regard, we are no different from the Labor Party. The Labor Party, in 2014, commissioned the Ernst and Young reports.

In 2013, Ernst and Young was commissioned by the department for health and ageing to assess the efficiency, effectiveness and financial performance of pathology services in South Australia. The most significant initiative of the efficiency improvement program was a proposed new operational configuration and workforce model for SA Pathology, and it included significant FTE reductions.

If the honourable member is suggesting that somehow SA Pathology staff are not able to work towards efficiencies, as do their interstate peers, I don't agree with her, and clearly the actions of the former government indicated that they also didn't agree. They did believe and we believe that responsibly working with SA Pathology can see efficiencies provided to the taxpayers and patients of South Australia.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:13):** Supplementary: has the minister met with Professionals Australia, the body representing these stressed workers, since the election day and consulted with them in any way about the announcement in yesterday's budget?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:13):** I certainly have met with Professionals Australia since the election. That was in the context of the mismanaged EPLIS project. As I think I have said to this house before, that project did involve significant stress on SA Pathology staff and a significant reduction in service outcomes to SA Health and its patients.

In terms of engaging Professionals Australia since yesterday's announcement, my understanding is that a statement has been made by the head of SA Pathology to her staff. My understanding is that Professionals Australia was invited to a briefing by departmental officers this morning—I will confirm for the member whether they are able to attend—but also there would have been correspondence yesterday from the department to advise Professionals Australia on the way forward.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:15):** Supplementary: how many employees employed by SA Pathology within the Department for Health are currently working over 50 hours a week?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15):** I don't have that information to hand, but I will certainly take that question on notice for the honourable member.

**SA PATHOLOGY**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:15):** By way of supplementary question: the minister talked about costs, but my question was about patient outcomes. Does he believe privatisation and other things that are currently placing SA Pathology staff under stress will improve or damage patient outcomes?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15):** I would remind the honourable member that she is a member of an opposition that was formally a government—

**The Hon. C.M. Scriven:** Answer the question: do you think it will advantage—

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I would like to answer the question, and I would like to answer it without coaching. The member is a member of a party that was formerly in government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Let the minister answer.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** —that was determined to pursue efficiencies in SA Pathology. This government also believes that we have a responsibility to provide patient outcomes in the most cost-effective way possible, and that is what we remain committed to doing.

**SA PATHOLOGY**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:16):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Do the more than 880 job cuts within SA Health include job cuts in SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging, or will the privatisation result in further job losses?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16):** In terms of the way forward in terms of SA Pathology, it will undergo an external review to identify opportunities for improvement that provide for appropriate care to be delivered in a sustainable way. PricewaterhouseCoopers has been appointed to undertake the review, commencing in September 2018. It will take approximately six months to examine in detail the public and commercial services provided by SA Pathology.

The steering committee, chaired by the Department for Health and Wellbeing, and involving representatives from local health networks and general practice, will oversee the process, and SA Pathology will engage staff, unions and other stakeholders through the process. What that review finds in terms of ways that SA Pathology can become more efficient, we will need to wait for the completion of that review in what I understand will be about six months.

**SA PATHOLOGY**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:17):** Supplementary: so the minister, I am just confirming, is not able to confirm or guarantee there will be no further job losses in this area?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:17):** What I can confirm is that I am looking forward to the report of PricewaterhouseCoopers in about six months' time.

**SA PATHOLOGY**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:17):** I want to reconfirm that, because on 31 May the minister referred to SA Pathology by saying:

...now the government, gave a commitment before the election that we would not implement the staff reductions...

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:18):** I suspect I am being verbed. What I do recall—and I'm happy to check the record—

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** I've got it here; that's exactly what you said—you're not being verbed.

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, don't cut across one of your own member's questioning.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** My recollection of the public commitments we gave—sorry, they may not have been public, they may have been direct to Professionals Australia—but my understanding of the clear commitments we made before the election is that we would not implement any job reductions in the calendar year of 2018. In terms of the efficiency improvement program (and the honourable member stimulates me to go back to what Labor did in opposition), as I said, they had their own review—they've done an Ernst and Young review. They didn't actually drop it: what they said on 8 August 2017 was that they were going to suspend it.

So we had this hanging over our heads right through to the next election, and what we have after the election is an opposition that had put forward funding cuts well above what the state budget yesterday presented. The opposition members who are opposing efficiencies, apparently, in public services have to explain to the people of South Australia: if they were determined not to pursue efficiencies in the public services, how were they going to achieve hundreds of million dollars more of cuts in health? It's a hypocritical opposition that criticises, in opposition, what they were pursuing in government.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:19):** Supplementary question arising from the original answer: would the minister agree if someone had said, quote:

...the former opposition, now the government, gave a commitment before the election that we would not implement the staff reductions...

And that was in relation to SA Pathology. Would the minister agree that someone making that comment and doing what they are now is a massive hypocrite and has misled parliament back then?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:20):** I am not sure what the honourable member is referring to.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** What you said two months ago.

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** Your *Hansard* record. Your words.

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, it's not appropriate for you to shout at the minister after you yourself have asked a question. I would like to listen to the minister respond to your question.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** What I stress is that the government is determined to make sure that we deliver cost-effective, quality services for Australians in Health, and the budget provides a clear pathway forward.

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** Misleading South Australians again.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** Check your phone, Stephen.

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** Check the *Hansard*, more likely.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** Check your phone; I am sure they're sending you *Hansard*.

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, have you quite finished? I would like to hear the Hon. John Dawkins' question.

### STRENGTH FOR LIFE PROGRAM

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:21):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding the Strength for Life program.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS:** Falls remain one of the leading reasons for older people being admitted to hospital, with the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare reporting that there were an estimated 111,222 hospitalised fall injury cases for Australians aged 65 years or older in 2014-15. Almost 3 per cent of all hospitalisations for people aged 65 or over are a result of a fall. Many falls are a result of muscles and bones becoming weaker with age. Will the minister advise the council on what can be done to improve the health of older South Australians by reducing the incidence of falls?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:22):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing support for promoting health and wellbeing. In terms of what can be done to reduce falls amongst older South Australians, I refer particularly to the work of the Council on the Ageing SA, which developed the Strength for Life program in 2004 to increase access to strength training programs for older South Australians. It plays a vital role in promoting health and wellbeing amongst people over 50 and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders over 40. Accredited fitness providers run strength training sessions throughout South Australia. In 2018, COTA SA introduced Strength for Life Aqua into multiple facilities with pools.

The honourable member rightly highlighted the high number of hospitalised fall injury cases. It's noteworthy that women accounted for most of these fall injury cases: 24 per cent of the injuries were to the hip and thigh, 24 per cent to the head and 55 per cent had a principal diagnosis of fracture. Obviously, helping older South Australians to prevent slips, trips and falls is vital to reducing hospital presentations, reducing harms associated with a fall and ensuring South Australians live healthier and longer lives.

The Marshall government recognises the importance of supporting opportunities for older South Australians to age well. We want to encourage them to stay active, improve their strength and balance and support their ongoing health and wellbeing. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to providing funding of \$400,000 over four years from 2018-19 to COTA SA to extend the reach of the Strength for Life program. A key focus of our commitment is to strengthen access to programs for older people in rural and regional South Australia, older people from Aboriginal and culturally and linguistically diverse communities and older people in economically disadvantaged communities.

Our funding commitment delivers on our election commitment to increase access. It also reflects our commitment to support community-wide health and prevention services. Nobody wants to be admitted to a hospital, no matter how good the hospital is. Strategies such as Strength for Life can reduce the risk of avoidable hospitalisation.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:24):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, representing the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, a question about electric vehicles.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** South Australia, up until 2016, had a low emission vehicle strategy. It is now quite a dated document. It has ministers Patrick Conlon and Paul Caica on the inside sleeve; it is a historic document. The point I think is that since that document expired—it was 'South Australia's Low Emission Vehicle Strategy 2012-2016'—there has been no replacement strategy. That particular document was not specifically aimed at zero emission vehicles, such as electric vehicles. Nevertheless, they do make up an important component of that sector.

The most recent report about the state of electric vehicles in Australia, including South Australia, is a report from June of this year, 'The State of Electric Vehicles in Australia'. It is produced by ClimateWorks Australia and it was commissioned by the Electric Vehicle Council. That document points out that sales of electric vehicles nationwide increased 67 per cent in one year. However, whilst that sounds impressive, there were only about 2,200 sold in the most recent year, which represents 0.2 per cent of motor vehicles sold, or one car in 500. In South Australia, only 1,000 electric vehicles have been sold in the last six years. My questions of the minister are:

1. Is the government now working on a new electric vehicle strategy for South Australia? If they are, when might it be released and what consultation will be undertaken?
2. What steps is the government taking to lead by example and convert a majority of the state fleet to electric vehicles?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:26):** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in electric vehicles and low emissions. I have just found one of the old 'Fix it, Pat' lapel badges in my drawer, so minister Conlon does live on. In relation to electric vehicles, it is something that I think we will see more of, even though there haven't been

as many purchased as perhaps the honourable member would like. Two years ago, I took the opportunity to visit the Formula E—which is the electric grand prix—people in London. I had heard that there was some speculation that they may be interested in coming to South Australia.

I thought that it might be logical to have that as part of the Adelaide 500 weekend. Unfortunately, the Formula E people would like to be at six months. They don't want to be anywhere near petrol; they don't burn petrol, so they want to be away from it. That was a bit disappointing, because I am not sure that we have the capacity in South Australia to shut down the streets of Adelaide for another race in and around the streets, like a city race. I am getting a little distracted there. In relation to the electric vehicle strategy, I will take that on notice and refer it to the minister in the other chamber and bring back a reply.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:28):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** In *The Transcontinental* on 18 February 2015, the following piece was written:

'Privatising SA Pathology in Port Augusta would have been a very poor move so I think that the minister has made the only sensible decision available to him and I welcome it,' Mr Dan van Holst Pellekaan said.

Does the minister support the comments made by his representative in the other place, the member for Stuart, that privatising SA Pathology is 'a poor move'?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:29):** I think I should remind honourable members what the government has announced. What the government has announced is that we are going to initiate a review by PricewaterhouseCoopers, which will commence in September and take six months, to look at how efficiencies can be delivered in SA Pathology.

I think the Treasurer also indicated that the government will need to look at other alternative strategies if SA Pathology can't achieve those reforms. There has been no commitment in terms of what will happen beyond the review. There has certainly been no decision made in relation to privatisation.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Wortley, a supplementary?

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:29):** The question was: does the minister support the comments made by his counterpart in the other place that privatising SA Pathology was a poor move? We didn't ask about reviews—

**The PRESIDENT:** You are seeking clarification, the Hon. Mr Wortley, are you?

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Clarification—does he think privatisation is a poor move?

**The PRESIDENT:** I have the gist of the question. Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:30):** It's an interesting question that the former minister asks. Let me bring to the attention of the parliament two statements that were made by two separate political parties in response to questions asked by the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation. During the election, the ANMF put out a policy statement and in it asked for individual parties to respond to what—

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Point of order: relevancy in the answer. Nowhere in the supplementary question was it asked about competing statements by parties, or any questions asked by the Nursing and Midwifery Federation. He was asked very specifically about a comment made by the member for Stuart. It was a very, very specific question.

**The PRESIDENT:** I appreciate it was a specific question. I am allowing the minister some latitude and we will see how it goes.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I will seek your guidance on this, Mr President, but if the member wants to know if I am going to provide commentary and speak on behalf of the honourable member for Stuart, the answer is no. If the member actually wants me to address the issue of the value of privatisation, then I ask for a bit of latitude in responding to it. Before the election, the ANMF put out this statement, and they asked this specific question:

Do you oppose any further privatisation or outsourcing of public health services, whether for delivery or management, or for the development of physical infrastructure?

The answer from the Liberal Party—unlike the answer from the Labor Party—provided a direct answer. It said:

The Marshall Liberal government will not sell any public hospitals, nor will we move to have any public hospital privately managed. The Labor Party has sourced a wide range of services from beyond the public sector. In assessing such options, the Liberal Party will be focused on health outcomes.

So how did the Labor Party respond to exactly the same question? They made one comment about Medicare, which seemed to be more related to the federal government than the state. They made another comment about being committed to world-class health services, which didn't seem to relate to the question. Then they got to the substance of the question in the latter part by saying:

We will not privatise our public hospitals and we will defend our hospitals against any attempt to do so.

And then this is their attempt to address the fact that they might outsource:

The South Australian Labor government acknowledges there is always more work to do in the provision of health care and that we must continue to invest and collaborate with all stakeholders in the healthcare system to bring about sustainable service improvements.

I put it to honourable members that collaborating with all stakeholders in the health system sounds like, 'We are going to continue to put out lots of tenders and to get lots of outsourced services.'

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:33):** Supplementary arising from the original answer where the member indicated that there will be a six-month review commencing in September about SA Pathology services. Will the review be entirely focused on the best health outcomes and not be at all focused on the cost of providing these services?

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** Grow up!

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Well, he said it was entirely focused on healthcare outcomes only.

**The PRESIDENT:** Treasurer, can you stop having a conversation with the Leader of the Opposition, and vice versa. Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:33):** Let me be clear to the parliament: I believe that delivering health outcomes for the people of South Australia includes having a health system that is sustainable and can continue to meet the demand for services consistent with the resources required.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Point of order: I don't mind if the minister doesn't want to answer my question, but what I do want is, I asked a specific question: does he support his representative in the other place that privatising SA Health was a poor move? He either says, 'Yes,' or, 'No,' or, 'I don't know,' or, 'I don't want to answer the question.'

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Wortley—

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** He has not answered my question.

**The PRESIDENT:** Mr Wortley, I am not agreeing to your point of order. Sit down. Minister, sit down. I cannot put words in the minister's mouth. I take that quote from a previous President. The Hon. Ms Lee.

### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:34):** My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services about measures to address domestic violence. Can the minister please update the chamber about

the suite of measures that the government has allocated in the 2018-19 state budget to address the devastating problem of domestic violence in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:35):** I thank the honourable member for her interest in this area and for her very sensible question. This government has a strong plan to address violence against women and has delivered on all of our election commitments in the recent budget, which a number of members of the former shadow cabinet (now cabinet) had a great contribution in and are very proud of.

Elements have included that we will improve data collection and communication to ensure that domestic violence data suits the needs of the sector, which is a collaborative partnership that is currently being led by the Office for Women, with the Attorney-General's Department, the Office for Data Analytics and the Office of Crime Statistics and Research. The Attorney-General's Department, in consultation with the Office for Women, tabled a proposal in May to improve access to data across government and non-government sectors, and the Office for Women and the Attorney-General's Department are collaborating to develop an options paper for the way forward.

The extension of safety hubs in regional South Australia is an ongoing work and is being worked on through our regional round tables and through relevant government agencies to develop a model for safety hubs, with the intention of developing and implementing a proposed model in regional sites: one to two sites in 2018-19 prior to further rollouts across South Australia.

Peak body funding for the coalition of women's domestic and Aboriginal family violence services will ensure that the coalition, in line with a range of other peak bodies that the government provides funding to—SACOSS, YACSA, COTA and the like—will receive \$624,000 over four years. The development of a personal protection app: one-off funding of \$150,000 has been provided. One of the really important areas that the women's sector is very excited about is the 24/7 funding for the women's safety crisis hotline, which is something that they called for during the election campaign. We have been able to provide \$1.66 million over four years to Women's Safety Services to provide for that hotline to operate 24 hours a day.

I think I have spoken about the 40 new crisis accommodation beds for domestic violence victims, to which \$4 million has been allocated in the state budget. The round tables are providing input into where those should be located, and also the interest-free loans for capital projects in the non-government sector at \$5 million.

It is a significant package of reforms. We saw with the previous government that there was a discussion paper released, I think, in July 2016 and the subsequent budget showed no commitment whatsoever. From my understanding of the former government's commitment at the last election, its centrepiece in its domestic violence policy was that the premier of the day announced that he would add domestic violence to his title, which is the sort of usual nonsense that we got from the government; very much sort of tokenistic without substance.

We are pleased as well to have the domestic violence disclosure scheme, which we will be commencing as a statewide trial. That is under the auspices of the Attorney-General and that is something I think that has been called for for several years in South Australia. With those comments, I again thank the honourable member for her commitment in this area, knowing that she has a deep understanding within CALD communities of the need for these services.

### ZERO-BASED BUDGETING

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:39):** My questions are to the Treasurer. Bearing in mind that the principle of zero-based budgeting in the formulation of budgets has been around for at least 40 years, can the Treasurer advise how many government departments and agencies adopted the principle of zero-based budgeting in the formulation of their 2018-19 budgets and how many government departments and agencies did not?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:39):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Whilst he did not put it in his explanation, I understand he had an interesting experience with a prominent Adelaide council in relation to the whole notion of zero-based budgeting and their implementation.

In the budget speech yesterday I indicated—and I know the honourable member's great interest in this, and we have pursued the issue in parallel during Budget and Finance Committee meetings over recent years—on behalf of the government that we had implemented a simplified version of zero-based budgeting, as I put it. Can I make it clear what I meant by that. What I meant by that was that, in the budget bilaterals, the discussions that I had and Treasury had with ministers and with CEOs in particular is that we indicated to them at the budget bilaterals that we no longer accepted the former government's tradition of, in essence, a salami slicing approach to expenditure restraint; that is, you just continue doing everything that you used to do and to achieve a savings target. Remember that the former government had \$715 million worth of savings locked and loaded in their Mid-Year Budget Review from December.

What we said was that we were not going to accept that. What we wanted them to do was a simplified version of zero-based budgeting. Return to first principles. Go back and have a look through your expenditure at what are either wasteful or low priority programs that you are currently funding. If the new government wants to fund a new program on palliative care, paediatric eating disorders, cancer services or whatever it might be, we therefore need to say that there are existing Labor priorities, existing Labor programs, existing Labor projects which are a lower priority to important programs like palliative care, paediatric eating disorders, suicide prevention programs and the like.

It is a simple matter: if you are going to incur additional expenditure on new programs or extended programs, unless you have a magic pudding, you actually have to stop funding certain programs. That is the approach we have adopted. We have had the debate in this house. One of the former government's favourite programs, Fund My Neighbourhood—\$20 million—we took the difficult decision to say that was a lower priority program than some of the new programs that the new government, which has been elected by the people, wanted. They had rejected the former Labor government, and the new government had new priorities and wanted new projects and programs.

That was the process. There was no formal written directive that went to departments and agencies in relation to that. As a result of the first experience we have had, which is, as I have described, a simplified version of zero-based budgeting, I am having and will have further discussions with Treasury to see whether or not we could or should formalise that process through the budget bilateral process.

As the honourable member knows, I don't support it being a legislative provision. I believe good governance and good governments should be able to manage these processes with obviously their ministers being in charge of their CEOs and their departments in terms of managing expenditure restraint. That is an ongoing debating issue in relation to it.

The answer to the honourable member's question, which I can give him, is that all departments and all ministers were asked to look at this simplified version of zero-based budgeting, that is, to go through and see what particular programs, projects or priorities you don't want to continue—not that you don't want to continue them. Ultimately, in the end, we have to make the difficult decision to say that, to fund a new program, we have to get rid of this particular program.

I indicated in the speech yesterday a reasonable selection but not an absolute comprehensive selection of projects, programs and priorities that were not going to be continued. The detailed explanation in the budget papers do outline a series of other and further projects and programs that ministers and CEOs said, 'We're not going to continue to fund those particular programs.' So there is further detail in the budget papers and the budget documents, which I am sure will be explored during the estimates committee process in the coming weeks.

That's the answer to the question: all agencies were asked in terms of that process. I'm happy to continue to engage with the honourable member with his ongoing interest in responsible expenditure restraint, a shared goal that we have. As I've said, we the government are not inclined to move down the path of legislative regulation of this particular area at this stage, but we are prepared to engage in productive discussion as to whether the version we used in our first budget round of bilaterals might be further improved. I'm happy to have that discussion with the honourable member as well.



### DIGITAL GAME DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:45):** Supplementary: given this Liberal budget's own stated target for this budget was a focus on growth in our creative sectors, particularly industries with strong links to technology such as craft, design, screen, digital platforms and music in the interactive media, why then was the digital game development program cut?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:45):** The pretty simple answer to that is that the government took a decision that there will be a whole new approach to industry assistance. That new approach was clearly outlined in the budget speech yesterday. We closed down a significant number of the more than 30 industry assistance programs the former government had. We believe that the provision of industry assistance should be in two forms. The first is to reduce the cost of doing business in South Australia for all businesses; so that's the payroll tax cuts, land tax, workers compensation reductions, electricity and water costs.

You have heard me talk about the total range of the cost of doing business in South Australia needing to be nationally and internationally competitive if our businesses are going to compete nationally and internationally. It doesn't matter whether you're a games producer, a creative arts-based industry or whether you're a manufacturing-based industry, your workers compensation costs, your electricity and water costs or your payroll tax costs—a variety of costs—impact on the cost of doing business in South Australia. If you are trying to compete with game producers in other states or countries, then whatever your total costs of doing business in the state are, they are an important part of how you can compete nationally and internationally. That was the first point.

We have been quite explicit about the second point we have made. No-one can criticise this government for not being transparent about this. We said for a year or more prior to the election that we were going to stop the former government's approach of politicians and public servants picking winners so the lucky small number of companies get a million dollar grant or half a million dollar grant or whatever it happens to be. There is a whole range of other businesses and industries competing with that particular business that are not a lucky winner and don't get the funding.

What we have said is that for our industry assistance programs generally—we have reserved the right of course on occasions to provide funding to an individual business or company—our emphasis is going to be on assistance to industry sectors or groups of businesses. A group of businesses might be the provision of support for transport infrastructure, energy infrastructure, water-based infrastructure or a variety of other programs where the benefit will go to a group of businesses or industries, perhaps in a geographic area, or to an industry sector that the government believes, through the provision of some sort of assistance, may well help the industry grow.

In terms of digital games and others, there are three proposed funds. One is an economic and business growth fund, another is the Regional Growth Fund, and the other is the commercialisation of a start-up fund controlled by industry. It may well be that a number of those industry supports for a sector, including digital games, may well be argued as an appropriate form of taxpayer-funded industry assistance for that particular area.

I do not think that we should just conclude that, as a result of a particular individual grant allocation program or scheme, it necessarily means that, if a group of industries or businesses in that particular sector come up with some sort of argument for government provided support that supports more than one industry, that that is not possible. They are the sorts of debates that industry sectors will have to have with the new government, with new ministers, under the new framework that was outlined in the budget yesterday.

### STATE BUDGET

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:49):** A supplementary: the Treasurer has in the past 24 hours repeated ad nauseam that his budget has abandoned the salami approach. What foodstuff would the Treasurer sum up his budget with? I would suggest a lemon, given the sour bitterness of 16 years in the wilderness, but what foodstuff would he describe this new approach as?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:49):** I thank the honourable member for her very generous description of the budget, but I am not going to enter into that particular discussion.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:50):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health regarding SA Pathology.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS:** On 4 February 2015, the member for Stuart said in *The Transcontinental*, and I quote: 'Generally, I am a strong supporter of private industry, but I do not expect that a private pathology company would provide the same level of service in Port Augusta as SA Pathology currently does.' My question to the minister is: does the minister agree with the member for Stuart's comments that a private pathology company will not be able to provide South Australians with the same level of service that they have expected and have had?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:50):** I thank the honourable member for her question and through you, Mr President, I just reiterate what the government has engaged in. The government has said that it believes that there is opportunity for more efficient delivery of pathology services in South Australia and that therefore we are going to establish a review by PricewaterhouseCoopers that will, in six months, come back with information to the government. Let me quote from the Budget Measures document. It says:

Efficiencies will therefore be pursued in SA Pathology, with the intent of delivering a service consistent with interstate peers. With the implementation of local health network boards from 2019-20, the public pathology service will be accountable for its performance. Should efficiencies not be achieved, it will be open to those boards to procure services from alternative providers.

So, the government is well short of presuming the outcome of the PricewaterhouseCoopers review, and we have indicated that we believe that decisions such as this should be fundamentally informed by the perspective of local health networks. That is particularly important for country South Australia.

That's why, unlike the former government, which in 2008 abolished dozens of boards around South Australia and completely undermined the capacity for self-determination in health services by local health network boards, the Treasurer has clearly indicated that, once this review is over, once the capacity for SA Pathology to demonstrate efficiencies has been made clear, then other options will be open. We are certainly not going to presume the outcome of this review, the outcome of SA Pathology's response to that review and, for that matter, what local health network boards might decide in terms of delivery of their own services.

### MAJOR EVENTS

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:52):** My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister update the council about how the government's 2018-19 budget is delivering for the tourism sector to attract major events and grow our visitor economy here in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:53):** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in the visitor economy and major events. The 2018-19 state budget is delivering more funding for the tourism sector to grow South Australia's visitor economy and create more jobs with the new government—the Marshall government—fulfilling its election commitments to boost the events bid fund and further strengthen South Australia's outstanding tourism offerings across the state.

Members would be aware that the new government has provided \$21.5 million more over four years to increase the event bid funding to secure more lucrative major events and conventions to increase visitation, create employment and drive economic growth. Members would be aware that about 66 per cent of participants at conventions come back and visit a destination with either their family or their friends after they have been at a convention.

In fact, the South Australian Tourism Commission is already communicating with all of the regional stakeholders because one of the things that we did in the election commitment was to change the mandate of the Convention Bureau to not only be bidding for conventions that are held in the Convention Centre but across metropolitan Adelaide and regional South Australia. The Tourism Commission has already begun communicating with regional stakeholders about the types of events that they might like to bid for to attract to their regional community.

Also, although a relatively small amount of money, the development of the Great Southern Bike Trail has been kickstarted with just \$100,000 to do a study on the existing assets and what infrastructure needs to be improved so that we can put together the proper business case. Interestingly, just the announcement of that policy in the last—it's not quite six months since the election and, as I alluded to yesterday, I have had 19 three-hour meetings around the state—there has been tremendous interest in the bike trail.

The Limestone Coast regional tourism group based in Mount Gambier has come up with a cycling and trails policy. It is trying to develop a whole range of trails. The Naracoorte council has put in its budget this year as going forward doing a cycling trail and walking trail from the Naracoorte township out to the Naracoorte Caves. The Murraylands and Riverland tourism bodies have put together cycling and walking trails along the River Murray. I was in Clare last week, or the week before, and they are now looking at wanting to connect the Riesling Trail along the old railway corridor alignment down to the Barossa and eventually into Adelaide. Just that one announcement, looking at what we can do to connect Adelaide and Melbourne, has created tremendous interest in touring cycling.

It is interesting that we always think of the men in lycra and the Lance Armstrongs of this world, but the development of e-bikes, ones that have a battery, assist people with maybe even my physique to ride a bike. I had the pleasure of being offered a ride on an e-bike in Melrose when I was on one of those trips, and it was a life-changing experience. It was like I was 18 again, the speed at which I shot up the road. It was quite amazing. If it can make me feel like an 18 year old then there must be hundreds of millions of people who will come to our state and ride on these great trails.

The budget this year also includes another \$4.9 million to support the hosting of major events in South Australia, which is in addition to the increased funding for the major events bid fund this year. The other really important factor is that the Marshall government has made additional funding for international marketing, another \$10 million for 2019-20, to invest in marketing our great state to the world. The Marshall government wants to showcase South Australia to the world and, clearly, this budget demonstrates that we are committed to doing that.

It is important to note that the visitor economy, as I mentioned yesterday, is a tremendous support to our regional communities, with 41 per cent of visitor expenditure in regional South Australia. By investing in these major events, investing the extra \$10 million of additional marketing expenditure, it includes funding to grow opportunities and merging international markets like China, while maintaining our traditional strong markets of the United Kingdom, Europe, the United States and New Zealand. We will also be running marketing campaigns on the national stage, promoting tourism experiences in Adelaide and South Australia's wonderful regions.

Importantly, the outcomes of the additional marketing spend will be analysed in detail over the next 12 months to ensure an appropriate level of future marketing spend to grow South Australia's economy into the future. The Marshall government is delivering on its commitment to grow the South Australian tourism sector and building a strong foundation for South Australia's future.

#### MAJOR EVENTS

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:58):** Does any of the government's proposed spending on new rail trails involve assessment of those trails for site contamination, given that every railway corridor in South Australia is contaminated by arsenic, which was used—

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** There's no spending involved; this is all doing business cases.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Hunter, I appreciate your—

*The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** I appreciate your willingness to assist—

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** —to suppress weeds—

**The PRESIDENT:** —the Hon. Mr Ridgway in answering the question.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** —and to protect sleepers from termites.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:58):** I thank the honourable member for his question about arsenic. I am sure it was used to kill termites; I'm not sure it suppresses weeds because it is an insecticide rather than a herbicide but, nonetheless, the honourable member is quite right. There are some wonderful opportunities.

There is an old rail corridor from Kingston through Lucindale to Naracoorte. Of course, the existing corridor that runs from Wolseley down to Mount Gambier, although I suspect the most likely part that could be used would be Naracoorte to Mount Gambier, and there is an old one from Beachport through to Mount Gambier. There are also the ones we talked about, the Riesling Trail and up through the Barossa and others.

I know that in Mount Gambier, right in the middle of the city, they have already turned the old railway line into a cycling trail. I am sure members are very familiar with how a railway line works: you have ballast and stone, sleepers and two railway lines. What they have done in Mount Gambier is just put a simple bit of bitumen between the two railway lines. Certainly, in a rail yard in a city where there would have been a lot of movement and a lot of activity, I expect there would have been a much higher potential for contamination. It appears that in the city of Mount Gambier they have been able to put a bitumen strip between the railway lines, and I'm not—

**The Hon. M.C. Parnell:** It's fixable, it just costs money.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** It does cost money and that's part of the assessment, to say, 'How can we do this?' In some cases these rail corridors still have the lines in place: Naracoorte to Mount Gambier; Lucindale to Naracoorte, no; Beachport to Millicent, no; but Millicent to Mount Gambier, yes; and up through the Barossa, the Riesling Trail, the lines have been gone for years.

Again, that's not part of the Adelaide to Melbourne bike trail assessment, but that is exactly why we've committed some money to do this, to talk to the local communities and say, 'Where would you like it to go?' If you get to Kingston, do you want to go around the coast and into Mount Gambier, or do you want to go across to Naracoorte, down to the world heritage-listed Naracoorte Caves? I think former minister Hunter may have teased everybody with a little bit of money into redeveloping the Naracoorte Caves. I heard there was a \$20 million program, but he did not ever fund that, unfortunately. But then, of course, for those in this place who might like some lovely Coonawarra wine, you can go through the Coonawarra—

**The PRESIDENT:** Hon. Mr Ridgway, you are really straying off the point here.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I'm just trying to emphasise how important these rail trails are.

**The PRESIDENT:** Stick to the question.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** That is exactly why we want to talk to the community: where do you want it to go? We won't be able to do them all in the first instance. So we actually want the community to have some input, and it will be about local businesses, the ones that can provide food and refreshment and overnight accommodation, where they might exist, bed and breakfast, on that trail. We are looking at the rail trails. I don't think that arsenic contamination will be a significant problem, but I take on board the honourable member's question and, if there's an issue with arsenic, I will bring back some reply at some point in the future.

#### LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:01):** My question is to the Treasurer.

1. What consultation did the government undertake with the Legal Services Commission before announcing the efficiency dividend announced in the budget?

2. Has the government undertaken any modelling on how this will affect the already stretched services of that organisation?

3. Does the Treasurer acknowledge the increased pressure this measure will have on other crucial pro bono services like that offered by JusticeNet?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:02):** The detailed arrangements in relation to individual decisions in minister's portfolios, such as the Attorney-General's, are essentially the responsibility for the individual minister, so in this case the Attorney-General. In relation to the general

process, the budget process, given the confidentiality of cabinet—I was asked this question in relation to decisions in relation to the Adelaide Remand Centre, for example—does not provide for a provision where you go out and consult directly the individual institutions or organisations that might be impacted because it's all part of the confidential budget process within cabinet.

But in relation to, obviously, getting advice, ministers are in the position, with policy officers, right up to the chief executive officer of his or her department, to get advice to say, 'Okay, this particular decision in our view will have this particular impact in this particular way.' So the Attorney-General in this case, but ministers generally, would take advice from the senior advisers they have within the department, and that doesn't mean that there is direct consultation in all instances with individual groups or organisations that are being funded by that particular department, it would be the view of the people within the minister's department in relation to the potential impact.

So the minister would be aware of advice on most occasions, I would imagine, from people within his or her department in relation to what they saw as the impacts. That view can and has, on many occasions in the past, differed from the view of the individual stakeholder groups; that is, the view that the department might have as to a particular savings dividend may well be significantly different from the view the stakeholder or the organisation might have.

I have seen enough of these over the years to accept the fact that one particular decision of a government may be viewed in one way by a minister's department but viewed completely differently by another organisation that is directly funded, or not, by the department.

#### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:05):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health regarding SA Pathology.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON:** On 17 February 2015, the member for Chaffey said the following:

'They're on call and they come out at any hour to provide a service and that's something that if pathology were to be privatised, may not occur anymore.

'Potentially, we could have also seen higher charges for pathology tests.'

My question to the minister is: does the minister agree with the member for Chaffey's comments that privatising SA Pathology could lead to higher charges?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:05):** As I said in relation to the comments of the honourable member for Stuart, I am not going to give a commentary on comments by members of the other place. What I am accountable to this house for is the commitments of this government and the commitment that we have made in the budget to make sure that we maintain quality services for South Australians.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I can't hear the minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Quality services for South Australians in an efficient and effective way. That is why we have announced the Pricewaterhouse review, which will be underway for about six months. But let's highlight the hypocrisy of Labor, when it comes—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, hold for a moment. Can the Hon. Mr Ridgway and the Hon. Mr Wortley cease their conversation because I cannot hear the minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** If the honourable member is suggesting that the privatisation or outsourcing is somehow anathema to good public health services then I would ask him: why did the former Labor government run radiology services through Modbury Hospital and through Noarlunga Hospital?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** At least part of the services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital are provided by private providers.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Hunter, honourable Leader of the Opposition, I literally cannot hear the minister. Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** And in relation to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister. I cannot hear the minister, therefore I cannot rule on any point of order that you may wish to bring up. Minister, can we just start again on that little bit.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Yes, I do humbly apologise to the Chair for not having made the points more clearly. In relation to the hypocrisy of Labor suggesting that outsourcing or privatisation is anathema to public health, let the Labor Party explain: why did they therefore provide radiology services at Modbury and Noarlunga through private providers and a significant portion of the radiology services at Lyell McEwin through private providers? In relation to quality—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, sit down. Point of order.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Sir, now that you have had an opportunity to hear what the minister has been saying, it doesn't come anywhere near to answering what was asked. A question was asked about the member for Chaffey's comments. He has not referred to that at all, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** Various parliamentary commentaries allow the minister some latitude to answer the question. If I could listen to the minister then I would be able to rule on your point of order. Minister, continue.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** If there was any sense in the honourable member's question, there was some implication that private services could not be quality and safe. What I would say to the members opposite is: why, therefore, are there 14 country hospitals—14 country hospitals—where the radiology services were provided by your government through the private sector? What hypocrisy!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** And this is the opposition who, when they were in government, established the largest privatisation deal ever in the state's history: the NRAH. Twenty-nine years left, \$11 billion—\$1 million a day you are giving to a private company because you thought that privatisation was such a good idea. In relation to other services that the former Labor government provided through the private sector, there are five metropolitan hospitals that receive a significant portion of their hotel services through the private sector: Flinders Medical Centre, Modbury Hospital, Lyell McEwin, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Women's and Children's Hospital health services.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I cannot hear the minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** It doesn't stop there. We even have four agencies in SA Health, and SA Health had actually engaged the private sector in transporting patients. Apparently, it's okay for Labor to have radiology by the private sector, hotel services by the private sector, patient transport by the private sector, but—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Sorry, the NRAH: \$11 billion, \$1 million dollars a day, 29 years. The hypocrisy of the current opposition is amazing. It is as though on 17 March they went through some sort of time warp and suddenly rediscovered their values, that private is bad. What the people of South Australia need to understand when they hear the hypocrisy from the opposition is: why did they keep doing it in radiology when they were in government? Why did they keep doing patient transport through the private sector? And what was the other one?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Hotel services. There are lots. There are just too many examples. I am having trouble remembering them all. What I can assure the people of South Australia is that we will not be dissuaded by the hypocrisy of the Labor opposition in delivering quality safe services to the people of South Australia.

**The Hon. J.E. Hanson:** Supplementary, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** Unfortunately, the Hon. Mr Hanson, the time has actually expired, on the clock that I go off at least. Perhaps you can save it for tomorrow.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Have we finished, the Hon. Mr Wortley?

**The Hon. R.P. Wortley:** I wouldn't go to Port Augusta if I was you.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Wortley, you have had your say.

*Matters of Interest*

#### **DRUG FREE AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:11):** I rise to speak on the important work of Drug Free Australia, which was established in 2004 as the peak body for organisations and family associations around Australia that seek the prevention of illicit drug use and expansion of its availability. Drug Free Australia's vision is to ensure communities, including members of parliament, are well informed about the harms of drug use and are empowered with knowledge to assist in effective policy information.

Indeed, many members in this place may have received emails from Drug Free Australia from time to time, which I personally have found to be very helpful and quite informative, given I hold views that are largely in accordance with their own, in particular on how we should treat the issues of trafficking, sale and manufacturing of illicit substances.

Members may not be aware that the chairman of Drug Free Australia is Major Brian Watters, who was actually the chair of former prime minister John Howard's Australian National Council on Drugs (ANCD), which served as his drug advisory from 1996 through to 2007. During this particular period, I am informed that the national cannabis use was halved, amphetamine use was cut by 40 per cent and heroin use decreased by 75 per cent. Major Watters was also Australia's representative to the United Nations' International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) throughout most of these years, which is an impressive accolade.

As part of their work, and in recognition that legislators require reliable, accurate and up-to-date information with regard to the prevalence of substance abuse in our nation, Drug Free Australia provides briefs to parliamentarians whenever specific issues call for evidence-based clarity. Part of the organisation's work with members of the federal parliament and state parliaments is undertaken through its participation in parliamentary inquiries, where its submissions are often cited at the reporting stage.

Drug Free Australia's research director calls upon 24 fellows, a group of epidemiologists, addiction medicine specialists, other medicos, PhD psychologists and social researchers to guide its public statements. Over recent years, Drug Free Australia has had extensive input into Australia's drug legalisation debate promoted by Australia21 via its involvement in community forums and discussions on television, radio and other media outlets.

In order to fulfil its mandate, Drug Free Australia runs drug prevention education programs in schools and provides guest speakers for other community groups, service clubs and special interest groups that have an interest in the topic.

It also seeks to keep the public informed on drug statistics and prevention initiatives via press releases to media outlets and mailouts to key stakeholders. In South Australia, Drug Free Australia

commenced surveying a cross-section of schools in the public, independent and Catholic sectors. The results indicated that, whilst some schools did offer drug education programs within their health or physical education classes, a majority did not prioritise the topic due to already crowded curricula.

I am informed that most presenters are happy to receive a gold coin donation for their time and effort to inform our youth of the dangers of illicit drug use when they go out and conduct these seminars, and I certainly commend them for their important work in ensuring they are well equipped to make wise decisions. I would encourage members in the other place to promote the program supported by Drug Free Australia to schools within their electorates.

I am pleased that Drug Free Australia has advised that the Marshall Liberal government's policies concerning the prevention and reduction of drug use and recovery-based treatment and rehabilitation programs closely aligns with its own position. It has indicated that its representatives are always available to members of parliament for consultation, and I look forward to working further with the organisation in the best interests of our state.

### REGIONAL SPORTS CLUBS

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:15):** What is the role of the sports club? For some, it is about health and fitness. For others, it is about competition, about trophies and being one's best. For others, it is about the sports they love—about playing, watching, barracking and cheering. For regional sports clubs, it is all this but so much more. Sports clubs in the country are community hubs. They are places where people gather on a regular basis to socialise and spend time together. They are a tangible sign that they are a community and they have a future.

Because of the importance of sports clubs in the country, the unnecessary cuts made by the Marshall Liberal government to the Female Facilities Program are particularly heartless. The former Labor government had fully funded a total of \$24 million to upgrade female facilities in sports clubs around the state. I emphasise: this program was fully funded. This Liberal government has not just ended future rounds of the Female Facilities Program but has also cut round 3, which took applications until April and was expected to announce by 31 July which clubs would receive grants.

This cut will prevent the proposed upgrade of the Kalangadoo War Memorial Park and Community Sports Club, a club that has over 500 members, with roughly half of them being female. The club's committee has been working to provide a safe and inclusive facility, to ensure future development of the club and increase overall participation in sports, including football, netball, tennis, bowling, cricket and women's football.

As I mentioned, clubs were expecting to hear the outcomes of round 3 funding in July. Instead, on Monday this week the club learned that the funding had been scrapped altogether. It is fair to say, they felt quite devastated. They had put in a huge amount of work on their grant application and, following feedback in previous rounds, were quietly confident that their bid would be successful.

The Wattle Range Council had committed \$65,000 to the project and the club was seeking \$313,000 from the Female Facilities Program. When I visited the club a couple of weeks ago, members remarked to me that they were embarrassed when they hosted opposing teams, given the poor condition of their clubrooms. Champion netballer Jade Peacock told me that some of the players get changed in their cars as their change rooms are so inadequate. I was talking to the club president, Andre Carlson, on Monday. He described the funding cut as a real kick in the guts. This is not good enough.

The Marshall Liberal government like to throw around the slogan 'Regions matter', but when it comes to delivering realistic support for regional sports clubs they are absent. The Kalangadoo War Memorial Park and Community Sports Club is a growing club and is attracting players from around the region, including Millicent and Mount Gambier. They need this money more than ever to help them grow as a club and attract players from all around the South-East. The sports minister, Corey Wingard, has said:

Clubs and councils will be required to contribute at least 50 per cent of the project costs for future funding programs.

This is simply not viable for many clubs and many councils. Essentially, he is saying the local council must stump up more money to fund this project. This is rather ironic, really. After all, the Liberal Party



claimed before the election that they would not cost-shift onto local government. In fact, the Treasurer, then the shadow treasurer, wrote to Wattle Range Council on 13 February this year and stated, 'A Marshall Liberal government will not continue cost shifting to local councils.'

The fact is, neither the council nor the Kalangadoo War Memorial Park and Community Sports club can afford to fund 50 per cent of this project on their own. I have campaigned for the funding to be guaranteed and will continue to pressure the Marshall Liberal government to reverse these cuts and to provide suitable facilities for the local community.

### STATE DROUGHT

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:20):** Today, I wish to speak about the Murphy's Law approach by our state government to the dire situation unfolding in parts of Eyre Peninsula and the Mid North. The farmers are calling it a drought, but members of the Marshall government refuse to use the 'D' word just yet. After trawling through the budget papers, it was disappointing to see the Treasurer has not allocated much to help some of these battling farmers, many of whom are too proud to put out their hand.

In the past two weeks I have travelled to the worst affected areas and it is heartbreaking. My first stop was the properties of Simon and Stephanie Schmidt. They straddle the almost aptly named Worlds End and Geranium Plains near Robertstown. It is a rather astonishing 15-minute journey going from the lush green acres of Clare, Goyder Valley and Burra to then come across the desolation of the Schmidts' land over what is known as Goyder's line. It is incredible that only a short distance separates two very contrasting environments.

The Schmidts are a young family. Simon is a fifth-generation farmer in the district with about 4,000 acres. He carries a permanent smile and an air of optimism. Simon's dad still works his own property at nearby Geranium Plains. They have not had any rain to speak of for almost a year and a half. Rainfall figures for Robertstown over the last 100 years show it is the worst on record. Their barren paddocks are a sea of red dust. Topsoil has blown across dirt roads. He jokes that he could grow mushrooms on them. Stoically they maintain a sense of humour, but in reality have little or no hope of getting anything of what they have optimistically sown.

Their sheep are scrawny because there is no feed. Simon's dad has resorted to using Mallee leaves. Neighbours have ventured far and wide for anything sheep can eat, like orange peel, onions, low-grade potatoes, even waste lettuce from McDonald's outlets. Simon normally runs 1,000 sheep, but is down to 140, which run freely so they can try to find a blade of grass. Ewes are abandoning their lambs. One consolation is the good price for sheep and wool, so farmers like the Schmidts are selling off stock, including breeding animals, to make ends meet. It is a catch 22 situation. It means they will not have many next year, further compounding their situation. Simon calls it a financial drought—idle, mortgaged assets soaking up their savings.

Disappointingly, they told me no government member has taken the time to take a look for themselves. During an interview on the ABC's *Country Hour* on 31 July, primary industry minister Tim Whetstone declared, 'I don't want to say drought until we have to say the word.' I think a farmer knows a drought when he sees one.

Over on Eyre Peninsula they are also doing it tough around the districts of Kimba and parts of Wudinna and Cleve. But Cowell was the eye-opener. Peter Webb is in an even worse predicament than the Schmidts. Thousands of acres are barren, although light, steady rain was falling on this day I went, the first he had seen in eight months. His sheep were being shorn and after the fleece were removed a thick line of red dirt was caked onto their skins.

I then travelled along what was once the Bungalow Road running through his property. So much topsoil has been windblown over it that it is at fence level, creating dunes. The only way over it is with a four-wheel drive and the experience was like traversing the Sahara Desert. It was quite heartbreaking hearing Mr Webb's story. He became quite emotional when he recounted the truck load of hay sent to the area by the children at Owen School, where they are selling wristbands to raise money for needy farmers. When I told him the state government did not believe they were in drought, he simply wiped the tears from his eyes and said, 'Tell them to come and have a look.'

Farmers like the Schmidts and Mr Webb simply want their areas declared drought affected so they can access further federal assistance and other grants for projects like the one in Cowell that will connect mains water to more than 22 farms. It is affecting their incomes and their health and mental wellbeing. As we know, there is also a drought of doctors and mental health specialists in these regions. Time is not on their side. They cannot wait for a task force to sit it out for a few weeks in the hope a saturation comes.

### **AUSTRALIAN WAR GRAVES**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:25):** I rise today to share with the chamber my experience in France and Belgium this year as a representative of the government and the people of South Australia. I was humbled to visit the war graves in Tyne Cot cemetery, Hill 60, VC Corner and Pheasant Wood. These cemeteries are the final resting places for many Australian soldiers who left this country to travel to the other side of the world and fight on the Western Front—soldiers who courageously fought to protect our values and freedoms. As a result, these soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice. These cemeteries do not just represent the sacrifice of those soldiers but the sacrifice made by their families who did not have the fortune of their loved ones returning home.

Flanders is a name that is familiar to many Australians. It was here in 1917 where the Third Battle of Ypres took place. This battle is commonly known as the Battle of Passchendaele and was a major offensive against the German line and one of the largest in the war. Australian forces were heavily involved throughout the fighting in an effort to prevent a German blockade, with German troops redeploying from the Eastern Front.

Playing a pivotal role, Australian divisions participated in the First Battle of Passchendaele, Menin Road, Polygon Wood, Broodseinde and Poelcappelle, much of which was fought in horrific conditions. These battles were also known as the Battle of Mud. Heavy rain and artillery bombardment damaged the area's drainage system to such an extent that fields became impassable. As a result of the mud, soldiers lying wounded on the battlefield often drowned in the mud. By the end of the fighting, Australian casualties numbered 38,000. Because of the sacrifices made by Australia's young men, Tyne Cot is deeply moving and sombre. Its cemetery holds the largest contingent of commonwealth war graves, including the highest number of Australian war graves in any one location, totalling 1,369 servicemen.

Following my visit to Tyne Cot, I was honoured to pay my respects to those Australian soldiers who gave their lives at the Battle of Hill 60 in 1915. Hill 60 cemetery lays on the battlefield from 1915, as those who died in the fighting would be buried amongst the trenches shortly after. The cemetery itself came into being during the fighting and only grew following the end of the war. It is where casualties of the Australian 18<sup>th</sup> Battalion and the Australian 9th Light Horse Regiment still lie.

I was also fortunate to attend the cemeteries at VC Corner and Pheasant Wood in Fromelles to commemorate the sacrifices made by Australian soldiers in Fromelles. In particular, the Battle of Pozzières was a significant firefight for the Australian armed forces in World War I. The town itself was of great strategic importance. Its position would allow the forces to dominate the ridge line along the front.

During these battles, Australian soldiers forged bonds with local Belgians and French, which carry on to this day. A clear example of this is the history between the Australian armed forces and the town of Blangy-Tronville. The focal point of the tribute in Blangy-Tronville was the local school. Here it was evident that this town has never forgotten the sacrifice made by the Australian soldiers. I was fortunate enough to meet the Mayor of Blangy-Tronville, Mr Eric Gueant, and a number of his city councillors. They made me very, very welcome. Together, we paid tribute to those who served in the Battle of Villers-Bretonneux.

To commemorate the Centenary of World War I, Blangy-Tronville changed the name of its school to the Arthur Stribling School. Private Arthur Stribling was a South Australian man from Tarlee who passed from wounds sustained at Villers-Bretonneux. His sacrifice was chosen as a symbol for those who died fighting for the 50th Australian Infantry Battalion and those who are serving to protect the freedoms and values that both Australia and France share. I once again wish to thank Veterans SA for their exemplary work in organising these visits for me.

## BOOKS NOT BOMBS

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:29):** I rise today to speak about a movement to disarm our universities. That movement is Books Not Bombs. Quite obviously, its aim is that universities be about books not bombs. But right now the federal government is pouring billions and billions of dollars into what they are calling the defence industry. Let's be honest, they are pouring all of this money into what should be called the 'harm industry', an industry whose very stock in trade is the perpetuation not only of human misery but, indeed, the violation, often, of human rights. While I am here making this speech, just a few doors down North Terrace, Adelaide is currently hosting Land Forces 2018, an international industry exposition to showcase equipment, technology and services for the armies of Australia and the Indo-Asia-Pacific. Outside, the Quakers are staging peaceful protest.

This federal government, however, has a vision for our universities that is not one of academic aspiration and opportunity, not one of free and high-quality accessible education. Indeed, it is one that is to turn Australia into one of the top 10 arms exporters on the planet and, worse, to make our universities a key part of that plan. The government needs skilled graduates to grow and sustain these military and weapons industry wet dreams, but intensifying the ties between universities, the Department of Defence and weapons manufacturers is simply not ethically justifiable.

Australia is already one of the wealthiest countries on the planet, and our political leaders want to make us just that little bit richer by trading in global misery. The federal Liberal government, under former prime minister Malcolm Turnbull, has committed \$3.8 billion to push the Australian arms export industry, \$3.8 billion on an industry that profits from war, from violence, from genocide and from human rights abuses; \$3.8 billion on all of this while, more broadly, universities are being starved of funding and people are being forced to pay back their so-called student debts earlier and earlier than ever before.

On top of this, we are seeing more and more troubling and uncomfortable links between universities and the defence and arms industries in our country. Twenty-five million dollars will be spent on a university research deal with the US military, with five Australian universities reportedly participating. The research program they are participating in aims to create, as was described by now minister Christopher Pyne, 'game changing military capabilities', because, you know, killing people is a game.

Some other parties have also bought the lies with a pork-barrelling race to the bottom in our electoral campaigns run on building more and more subs and avoiding a so-called valley of death literally by profiting from death itself. It is a perverse and expensive job creation scheme of little social benefit, and public funds should and could be spent in much better ways. For example, as SACOSS has suggested, one less sub perhaps raising the rate of Newstart and having an equivalent boost to our state economic books, thus eradicating misery rather than perpetuating it.

But this is not just a fervour confined to politicians. In South Australia, our three main universities are all part of a research network funded by BAE Systems, the UK weapons manufacturer. These partnerships raise serious ethical concerns. BAE Systems has faced allegations of bribery and fraud. Its airplanes are currently used in Saudi Arabia's current bombardment of Yemen. These partnerships also place academic freedom at risk, where military-funded research will be expected to demonstrate military value.

As Australian research councils struggle and we see a culture of cuts to our universities, academics with limited funding options may be driven to seek military funding. This has the potential to undermine their control over the direction and use of their research. It does not have to be this way. Education of course used to be free, driven by an idea that it should be not money but merit and a funded, fair taxation system that drives our educational priorities.

Perversely, however, the more we have seen credentialism creep into the higher education sector, that very expense that is required now increasingly on those students has been borne by those individual students. Yet, education is an investment, not a social cost, and a fair taxation system would take a share of your wealth, not your wisdom. Importantly, our education system does not need to be interlinked and dependent on a global harm industry. That is why I support Books Not

Bombs and was happy to speak at its launch. That is why we need to stop investing in human misery and suffering, as the campaign call says, to fund books, not bombs, and to create a university culture that builds metaphorical bridges, not blows them up.

#### **WEATHERSPOON, MS PAIGE**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:34):** During the winter sitting break, I made the most of the opportunity to spend some time in regional communities. I was even brave enough to make a brief comeback to the hockey field after 15 years to play for Minlaton at my old home ground in Maitland.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Wait, I will get to that in a second. My family were incredibly excited because it rained for the first time in months, but I have to say a hailstorm does not really make for a great hockey game. As I know you are all dying to know, we lost 12-0.

**The Hon. C.M. Scriven:** It was the hail.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** It was the hail, but I think the fullback even got a goal against us, so it was a terrible game. Despite the indisputable loss on the hockey field, I did have much more success at the doors of homes in Kadina, Wallaroo Mines and in the Barossa region. The thing I love most about regional South Australia is you can always count on honest but friendly chats. Whether it was from the doors of residents living in Penrice, Angaston or Wallaroo Mines, there was a resounding, strong appreciation for backing local community.

In particular, I would like to touch on time spent in Wallaroo with the leader of the state Labor Party, the member for Croydon from the other place, during one of his many visits through his Labor listening forums in South Australia. The 23<sup>rd</sup> of August turned out to be a big day in politics, but much of the conversation at the Wallaroo Anglers Inn was not based around the uncertainty of who would be our next prime minister. Residents were more concerned about what was happening in their backyard, and it is a shame our federal colleagues were not doing the same thing.

The reason why I want to discuss this event is to bring to the chamber's attention two special guests who joined us at the Wallaroo Anglers Inn: Nicky and Dwayne Weatherspoon. What makes the Weatherspoon family story so chilling—

**The PRESIDENT:** Would you like to take a break? I call the Hon. John Dawkins, and we will come back to the Hon. Ms Bourke.

#### **R U OK? DAY**

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:37):** I rise today to speak about the World Suicide Prevention Day and R U OK? Day that will be commemorated next week. I am very pleased to commend a number of activities that are happening around the state on both of those days but also I think on the weekend preceding them and throughout the week. Obviously, World Suicide Prevention Day is always on 10 September, so that will be next Monday, and R U OK? Day is held on 13 September.

I think the response to both of those days has increased enormously in recent times. While I have had a specific focus on suicide prevention for many years, I think the advent of R U OK? Day has been very helpful because there are some people who have not been ready to grasp the topic of suicide prevention directly but have been ready to perhaps take on the aims of R U OK? Day. I think both of those events are very well intertwined within the community.

Today, in the House of Assembly, the member for Waite, Mr Sam Duluk, moved a motion particularly around R U OK? Day, and many members of that chamber spoke very well about activities in their own electorates around R U OK? Day particularly but also around many of the activities to do with World Suicide Prevention Day as well as their own local suicide prevention networks and other associated groups.

To highlight some of the things that are happening next week, currently we have the Suicide Prevention Networks' stand at the Royal Adelaide Show. I was a significant part of that last year and will take part again this weekend. I commend the volunteers and members of the trained staff from the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist and, from my own office of the Premier's Advocate for

Suicide Prevention, staff who have also been trained and are handing out StaySafe kits to members of the public. Each kit contains two tea bags and two wallet cards, and I think it also adds to the discussion about these matters. I witnessed that at last year's Show.

Also at the Showgrounds on Sunday is the annual Ride Against Suicide, which is being run for the third consecutive year. Motorbike riders commence from three locations, Nuriootpa, Mannum and Two Wells, and come to the Showgrounds on the afternoon of the final Sunday of the Show. I will be participating on Sunday morning in the Onkaparinga Seaside Walk for Suicide Prevention, which will run from the Esplanade at Port Noarlunga South to Moana. I commend that event and many others that are commemorating this time of the year when many people come together to advocate awareness about the impacts of suicide and mental illness.

Next Monday evening, in the company of the member for Narungga, I will be attending the showing of the film *The Ripple Effect* at the Maitland Town Hall, which will be conducted by the SOS Yorke suicide prevention network. Also next week, MATES in Construction are holding an industry leaders' lunch, at which I have been invited to speak. I have had a long association with MATES in Construction and the work they do in the construction industry to prevent suicide in that sector.

All of the volunteers involved in the groups that are running these events are to be commended. I am delighted that so many people, including members of parliament from across the electoral divide, are right behind these efforts. It is very welcome and I look forward to seeing many people at all these events next week.

#### **WEATHERSPOON, MS PAIGE**

**The PRESIDENT:** Ms Bourke, I will take it that you have gone one minute in, so you will have four minutes.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:42):** Sorry about before.

**The PRESIDENT:** No, don't apologise.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** What makes the Weatherspoon family's story so chilling is that, like me and I am sure many in this chamber, we have nursed a sick child through high temperatures. I vividly remember the day communities across Yorke Peninsula and, undoubtedly, communities across the state were heartbroken by the Weatherspoon family's story in June of the year 2000. When Nicky and Dwayne's toddler, Paige, complained of feeling tired and running a temperature, it appeared that she had a typical childhood virus.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Bourke, I am—

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Mr President, is another honourable member able to continue?

**The PRESIDENT:** No, but we have a couple of options. The Hon. Ms Bourke, you can complete or you can seek leave to conclude your remarks and come on a little bit later on this afternoon, or you can seek leave to have it inserted into *Hansard*. I am happy—

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** No, I will be fine.

**The PRESIDENT:** Would you like to continue?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** It appeared that Paige had a typical childhood virus and she was tucked into bed to rest. Nicky had already endured a harrowing week after her mum had passed away from terminal cancer only a few days prior.

By evening, Paige complained of sore legs, and Nicky noticed bruise-like spots appearing. This prompted Nicky to take Paige to the surgery, only to be told that it was probably a virus and to come back in the morning if she wasn't better. At 2am Nicky had a very bad feeling and rushed Paige to hospital. Nicky and Dwayne lost their beautiful Paige at 3am on Saturday 24 June in the year 2000 to meningococcal.

Their story they have so bravely shared since this first annual violet day, where they turned the streets of the Yorke Peninsula purple, Paige's favourite colour—and that is why I am wearing my jacket today—to help create community awareness, has contributed to the passing of the

meningococcal vaccination being free for young children—a policy decision fought for by Labor, but thankfully supported by both sides of this chamber.

I am not going to turn this into political point scoring—there is no need. Nicky and Dwayne's experience of turning adversity into lasting community awareness and change is nothing but commendable. It goes without saying that Paige will never be forgotten by her family, her friends and her community. But perhaps what the Weatherspoon family did not anticipate was how the foundation would bring awareness that would go on to help create lasting change for children across South Australia.

I strongly encourage members to visit the Paige Weatherspoon Foundation website to read the Weatherspoon story in full and to show their support, and I do apologise for being so emotional.

**The PRESIDENT:** There is no need to apologise.

#### *Motions*

### **SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR**

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:47):** I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the South Para Reservoir, which is the most recent and largest of the reservoirs in the South Para system;
2. Highlights the importance of water storage to supply urban and industrial areas;
3. Takes note of the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary to be celebrated with a book launch, bus tours and barbecue to be held at the Senior Citizens/RSL Hall, Williamstown, on Saturday 13 and Sunday 14 October 2018 from 11am;
4. Recognises the enormous contribution to the construction of the reservoir by migrants from other countries and the community feeling, which quickly developed amongst the families which lived on site; and
5. Acknowledges the work of the organising committee and the sponsors of the event SA Water, Williamstown Hotel, Williamstown Post Office and Smith Bros.

This year, the South Para Reservoir celebrates the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its official opening on Friday 17 October 1958 by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, then premier of South Australia. Citizens will celebrate the anniversary with a book launch, bus tours and a barbecue at the senior citizens RSL Hall in Williamstown on Saturday 13 and Sunday 14 October.

Long-time poet, writer and storyteller Martin Johnson from Gawler will release his second edition of *Twenty Houses*, an anecdotal history of the building of the South Para Reservoir to coincide with the anniversary. Mr Johnson has been the leader in the movement to celebrate this anniversary, in fact it was some time ago that I first learnt that the anniversary was coming up, and he has been very active in getting a committee together to work on this anniversary.

Mr Johnson has worked with SA Water, which obviously is the owner and operator of the site, to get them to provide some access to the site because unfortunately these days there is no public access to the site, something that is vastly different from the days of my youth when certainly a number of us from my area can remember going to the South Para Reservoir for recreation and enjoyment as young people. It is a place that is worth seeing. I did raise last year with the then minister, the Hon. Mr Hunter, the issue of getting SA Water to assist with the celebration of this milestone, but also to allow some public access on that weekend.

The potential of the site was recognised many years before its establishment and was actually referred to in a report to the parliament back in 1878. The reservoir was originally constructed in response to rapid population growth—largely a result of postwar immigration—and industrial development in South Australia. Costing \$6.4 million, the reservoir took almost a decade to construct, from 1949 to 1958, with predominantly migrant workers undertaking the project, most of them living on site during the construction period.

South Para Reservoir is the newest and largest of the reservoirs in the South Para System. The other reservoirs are the Barossa Reservoir and the Warren Reservoir. South Para Reservoir is

situated between Williamstown and Para Wirra Conservation Park. The site of the dam is immediately below the confluence of the two main tributaries of South Para River—Malcolm Creek and Victoria Creek. The reservoir is surrounded by nature reserve and has been a focus of two major revegetation projects: the first in the late 1950s, when over 5,000 trees and shrubs were planted, and the second as part of the South Australian government's Million Trees initiative.

As we all know in our climate, reservoirs are South Australia's primary water storage areas. Their existence is critical to the supplying of water to urban and industrial areas across the state. The South Para Reservoir is situated in the electorate of Schubert, but many of those with a strong connection to the construction history live in the electorates of Light and King and in many other areas.

As I said, I have many memories of going to South Para as a young person, and I know many other people do too. It is important that as many people are aware of this celebration. I know the committee has gone to great lengths to bring it to the attention of the general public. Last year, I attended an official launch of the anniversary celebrations, which was held in Café Nova in Gawler. I note that the member for Light was in attendance. I am also aware that the member for Schubert, Mr Knoll, is well aware of this anniversary, as is the Minister for Environment and Water.

I will be attending as much of the celebrations as I can, and I urge others to take part if they wish to. As I said earlier, I think it is very important that the work of Mr Martin Johnson, which he published some years ago, is going to be republished because it gives a great snapshot of the efforts that were taken, under some difficult conditions, to construct that reservoir and the fact that so many of the families involved in the construction were people who had been very recent migrants to this country. Many of those families have remained in that general area and have become very important members of the communities of Williamstown and Gawler, the northern suburbs and other parts of the Barossa and other places close by.

For anybody who has met him, Martin Johnson himself is a great character of Gawler and the surrounding areas. He has an ability to get people involved in projects that he thinks are worthwhile. I commend him and the other members of the organising committee for the work they have done to commemorate what is an important milestone of a piece of infrastructure that is very important to South Australia.

I also indicate that I would like members to make a contribution, if they wish to, on the next Wednesday of sitting. It is unusual to ask to bring something to a vote that quickly, but I would like to conclude this debate before the actual 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary and unfortunately I have not that long ago realised that the only sitting week before then is the next sitting week, which is a fortnight away. I will be communicating with members, hopefully later this afternoon, just to ask anybody who wishes to contribute to this motion to do so on 19 September, if they would.

Once again, I think this indicates that people in South Australia are proud of their history. This is, as I said, an area of South Australia that was identified in the 1870s as having the potential for a great reservoir. It wasn't completed until probably 80 years later, but now we are about to celebrate its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary. I commend the motion to the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

#### *Bills*

### **SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:56):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to make provision for the registration of social workers, to establish the social workers registration board, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:57):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I introduce this bill today with great excitement and positivity, and I hope it will be viewed in a collaborative spirit in this place. It is a bill that would make an act to make provision for the registration of social workers, establish the social workers registration board and associated purposes. Before I go much further, I would like to acknowledge and thank the many members of the Australian Association of Social Workers, some of whom are in the chamber with us today, and many of whom are watching us on the live stream. I have been very fortunate to work with them and to receive their support in the drafting of this bill. I know that they are all looking forward to seeing this bill hopefully progress through this parliament.

I also want to acknowledge the extraordinary and valuable work that the Australian Association of Social Workers and its members do each and every day. It may surprise members of the community, but it possibly is no surprise to members of the council, that there is currently no form of legal professional registration for social workers in Australia, despite many organisations, parties, reports and individuals calling for this reform for an incredibly long time.

The Australian Association of Social Workers is by no means alone in that call. In fact, the current Marshall government promised this reform in its 2018 election platform, and back in the days of then minister Snelling and the former Labor government there were also some positive noises in this direction. Indeed, one of the first bills I ever handled for the Greens in this place was a bill for the registration of professional bodies. Even at that time, it was still a longstanding sore point that social workers were not included in that work.

This reform has been a long time coming. It was called for in the Layton report. It was called for in the Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry. It was called for by a South Australian parliamentary committee. It was called for in the inquest into the death of Chloe Valentine. But, despite all of these calls and more than two decades of these calls, we are yet to see action, and we have waited long enough.

This reform is vital to ensure adequate standards. Around the country there are thousands—literally thousands—of social workers working outside of a regulatory framework, which means that there are the risks of clients being unaware of their workers' qualifications, skills and ethical obligations. The Australian Association of Social Workers has been pursuing registration of social workers as it is a means of enforcing safe and competent practice and it further protects the public from practitioners who do breach those ethical standards.

While there is currently a self-regulatory system within the Australian Association of Social Workers, it is a very limited one and it is only those who are members who can be investigated. Also, the penalties are, of course, most limited. Registration would allow for legally enforceable probity, qualification and practice standards and for these to be a requirement for entry into the profession. It would also allow for the maintenance of continuing professional development as a requirement for maintaining that registration and accreditation. This can give the public greater confidence that our social workers are qualified and conform to that ethical practice.

The bill provides for a registration board with powers to investigate complaints and enforce penalties for practitioners who breach those competency and ethical standards. By doing this, the bill can help to ensure that individuals who are not qualified, who are underqualified, or who act unethically, are less likely to enter the profession and, certainly, to remain in the profession. Importantly, the bill will also provide social workers and their profession with greater recognition, improve the perception of the profession in the public and, of course, in the media.

As I have noted, social workers do some incredible work each and every day and there are a wealth of good news stories out there. But, more often than not, it is the bad news stories that the public and the media focus on. It is the few bad news stories that are the ones that get reported, and this can have a negative impact on the profession and its perception. By being better able to regulate how that social work is carried out, I would hope that we would avoid those bad news stories as much as possible. I am cognisant that they are not just stories: they are, of course, real lives of real people—some very vulnerable members of our community. We, as parliamentarians, owe them a duty of care to do all that we can to ensure the best possible professionals are taking care of them.

Given the pre-election support and commitments from both the Labor and the Liberal parties, I am hoping that, with collaboration and indeed working with crossbenchers as well, we can make



good progress, finally, with the bill. I look forward to South Australia becoming the first state in Australia to register and properly recognise social workers.

We have heard time and time again that there have been stumbling points at a federal level, at a COAG level. The bill provides a way forward, a first step—an essential step—and unless somebody takes that first step, we will continue to hear, possibly for more decades, that it is all too hard at the COAG level. It should not be too hard. It is our duty of care to some of the most vulnerable members of our community and it is something that we can come together and be proud of as a parliament that South Australia could lead the way on the registration of social workers in this country.

With that, I note, for members of this council and members of this parliament, that there will be briefing sessions, and the Australian Association of Social Workers, right across the country, are keenly watching this debate. I also particularly thank the CEO, Cindy Smith, who is here today. Many members across the country are willing to work with members of this parliament to finally have the progress that we need.

I also foreshadow that one member alone cannot come up with a bill that will potentially have such an important role and that the bill should be put to a committee to ensure that we have that public consultation so necessary to get the best bill possible. I look forward to working with you all to achieve that for our most vulnerable members of the community. With those few words, I commend the bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

#### *Motions*

### **LABOUR HIRE REGULATIONS**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:05):** I move:

That regulations made under the Labour Hire Licensing Act 2017 concerning fees, made on 21 June 2018 and laid on the table of this council on 3 July 2018, be disallowed.

Legislation to regulate the labour hire industry under the Labour Hire Licensing Act 2017 came into effect on 1 March 2018. There was a six-month period before the licensing enforcements were to start on 1 September of this year. The Treasurer and the Minister for Industrial Relations laid regulations on this table, I think, on 3 May 2018. Those regulations included the start date of 1 September 2018, which I understand is also in the act as the start date.

A new set of regulations was made on 21 June 2018 and laid on the table on 3 July 2018 that had some minor variances in the fines in relation to the scheme—some were up, some were down slightly—but had completely removed mention of the start date. It would be thought that, if the legislation refers to a start date, it is irrelevant whether the regulations, subordinate legislation, mentions a start date or not, given that the legislation had the start date as 1 September 2018.

In addition, Consumer and Business Services have issued a media release saying they will not be enforcing these important licensing requirements for some time to come. The reason for the disallowance motion is to allow an explanation to be given as to what the hold-up is. What is the reason that this scheme has been held up? This scheme is exceptionally important and was due to start only days ago, on 1 September 2018, but is apparently now not due to start until sometime next year.

I think we need to know why many vulnerable workers who work in the labour hire industry are not being afforded the protection that this scheme would allow them, a scheme that passed this chamber last year. Oddly enough, this scheme in force will actually help with government revenue. From just one industry sector where labour hire operates, the food production industry, ReturnToWorkSA uncovered undeclared remuneration discrepancies in excess of \$100 million that premiums were owed on. In doing that same audit, RevenueSA identified unpaid tax liabilities of some \$650,000.

It was summarised during last year's and the previous parliament's Economic and Finance Committee hearings that if a labour hire provider had just 200 workers on the books and they skimmed \$2 or \$3 an hour from every worker's pay, over a period of time that would add up to a massive amount of income. The disallowance motion provides an opportunity for a debate in this

chamber about the start date of this scheme, why this scheme has not started, why vulnerable workers are not being protected and why we cannot start this scheme immediately.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

### *Bills*

## **SOUTHERN STATE SUPERANNUATION (CHOICE OF FUND) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:09):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Southern State Superannuation Act 2009. Read first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:10):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

An efficient and healthy superannuation system is one of the critical principles in helping Australia meet the economic and fiscal challenges of an ageing population. The country's superannuation pool has accumulated over \$2 trillion in assets. Given its size and growth, the system is of central importance to funding the economy and delivering retirement incomes. A key component of this should be choice and flexibility to the consumer. Regrettably, and in what might be called an unhealthy monopoly, more than 211,000 South Australian public servants are given no choice but to deposit their retirement savings in the state government-owned Super SA superannuation fund.

Anyone who is a public servant in South Australia right now, whether they be a teacher, nurse, emergency service worker or even a member of parliament, must be a member of Super SA. There is no exception to this rule. This means that over 200,000 South Australians are denied the opportunity of selecting their own superannuation scheme of choice by dint of their employment with the South Australian Public Service.

Conversely, public servants working for a federal government department are not subjected to the same restrictions. Indeed, South Australia is the only state that forces public sector employees to join a specified super scheme. That is not to say that the funds offered by Super SA are not performing; they are. Figures released by SuperRatings in July 2018 show that all of the top 20 performers for year are not-for-profit funds, either industry funds, public sector funds or corporate funds. Super SA funds do offer excellent returns to members, including better compounding returns, because contributions are not taxed until they are paid out as entitlements to members.

Members also have the ability to salary sacrifice moneys above the commonwealth's contribution cap. The performance of Super SA funds are not the issue this bill addresses; it is the lack of choice and flexibility provided to SA public servants in choosing their preferred super fund. Sadly, SA is lagging behind other states in the choice of offering to public servants, and it is time we caught up.

For reasons unbeknown to me, the state is barring the entire SA Public Service, a significant number of South Australians, from making their own informed choice about what to do with their retirement savings. Last year, former SA treasurer Tom Koutsantonis said public sector workers had not been asking for the right to leave Super SA; that is simply not the case.

A constituent in the federal set of Mayo earlier this year detailed his situation to my office. That constituent, a teacher employed through DECD, is of course with Super SA. He is 66 years of age and his income protection policy through Super SA ceased when he turned 65. He was wanting to refinance his financial affairs and was told by his financial institution that he cannot refinance unless he has an income protection policy. The constituent was, up until this year, unable to change super providers to one that provides income protection cover until 69 years of age, such as AustralianSuper. While he looked into securing income protection insurance cover privately, he has told us that it comes at a significant cost for limited cover.

The Australian Human Rights Commission's report, 'Working past our 60s: reforming laws and policies' (2012), talks about encouraging insurance companies to extend their coverage of

workers based on health and wellbeing measures and not on age limits. This would protect workers over the age of 65.

I understand that only in the last month Super SA has made changes that address the issue I have just outlined. Although that has now been rectified, it does still highlight the need for further review of the legislation, especially in relation to the choice of super funds more generally.

On a personal note, I have staff who came into their roles in state parliament earlier this year with longstanding existing super funds arrangements. They were faced with a situation of having Super SA accounts open for them for superannuation entitlements due to them in their new positions and also having to decide whether to maintain their existing, longstanding super fund accounts and therefore pay two sets of fees and charges or rolling over those maturing funds into Super SA and closing their pre-existing super fund accounts.

They and many other South Australian public servants should not be faced with this dilemma but instead should have the ability to have their super entitlements paid into the fund of their choice. It is a choice available to state public servants in other states and to those who work for the commonwealth government but, oddly, denied to South Australian public servants. It is time to repeal rules that require SA public sector workers to stay in super funds run by Super SA.

The bill does that for those public servants in the Southern State Superannuation, or Triple S scheme. The bill does not amend the superannuation schemes established under the Superannuation Act 1988. This is because the superannuation schemes created under that act, including a pension scheme, have been closed to new members for many years, although both schemes still have existing members and consequently are not affected by this bill.

The bill has been drafted in such a way because payments under the act are made from the Consolidated Account. As we know, the bill cannot make provision for payment of entitlements to members who opt out of the Triple S scheme, as it would be a money bill and there would be appropriation from the Consolidated Account. Consequently, the bill as drafted refers to matters of the regulations. Firstly, clause 19A(3)(c) provides that an amount standing to the credit of a person's account is to be dealt with in accordance with the procedures set out in the regulations, and section 21(3c) authorises the making of regulations that will allow employers to fulfil their responsibilities under the commonwealth act. This obviously allows us to overcome those issues of a money bill.

In 2017, former federal financial services minister Kelly O'Dwyer said that South Australians are being duded because they have been forced to keep their money in a specified fund even when they might have wanted to change funds or put their money into a self-managed super fund. SA Super is responsible for \$24.4 billion in total assets under management at the end of the past financial year. It has been a quarter of a century since super became compulsory. These sensible reforms are long overdue and deserve to be passed by the parliament. Making it easier for members to get engaged and compare products is an essential prerequisite for driving healthier and safer competition in the super system and ultimately making competition work for members rather than against them.

The Productivity Commission draft report, entitled Superannuation: Assessing Efficiency and Competitiveness, published in April this year, at recommendation 5 stated:

Proposed legislative changes to prohibit restrictive clauses in workplace agreements on members' choice of fund are much needed.

With this bill, SA-Best has delivered the legislative changes required to effect change and provide choice and autonomy to South Australian public servants so that they are on par with every other state and commonwealth public servant. We are keen to work with the government, the opposition and the crossbenches to ensure the bill becomes a reality. I commend the bill to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (MANDATORY REPORTING) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:19):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:19):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

At the outset, I would like to highlight the timeliness of this bill, given that we are in the middle of National Child Protection Week. In May this year, I announced the proposed bill, which I now introduce into the parliament. It seeks to tighten legislation which was passed in 2017 and which will come into effect next month in the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 with respect to mandatory reporting requirements as they pertain to priests.

Under the new laws set to take effect in October, priests who hear confessions about child abuse will have a mandatory obligation to report that matter to police. This change means that South Australia will become the first state in Australia to adopt a specific recommendation of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse to remove the exemption from mandatory reporting for priests hearing confession. However, the act maintains a regulation allowing for the provision of a future exemption. It is imperative that this loophole is closed so that priests cannot be exempted.

Given the Catholic Church's response last week to the recommendations of the royal commission, and against a tsunami of community outrage and disgust, and the church's steadfast refusal to lift the veil of confession, it is crucial that the loophole provided by regulation be closed shut once and for all. We simply and morally cannot allow a possible exception for priests to avoid the obligation to report.

The Catholic Church in Adelaide has already refused to obey the law with respect to the confessional and seeks to place the church's canon law above all else, including the welfare of children. The power and might of the Catholic Church cannot be underestimated in seeking to lobby any government to be exempted through regulation, which would not require legislation. In addition, the bill also broadens the scope of the requirement for priests to report certain child sex offences, including in the course of confession, by specifying a prescribed child sex offence to include murder, rape, use of children in commercial sexual services, incest and child exploitation material and other related offences.

SA-Best has spoken several times now in this place about the sexual abuse of innocent children within our institutions and particularly within the Catholic Church. I do not need to remind my colleagues in this place that victims of sexual abuse within the Catholic Church represent 61.8 per cent, that is two-thirds, of all the victims who bravely came forward to share their unflinching, intensely personal and harrowing stories of abuse to the royal commission.

Damning figures from the royal commission, which heard from 2,489 survivors of child sexual abuse in Catholic institutions, reveal that 7 per cent of Catholic priests abused children between 1950 and 2010. In private sessions, the royal commission heard about child sexual abuse occurring in 964 different Catholic institutions. In one Catholic order—St John of God Brothers—40 per cent of clergy were alleged perpetrators, while one in five Marist and Christian Brothers were the subject of allegations.

It beggars belief and is nothing short of a national disgrace that, within the hallowed walls of the Catholic Church, there was never a whistleblower. There was never someone who had the courage and integrity to break ranks. There was a shocking, appalling, unforgivable, unholy silence. Instead, perverse paedophile priests were protected, moved on to continue their demonic offending in other parishes because those who knew elevated the need to protect the church from the scandal over the need to protect children from harm.

Those who knew preferred to be complicit rather than have the intestinal fortitude to stand up for what they knew was so appallingly wrong. Those who knew preferred to look the other way so that paedophile priests could evade justice rather than face judgement. It was an era that spanned six decades when priests were revered, respected and never, ever questioned.

Of course, while the Catholic Church was the most pervasive in its sexual abuse of children, it most certainly was not alone. There is no doubt that many faiths have been affected by these scandals, and the royal commission has highlighted some of those. It also frequently heard about child sexual abuse in Anglican institutions: 594 survivors, or 14.7 per cent of survivors, who told the royal commission about abuse in religious institutions involving 244 different Anglican institutions; and Salvation Army institutions: 294 survivors, or 7.3 per cent of survivors, who told the royal commission about abuse in religious institutions involving 64 different Salvation Army institutions.

Collectively, these figures are hard to comprehend and they make my skin crawl. I cannot help but think how many more victims there may have been who are not willing or who are unable to speak out because of the complex reasons that this sort of trauma creates. As the royal commission highlighted in its report, the occurrence of child sexual abuse was most common in religious schools and residential institutions, and it is against this backdrop that we need to consider the impact these organisations have had in Australian society, especially given their pivotal role in educational and welfare services to large numbers of children over decades and the considerable government funding they have received for the provision of such services.

It is also important to acknowledge the similar impacts caused to the lives of a large number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, including many who were forcibly removed from their families as children and placed in Christian missions. The royal commission had this to say about confession in its final report:

We are satisfied that the practice of the sacrament of reconciliation (confession) contributed to both the occurrence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church and to inadequate institutional responses to abuse.

We heard in case studies and private sessions that disclosures of child sexual abuse by perpetrators or victims during confession were not reported to civil authorities or otherwise acted on.

We heard that the sacrament is based on theology of sin and forgiveness, and that some Catholic Church leaders have viewed child sexual abuse as a sin to be dealt with through private absolution and penance rather than as a crime to be reported to police.

The sacrament of reconciliation enabled perpetrators to resolve their sense of guilt without fear of being reported.

Also, the sacrament created a situation where children were alone with a priest. In some cases we heard that children experienced sexual abuse by Catholic priests in confessionals.

The example of Father Michael McArdle is sickening and is testament to the need for reform. A notorious paedophile priest, McArdle admitted in confession to child abuse on more than 1,500 occasions—that is one thousand five hundred times—but the advice proffered by clergy was simply that McArdle had to pray more.

McArdle is a prime example for lifting the veil of secrecy of the confessional. McArdle's reign of absolute horror on young children highlights the crucial need for priests to be told by senior leaders that they should report crimes to authorities. McArdle made an affidavit in 2004 stating that he had confessed 1,500 times to molesting children to 30 different priests over a 25-year period: 30 different priests and not one chose to break ranks, not one chose courage over cowardice and not one chose to protect children over the church—not one.

It is an outrage of the most horrific kind, the likes of which this country has rarely seen, but every one of the priests McArdle confessed to would have known that he would continue his offending, which beggars the question: why was he given absolution? Every single time thereafter he clearly did not possess the necessary qualities to obtain absolution, or cared to for that matter, knowing the protection and security he was getting from his church. If his crimes had been reported so many children would have been saved from a lifetime of pain and suffering.

After each confession he said, 'It was like a magic wand had been waved over me.' If only a magic wand could be waved over the abuse and suffering he caused his victims, but we live in the real world where the safety of children must be the paramount consideration.

McArdle was gaoled for six years in 2004 after pleading guilty to indecently dealing with two girls and 14 boys aged eight to 13 between January 1965 and June 1987. He molested altar boys and girls in the confessional, in the presbytery, in the vestry and on church and school camps—places that churches hold most sacred. McArdle was forgiven 1,500 times in face-to-face confessions with his fellow priests and was told merely to go home and pray. But 10 Hail Marys and an Our Father just does not cut it. It is not good enough, and our children deserve better. Lawyer Mal Byrne said it best:

Paedophiles do not stop harming children because they have been to confession. What they are doing is unburdening themselves to a priest in the hope that they might feel a little bit better but then continue to commit their heinous crimes. There is a difference between confessing something just to get it off your chest and make yourself feel better, and confessing in real terms which means proper atonement for what you have done. In the case of paedophilia, this means being properly accountable by handing yourself into police, accepting the penalty that is coming to you and trying to reform. If you are not making that type of confession, why should you be protected?

The many case studies before the royal commission of children sexually abused when they attended confession make for appalling reading and are an illustration of the desecration of the sanctity of the confessional by clergy.

One case involved Luca, who was one of numerous siblings in Malta. His mother had mental health issues and his parents struggled to provide adequate care. Luca was 10 years old when he was placed in a Catholic orphanage and 13 when he and his brothers were placed on a boat bound for Australia as part of the Catholic migration scheme. He was sent to a boys' home run by the Catholic Christian Brothers.

When Luca was 15 years old, Brother Daniels fetched him from his dormitory, took him into another room and instructed him to kneel on the ground, where he was forced to hold out his arms in a crucifix position. Luca said:

I thought he was going to get me to pray or something. He made me kneel down and he put my pyjamas and he tied them around me head, around my eyes. And I felt somebody grabbing my two arms like that. And he lifted my shirt up and dropped my pants down and he masturbated on my back.

Shocked by what had happened, Luca went to confession, where he disclosed the abuse. Despite the seal of confession, the priest told Brother Superior about the incident who, would you believe, punished Luca, the young victim, rather than reporting it.

I cannot fathom a situation where a child goes to confession to disclose abuse where a priest would uphold the seal of confession rather than protecting that child. Many dioceses have already issued guidelines or directives along the lines of recommendation 16.48 of the royal commission that confessions for children take place in an open space within the clear line of sight of another adult.

It is time to elevate the wellbeing and safety of our children over those who seek to harm them and above the stonewalling of the Catholic Church, and indeed any other church. The church's refusal last week to abide by the royal commission recommendation is an insult to survivors. Reverend Rob MacPherson, a minister of the Unitarian Church in Adelaide, has steadfastly argued that canon law must not come before the need to protect children.

MacPherson was abused by a member of the clergy under the seal of confession, and suffered as his abuser continued to hold a position of influence in his parish. MacPherson was just a nine-year-old altar boy when a Catholic Church deacon violently raped him. He said:

Back then my whole world was the parish, its church and its school. Feeling that I was somehow complicit in the abuse—as many victims do—I sought absolution by confessing the 'sin' of having sex.

Tragically, my confession did remain sealed because the crime went unreported and the perpetrator remained in place. For years, I had to go about daily life in the parish under the knowing eye of my abuser.

MacPherson's life, following his abuse, spiralled out of control, but he was able to make his way back with the help of psychologists and therapists over many years. He argues:

Had mandatory reporting applied at the time and place of my abuse, I could have started on the path of healing earlier—and my abuser brought to justice.

The Catholic Church the world over, and other churches, have justifiably paid a heavy financial price for the culture of secrecy that allowed paedophilia to thrive, but that price is a pittance compared to the holocaust of childhood innocence taken and lives lost through the horrors of sexual abuse. The systematic sexual abuse of children by priests in the Catholic Church throughout Australia, Ireland, the US and across the globe is a Reformation-style scandal, and nothing short of a purge will suffice.

We argue for accountability and transparency in our public institutions and governments, yet the Catholic Church is one of the most secretive organisations on the planet. That culture of secrecy has enabled abuse to continue unabated. It is time for the laity to take back their church. An editorial in the *National Catholic Reporter* recently opined:

The next time you go to Mass and as you kneel in that silence that envelops the church just before liturgy begins, utter a prayer for this battered and wounded body we call the church. Pray for a renewal and inspiration from the Holy Spirit, and pray for a reform of our broken system. Then glance to your left and your right. Kneeling beside you are likely the strongest allies you have in rebuilding a church so badly in need of reform.

Former Melbourne Catholic priest Eugene Ahern, a close friend and supporter of Cardinal George Pell, has said that he has never heard a priest confessing to abuse. He is wrong. Ahern also thinks abuse is now a thing of the past, and again he is wrong. In the final report of the royal commission, the commissioner stated that the risk of sexual abuse of children remains across religious institutions that deal with children in schools, churches and recreational settings. They said that new cases continue to come forward. Ahern feels strongly that all Catholic priests should go to gaol rather than break the sacred seal of confession. Then so be it.

As a parent, nothing terrifies me more than the thought of anyone harming my child, and I know I am not alone. I am sure that everyone in this place who has a child, or a child in their lives who they love, feels exactly the same way. In considering this bill, I ask honourable members to put themselves in the shoes of the countless children who were sexually abused, or even the parents of those abuse victims, and imagine their pain, if just for a minute. If it is faith in God that guides you through life then you would want, for the safety and wellbeing of our children, to put their interests above all else. I commend the bill to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

#### *Motions*

### **GREECE, WILDFIRES**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That this council—

1. Expresses its deep regret at the loss of life of almost 100 people in Mati, east of Athens, from devastating forest fires;
2. Acknowledges that at least 187 people were injured in the blaze, including 23 children, and many more people remain missing;
3. Recognises the efforts of firefighters, the coastguard and volunteers to save lives;
4. Praises the efforts of the Greek Orthodox community in South Australia to raise funds to contribute to the relief effort in Mati; and
5. Offers its deepest sympathies to Greek-Australians who have lost loved ones in Mati.

(Continued from 1 August 2018.)

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:39):** I rise to echo and support the sentiments expressed by my honourable colleagues in support of the motion brought to this place by the Hon. Connie Bonaros, asking that we acknowledge those who are suffering as a result of the wildfires in Mati. As South Australians, we know the real devastation that fires can cause. The empathetic response from members across party lines and across the South Australian Greek, Cypriot, Italian, Jewish, Islamic, African and Indian communities highlights how solidarity and compassion remain the only way for us to solve our common problems.

South Australia is home to so many from a vast array of vibrant and diverse cultures. Our multicultural community thrives when we focus on our common goals rather than the differences that seemingly divide us. I commend all those present at the Greek Orthodox Community's Olympic Hall fundraiser for rallying behind the Greek-Australian community, including the Premier, Steven Marshall, and the opposition leader, Peter Malinauskas.

Out of the ashes of tragedy comes some joy, and this is an example of that joy in the community spirit. It is testament to the resilience and compassion that we can find in South Australia and that we hope for those in Greece. The destruction of at least two-thirds of the houses in the Marathon district, the degradation of the landscape, the hollowed-out cars and the charred villages illustrate how important these fundraising efforts are in ensuring Greece has the provisions necessary to rebuild after this tragedy.

I would like to add my wholehearted support for the firefighters and commend them for battling with gale force winds as they tried to control the blaze. Dimitris Stathopoulos, head of the union of fire brigade employees, called the fire a blowtorch that no-one could stop. We can learn ourselves the importance of investing here in urban planning and fire resources and making sure that those who live near such forested areas are well versed in evacuation procedures and preventative fire measures for their area.

The Greens, of course, have as our four pillars social justice and grassroots democracy, along with peace and nonviolence, and environmental sustainability. The efforts made for those victims in Greece are a perfect example of the kind of advocacy we stand for, and we commend anyone in this place who shows that leadership. From community groups to soccer teams to cultural centres to churches, South Australians have come together to alleviate the social, economic and emotional pain we have seen in Greece.

Here, whether we are fighting to save the Murray or drawing attention to outdated and unjust clauses in our health, social or environmental laws, or simply rallying the community to protect our wildlife, the Greens do support that grassroots democracy as a resource for making progressive change, so we fully support this motion.

I wish to send my deepest condolences to the Greek community, both there and in South Australia, as they mourn those who have lost their lives and livelihoods. The committee of volunteers has my complete support, and our party's complete support, as they continue to raise the much-needed funds for those affected by the fires. I commend the motion.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:42):** The Hon. Rob Lucas has already indicated the government's support for this motion, and today I would also like to add my heartfelt support to the motion. When I learned about the fires in Athens, Greece, I made contact with the Greek Consul General here, Mr Andreas Gouras, straightaway and also contacted Bill Gonis.

There were plans to organise this coordinating committee meeting, which was scheduled on Monday 30 July 2018. I therefore joined the Premier of South Australia in attending the meeting to address the forum. I also contacted SAMEAC straightaway to ensure that Norman Schueler, the chair of SAMEAC, together with other SAMEAC members, was able to make time to attend the forum, because as a multicultural community our strength is well demonstrated. When we are in crisis, we must stand together as one big community.

It was reported in *The Advertiser*, of course, that the Greek fires tragedy is forging community spirit as ethnic groups unite in Adelaide to coordinate fundraising. Almost all the SAMEAC members attended: from the Italian community, the Jewish community, the Vietnamese community, the African communities, the Indian communities, the Islamic communities and the Chinese community. On the night, the Hon. Julian Stefani, a former member of the Legislative Council, offered his great help, assistance and advice, because he has helped many natural disaster fundraising appeals in the past, particularly in the Italian community. He offered his help straightaway and joined the board of the appeal.

I would like to also offer my condolences and deep sympathy to the Greek-Australian community and families who have lost loved ones in the Athens fire. I spoke to many Greek community leaders during the difficult times and they were certainly very grateful that so many community leaders in South Australia have come together to organise many, many fundraisers.



I will put on the record my thanks to Mr Andreas Gouras, Greek Consul General, Mr Bill Gonis, President of the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia, Mr Peter Piros, Chairman of Justice for Cyprus Committee, Andreas Evdokiou, President of Cyprus Community, and Ms Martha Ioannidis, President of the Executive Committee of the Messinian Association of South Australia. I would also like to thank the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese Inter-communities Council of South Australia because they have organised so many quiz nights, soccer matches, afternoon teas and other fundraising efforts aimed at raising funds for the people of Athens, which have shown great solidarity from South Australia.

I would like to also take this opportunity to promote two upcoming fundraisers, if I may. There is a Greek Fires Appeal gala dance, which will happen on 14 September, organised by the Cyprus Community and the Australian Hellenic Medical Charity Incorporated. Get to that, if you can. There is a Greek Fires Appeal live concert happening at Woodville Town Hall on 21 September, so if members can get to that, that would be wonderful as well.

I would like to pay tribute to the efforts of the firefighters, coastguards, doctors, nurses, emergency personnel, social workers and volunteers who assisted in fighting the fire. I would like to give my compliments and praise the whole effort that was conducted by the Greek Orthodox community in South Australia. I commend this motion and thank the honourable member for moving this motion.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:47):** I thank all honourable members who contributed to the motion, including the Hon. Rob Lucas, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Jing Lee, and my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo. I thank you all for your thoughtful and moving words honouring the 97 men, women and children who lost their lives as a result of the wildfires that devastated the seaside town of Mati, Greece, in July.

I have been told by a number of people in the South Australian Greek community in particular that they were moved by the speeches and the acknowledgement from this chamber, and the outpouring of support and sympathy for the many lives so tragically lost and to their families who continue to grieve following this horrific catastrophe.

When I moved the motion, I spoke of the solidarity of the Greek-Australian community throughout Australia and the broader migrant and local community in South Australia who have all united together to assist in the relief and recovery efforts in Greece. A stirring testament to that solidarity is the enormous efforts of the Greek Orthodox churches throughout Australia and the thousands of parishioners and broader community members who have so far raised over \$630,000 in just over a month for the relief effort in Mati, which is quite a contribution if you consider the little money tins going around in churches.

The money is crucial as the people of Mati continue to count the devastating cost of the wildfires and begin the painstaking effort to make sense of what has occurred through a thorough investigation to help them learn valuable lessons and ultimately rebuild, taking whatever action is required in order to protect the Greek people from such a catastrophe in the future.

Currently, Johann Georg Goldammer, Director of the Global Fire Observation Centre, is in Greece leading the independent investigation into the wildfires. He has called for more effort to tackle the threats that fires are increasingly posing throughout the world. He said:

I think we all, including Greece, are entering an era that is determined by a number of factors, where these fires are becoming a bigger threat to all of us. And, indeed, this is where we have to look to develop visions, but also policies and strategies to deal with these issues.

Obviously, since the fires in Greece, we have seen catastrophic and multiple wildfires ravaging California, with the Mendocino Complex wildfire now the largest in the state's history, burning over 459,000 acres and coming on top of ruinous wildfires only the year before. Similar to Mati, the Californian wildfires have also claimed a number of lives.

I have spoken previously about how the tragedy hit so very close to home, not only because of my own heritage and close links to so many Greek-Australians, but also because in South Australia and across the nation, as Australians, we sadly are all too familiar with the utter destruction that bushfires can cause to the landscape, but most devastatingly the heartbreaking loss of life.

The tragic events in Mati and California are salient, sorrowful and stark reminders that Australia's bushfire season is almost upon us and that we must prepare to brace ourselves for a potentially dangerous fire season due to the current drought and dry conditions impacting many parts of regional Australia. We are no strangers to the serious consequences of bushfires here. Our nation's preparedness is at risk from climate change, as bushfire seasons increasingly lengthen and overlap with fire seasons in the Northern Hemisphere and the increasing frequency and severity of heatwaves, storm surges, droughts, floods, cyclones and bushfires are already exposing our vulnerability, including many of our natural ecosystems.

Globally, the length of the fire weather season increased by nearly 19 per cent between 1979 and 2013. These longer fire seasons will reduce opportunities for controlled burning and increase pressure on firefighting resources, something we should all be very concerned about.

In January 2015, a severe bushfire in South Australia caught the nation's attention. The Sampson Flat bushfire caused devastation in the Adelaide Hills region. It raged for six days and destroyed everything in its path, including 12,500 hectares of land, 27 homes, numerous sheds and killed 900 head of livestock. The insured value of damage from those fires was \$36.6 million. The economic impact of bushfires is enormous, due in no small part to the cost of bushfire management and suppression, as well as the loss and damage to infrastructure and businesses.

Finally, when I moved the motion I also spoke about the efforts of world-renowned Adelaide plastic surgeon, Dr Greenwood, who flew to Greece to treat burns victims with a skin repair technology he pioneered in Australia. Dr Greenwood is the director of the Adult Burns Unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and in 2016 was awarded the 2016 SA Australian of the Year award for his world-leading work in burns treatment.

In Greece, Dr Greenwood assisted surgeons to treat the 10 most severely burnt patients from the Mati forest fires, using a biodegradable skin graft substitution called NovoSorb, which he pioneered with the CSIRO following the Bali bombings in 2002. He took 25 sheets of that with him to help in the recovery of the burns victims and had to obtain special exemptions for its use in Greece, where it had not been approved. It is a standout example of brilliant Australian-led innovation and expertise.

I will end by saying that there are two further events that the Hon. Jing Lee has just pointed out to us. On Friday 14 September, the Cyprus community and the Australian Hellenic Medical Charity will host the Greek Fires Appeal Gala Dance at the Cypriot Club with Dr Greenwood and Professor Andreas Evdokiou as special keynote speakers.

On 21 September, the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia will be holding a Greek Fires Appeal concert in aid of the victims and their families. I encourage all members to participate, if they can, to raise much-needed funds to allow the relief effort to continue and to learn about Dr Greenwood's work, in particular, in helping the Mati burns victims. I thank you for your support.

Motion carried.

#### **ABORIGINAL VETERANS COMMEMORATIVE SERVICE**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher:

That this council—

1. Commends Reconciliation SA and Aboriginal Veterans SA on the ANZAC Day service at the Aboriginal War Memorial;
2. Acknowledges the contribution of Aboriginal service men and women; and
3. Recognises that their sacrifice often did not result in equal treatment to their non-Aboriginal brothers and sisters in arms.

(Continued from 26 July 2018.)

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (17:55):** I rise to commend this private members' motion which acknowledges the contribution and sacrifice of Aboriginal service men and women and to reflect the support for the motion by the Liberal joint party room. As many will know, Reconciliation SA is a not-

for-profit organisation that promotes the movement for reconciliation at a state level. That body was formed in 2002.

In addition, the motion notes the work of Aboriginal Veterans of South Australia (AVSA). AVSA has collected almost 500 names of Aboriginal servicemen and servicewomen from the Boer War to the present day. These names and their stories are on a register hosted by Reconciliation SA on its website. The goal is to improve and extend the information available on the register by, firstly, linking names to the individual service records in the Australian War Memorial and the National Archives; secondly, finding out the identity of service personnel in the 'Seeking further information' section of AVSA; and, thirdly, the service of Indigenous Australians.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have a very long and proud history of serving in all sectors and units within the Australian Defence Force through the wars, conflicts and peacekeeping operations that Australia has participated in, from the nation's first engagement in the Boer War in 1899 through to present-day conflicts.

Like their male counterparts, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women have also made an important contribution to the defence of the nation through their service with the armed forces and civilian organisations such as the Women's Land Army, or work in wartime industries, and of course that very much includes primary industries. When the workforce for food production, etc., was in short supply, many women, including women of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent, were very much involved in that.

Many of these men and women pushed through adversity to enlist and serve their country. Their contribution is all the more significant when viewed against their lack of citizenship rights and early policies that discouraged and limited their enlistment. In particular, many Indigenous Australians volunteered to fight in the First and Second World Wars at a time when they did not enjoy the same rights as their fellow Australians. This commitment has continued post-service.

Many of today's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ex-service men and women work tirelessly in the ex-service community to assist others in need. That has been demonstrated to me with the interest shown by members of that group in the work that I do in suicide prevention. I have been very grateful for that support, which was demonstrated to the Hon. Mr Maher and myself at a function in the parliamentary complex after the Hon. Mr Maher moved the motion.

In recent years, the contributions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander veterans have become more widely acknowledged. In 2017, Indigenous veterans and their families led the national ANZAC Day march in Canberra for the first time. In 2018, the Australian War Memorial's exhibition *For Country, for Nation* has become a national tour that will last until June 2021. The exhibition will be at the Samstag Museum of Art at Adelaide University from 26 April to 19 July 2019.

The exhibition highlights stories of service by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and explores themes of remembrance and tradition through family histories, objects and photographs from across Australia, drawing inspiration from cultural traditions and symbols of discipline, knowledge, leadership and skill.

At least 1,000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander soldiers served in World War I, and they were present in almost every Australian campaign of that war. It is estimated that about a third of the Indigenous soldiers who served overseas between 1914 and 1918 were killed in action or died of wounds or disease. After the war, however, Indigenous veterans found that their war service counted for little. Very few of them were granted a soldier settler block. They were not given full citizenship and rights and still had to live under the so-called protection acts that imposed strict control over many aspects of their lives.

As many as 8,000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people may have enlisted during World War II, although the exact number is not known because there was no Indigenous identification process in the Defence Force until the 1990s. A Torres Strait Light Infantry Battalion was formed in 1941 primarily to protect Torres Strait. Indigenous troops usually received less than half the pay of non-Indigenous troops and, unless they served overseas, did not have access to many veterans' benefits. It took more than four decades of campaigning for some of these anomalies to be rectified.

Indigenous Australians continued serving after World War II. This included involvement in the British Commonwealth Occupation Force in Japan, the Korean War, the Malayan Emergency, Borneo, the Vietnam War, East Timor, Iraq and Afghanistan. The Australian Defence Force now actively recruits in Indigenous communities for reserve and regular forces.

In 2013, an Aboriginal War Memorial was unveiled at the Torrens Parade Ground by the then Governor-General Quentin Bryce. The bronze sculpture shows a World War I male soldier and a World War II female nurse standing above a coolamon, a traditional Indigenous Australian holding vessel. The rainbow serpent surrounds the two figures. This creature is part of the Indigenous Australian creation story and the Dreamtime. A walkway of honour leads to the memorial bearing the names of those Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men and women who have given service.

Veterans and their families received \$100 million in additional funding in the recent federal budget. This funding is in addition to ongoing funds allocated to the Department of Veterans' Affairs. I think there is much more that we can do to work with veterans from an Indigenous background. They have demonstrated, in my mind, that they are proactive in their recognition of the service of people who have gone before them and those who have come after them. I commend them for that.

I am very pleased to support this motion. I note the Hon. Mr Stephens is also going to speak on this matter. I commend the motion to the chamber.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:03):** SA-Best wholeheartedly supports this motion acknowledging the contributions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service men and women and particularly recognising that their sacrifice for our country did not result in equal treatment with other servicemen and women. It is a great shame the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service men and women served at a time when they did not enjoy full constitutional rights. Many made the ultimate sacrifice, offering up their lives for the freedoms that we all enjoy today.

As the Hon. John Dawkins just alluded to, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service men and women enlisted and served with distinction in every conflict in which Australia has been involved with, starting from the Boer War. It is astonishing that the actual number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service men and women who enlisted might never be known because many were not able to declare their Aboriginality when enlisting because of legislative barriers.

At the commencement of World War I, commonwealth law, under the Defence Act, prevented the enlistment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders into the Australian armed forces, yet despite the legal prohibition a significant number did enlist and see active service. Estimates suggest that up to 800 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men were able to enlist, while over 500 saw active duty. To get around the legislation, they were forced to use false English names and birthplaces or say that they were Maori. This is a blight on our past that cannot be erased.

Although Indigenous enlistment was legally prohibited, there are examples of government officials in SA consciously ignoring the Defence Act, with at least 61 Aboriginal men from South Australia known to have enlisted. Indigenous military service, during World War I at least, was greatly respected. At times, it was even used to embarrass and shame Australian men evading military service. Yet, while Indigenous soldiers were treated equally on the battlefield and in the trenches, sadly, upon returning home, they faced continued discrimination and prejudice.

The Defence Act was not the only piece of legislation that discriminated against Indigenous Australians during the Great War. It was during this time in Australia's history that Indigenous Australians could not enter a pub. They could not vote. They could not marry non-Aboriginal partners and they could not buy property.

Historians suggest that the reason why so many Indigenous men fought against the legislative and structural barriers to enlist was the hope that fighting for Australia would in turn change the way they and other Indigenous Australians were treated: to no longer be discriminated against and to be treated equally. Sadly, many ex-servicemen of Indigenous background found they were treated with the same prejudice and discrimination as before.

Discrimination of course continued through to the Vietnam War when Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people continued to face discrimination at home. It was during this time of upheaval,

social change and activism that the significance of the fight for Aboriginal civil rights emerged as a key social movement, and for that I think we are all very grateful.

Whilst equality for our First Peoples has come a long way since this time, we all know there is still much to do. The Aboriginal War Memorial will stand as an enduring symbol of respect and dignified salute to our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander service men and women. We solemnly honour the sacrifice and acknowledge the contribution of our First Peoples during times of war.

Whilst I do not want to politicise this motion, I do want to make reference to the recent appointment of Tony Abbott as envoy for Indigenous affairs. I think it is a sad indictment that the Prime Minister's own hand-picked Indigenous Advisory Council was not consulted on the appointment and only found out about it through the media. However well intentioned the appointment may have been, to reiterate the words of Senator Pat Dodson, 'The First Nations people have asked the government for a voice and we get Tony Abbott.'

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:08):** I rise to very briefly associate myself with remarks and commend the mover for bringing this motion before this place. Indeed, on behalf of the Greens in this council, I commend Reconciliation SA and Aboriginal Veterans of SA on the ANZAC Day service at the Aboriginal War Memorial, and I certainly recognise that their sacrifice often did not result in treatment equal to their non-Aboriginal brothers and sisters in arms.

In one of my first speeches in this place, I acknowledged the contribution of Aboriginal service people to our nation. In fact, they have, as has been mentioned, been involved in campaigns since the Boer War to the present day. I remember learning at Camp Coorong that some of those who fought in the Boer War not only sacrificed for this country but of course, to add insult, were not allowed back into this country, their country, their nation. Our First Nations people were not recognised as citizens and were denied entry back into the very place they had fought for.

There is much unfinished business when it comes to reconciliation in this nation. I think the need for that is stoically drawn when you look at the way we have treated our Aboriginal service men and women. With those few words, the Greens commend the motion.

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (18:09):** I rise to support the motion. This motion from the Hon. Mr Maher commends Reconciliation SA and Aboriginal Veterans SA on the ANZAC Day service at the Aboriginal War Memorial and acknowledges the contribution of Aboriginal service men and women, and recognises that their sacrifice often did not result in equal treatment to their non-Aboriginal brothers and sisters in arms.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have a long and proud history of serving our nation. Their involvement ranges throughout all sectors and units of the Australian Defence Force in wars, conflicts and peacekeeping operations. This extends from Australia's first engagement in the Boer War in 1899 through to present day conflicts. Sadly, only in recent years have the contributions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander veterans become more widely acknowledged.

I was extremely honoured to represent the Premier earlier this year at the Point Pearce War Memorial, where the Point Pearce Aboriginal Corporation and Aboriginal Veterans SA commemorated over 100 years of military service by Aboriginal veterans from Point Pearce and surrounding areas. This was an extremely moving and respectful service with a very large number of people in attendance, including the federal member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey MP.

Services like these act as a reminder of the great contribution of Aboriginal veterans in service to this country. I would like to acknowledge and thank the veterans and their families who have sacrificed and courageously fought to protect our freedoms. I am pleased to say that the 2018 federal budget has provided veterans and their families with \$100 million extra in funding, allocated to the Department of Veterans' Affairs, which in 2018-19 will total \$11.2 billion. It is absolutely vital that we take care of our veterans and acknowledge their sacrifice, bravery, hardship and determination. I commend the Hon. Mr Maher for bringing the motion to the house and I am proud to support it.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (18:11):** I wish to thank all members who have contributed to the debate on this motion. I think the fact that we have had so many people speak on this motion and the words that people have used when they have spoken shows that we

have come a long way—a long way from days gone by when Aboriginal veterans returned home not being able to return to the land they had occupied for thousands of years, and not only not to be able to return to their land but to have their land given away to other people who were returning under soldier settlement schemes. I think it speaks volumes as to how far we have come, and I thank members for their contributions.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **STATUTES AMENDMENT (DRUG OFFENCES) BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:13):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Controlled Substances Act 1984*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *serious drug offender* for the purposes of determining the maximum penalty that will apply for certain offences against the Act. An offender that is to be sentenced for an offence is a *serious drug offender* if the person has, within 10 years of the commission of the offence for which they are to be sentenced, been previously convicted of—

- (a) 2 or more offences against Part 5 Division 2 (other than Subdivision 4) or Division 3, being offences arising out of separate incidents; or
- (b) 3 or more offences against Part 5 (other than sections 33D, 33DA, 33I(2), 33K, 33L, 33LA, 33LAB or 33LB), being offences arising out of separate incidents.

5—Amendment of section 32—Trafficking

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 32 of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum fine for an offence against section 32(1) will increase to \$1,000,000 from \$500,000;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 32(2) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$500,000 or imprisonment for life, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 32(2a) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$200,000 or imprisonment for 25 years, or both;
- (d) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 32(3) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both.

6—Amendment of section 33—Manufacture of controlled drugs for sale

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 33 of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum fine for an offence against section 33(1) will increase to \$1,000,000 from \$500,000;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33(2) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$500,000 or imprisonment for life, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33(3) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both.

## 7—Amendment of section 33A—Sale, manufacture etc of controlled precursor

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 33A of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33A(1) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$500,000 or imprisonment for life, or both;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33A(2) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$200,000 or imprisonment for 25 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33A(3) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both;
- (d) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33A(4) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both;
- (e) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33A(5) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both.

## 8—Amendment of section 33B—Cultivation of controlled plants for sale

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 33B of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum fine for an offence against section 33B(1) will increase to \$1,000,000 from \$500,000;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33B(2) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$500,000 or imprisonment for life, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33B(3) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both.

## 9—Amendment of section 33C—Sale of controlled plants

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 33C of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum fine for an offence against section 33C(1) will increase to \$1,000,000 from \$500,000;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33C(2) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$500,000 or imprisonment for life, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33C(3) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both.

## 10—Amendment of section 33D—Sale of equipment

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33D of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty for a basic offence will be increased to \$15,000 or imprisonment for 3 years, or both;
- (b) an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence is added, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (c) an additional increased penalty is added for an aggravated offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

## 11—Amendment of section 33DA—Sale of instructions

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33DA(1) of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum fine for a basic offence will be increased to \$15,000, from \$10,000;
- (b) an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence is added, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum fine for an aggravated offence is to be increased to \$20,000, from \$15,000.

12—Amendment of section 33GA—Sale of equipment to child for use in connection with consumption of controlled drugs

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33GA of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum imprisonment that applies for a basic offence will be increased to 5 years, up from 2 years;
- (b) an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence is added, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both;
- (c) an additional increased penalty is added for an aggravated offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both.

13—Amendment of section 33GB—Sale of instructions to a child

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33GB(1) of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum imprisonment that applies for a basic offence will be increased to 5 years, up from 3 years;
- (b) an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence is added, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum imprisonment that applies for an aggravated offence will be increased to 7 years, up from 5 years.

14—Amendment of section 33I—Supply or administration of controlled drug

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 33I of the Act as follows:

- (a) for section 33I(1), an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence is added, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both;
- (b) for section 33I(1), an additional increased penalty is added for an aggravated offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both;
- (c) for section 33I(2), the maximum penalty for a basic offence will be increased to \$15,000 or imprisonment for 3 years, or both.

15—Amendment of section 33J—Manufacture of controlled drugs

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 33J of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum fine for a basic offence against section 33J(1) will decrease to \$30,000 from \$35,000;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33J(1) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33J(1) will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years, or both;
- (d) the maximum fine for a basic offence against section 33J(2) will be increased to \$20,000, from \$15,000;
- (e) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33J(2) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both;
- (f) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33J(2) will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both.

16—Amendment of section 33K—Cultivation of controlled plants

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalties provided for in section 33K of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33K(1) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$5,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33K(1) will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$5,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33K(2) will be increased to \$2,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both.



## 17—Amendment of section 33L—Possession or consumption of controlled drug etc

This clause proposes to increase the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33L(2) of the Act to \$2,000.

## 18—Amendment of section 33LA—Possession or supply of prescribed equipment

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33LA of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (b) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

## 19—Amendment of section 33LAB—Possession or supply of instructions

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33LAB(1) of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (b) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

## 20—Amendment of section 33LB—Possession or supply of prescribed quantity of controlled precursor

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33LB of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum fine for a basic offence against section 33LB(1) will increase to \$15,000 from \$10,000;
- (b) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33LB(1) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33LB(1) will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (d) the maximum fine for a basic offence against section 33LB(2) will be increased to \$20,000, from \$15,000;
- (e) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33LB(2) will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both;
- (f) the maximum penalty for an offence against section 33LB(2) will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both.

## 21—Amendment of section 33LD—Intentional manufacture of controlled drug alternative

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33LD of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty for a basic offence will be increased to \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (b) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both.

## 22—Amendment of section 33LE—Promoting controlled drug alternative

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33LE(1) of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (b) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

23—Amendment of section 33LF—Manufacturing, packaging, selling or supplying substance promoted as controlled drug alternative

This clause proposes to amend the maximum penalty provided for in section 33LF(3) of the Act as follows:

- (a) the maximum penalty for a basic offence will be increased to \$20,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both;
- (b) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for a basic offence committed by a person who is a serious drug offender in respect of the offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both;
- (c) the maximum penalty will include an additional increased penalty for an aggravated offence, being \$30,000 or imprisonment for 7 years, or both.

24—Amendment of section 34—Application of Division

Part 5 Division 6 of the Act provides for referral for assessment and undertakings of persons alleged to have committed simple possession offences, being an offence against section 33L(1) other than an offence relating to a prescribed controlled drug. This clause proposes to disapply Part 5 Division 6 in respect of a person who is alleged to have committed simple possession offence if the person has been previously referred under the Division on 2 or more occasions in respect of other simple possession offences within the preceding 4 years.

25—Amendment of section 44—Matters to be considered when court fixes penalty

This clause amends section 44(1) of the Act to add to the matters that a court must take into account in determining the penalty to be imposed on a person convicted of an indictable or minor indictable offence against this Act. The addition to section 44(1) is, in the case of an offence against section 33, whether a child was present at any stage when the offence occurred.

Part 3—Amendment of *Sentencing Act 2017*

26—Amendment of section 71—Home detention orders

This clause amends section 71 of the *Sentencing Act 2017* to include in that section's definition of *serious and organised crime offence* offences under section 33F, 33G and 33H of the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*.

27—Amendment of section 96—Suspension of imprisonment on defendant entering into bond

This clause amends section 96 of the *Sentencing Act 2017* to include in that section's definition of *serious and organised crime offence* offences under section 33F, 33G and 33H of the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

## ELECTORAL (PRISONER VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:13):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

As members know, the Marshall Government has committed to introducing legislation to disqualify people who have committed serious offences from voting at South Australian state elections.

Passing this Bill will mean that a person who is in custody at the close of rolls and serving a sentence of imprisonment of three years or more will be ineligible to vote at a South Australian state election. This is an overdue change and one that will be broadly welcomed.

Currently, all prisoners in South Australia can vote in South Australian state elections, however, the position is not the same in other jurisdictions.

The Bill will bring South Australia broadly in to line with the Commonwealth position.

It will mean that prisoners who are ineligible to vote in a Commonwealth election will also be ineligible to vote in a South Australian election.

A difference between this Bill and the Commonwealth laws is in relation to prisoners serving a sentence of imprisonment of 3 years or more on home detention, who will be ineligible to vote at a State election. The rationale for this is that, in South Australia, home detention is a custodial sentence.

People sentenced to home detention must realise this is a serious sentence from the Court and will impact on their right to vote just as any other type of custodial sentence would.

In addition, the Bill will prevent the following categories of people from voting:

- a person who is detained on the basis that they are unwilling or unable to control their sexual instincts; and
- a person who is subject to a continuing detention order under the *Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015*.

The Bill will also apply to a young person who is serving a sentence of 3 years or more in a training centre. The circumstances where this could occur are where a young person is sentenced as an adult, having regard to the serious nature of their offending, and serves that sentence (or part of it) in a training centre.

Importantly, the Bill will not apply to people who are detained under the mental impairment provisions of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*.

Regardless of whether a person has committed multiple offences, the disqualification will apply to them if the total period of time for which they have been sentenced to imprisonment exceeds 3 years and they are in custody at the close of rolls.

It does not matter whether they are serving sentences cumulatively or concurrently.

This Bill does not affect a person's enrolment status or their ability to enrol. Enrolment is provided for in Part 5 of the *Electoral Act 1985* ('Electoral Act'). It is unaffected by these amendments, which relate specifically to the entitlement to vote that is provided for in Part 9 Division 1 of the Electoral Act. A prisoner who is enrolled but ineligible to vote will remain on the roll and will be able to vote again once they are released.

In other words, once a person has finished a custodial sentence their rights are restored, including the right to vote. That is how it should be.

The Bill makes a number of technical amendments to the Electoral Act to support the new position on prisoner voting.

It makes amendments to section 68 of the Electoral Act, which provides for the preparation of the certified list of electors for an election. While the name of a prisoner who is ineligible to vote will remain on the electoral roll, the amendments provide that the name of a prisoner who is ineligible to vote at an election will not appear on the certified list of electors that is prepared for that election.

The Bill also inserts new section 27B into the Electoral Act which is entitled 'Provision of information to Commonwealth Electoral Commissioner'. New section 27B will enable the Electoral Commissioner to provide information about prisoners serving a sentence of 3 years or more to the Australian Electoral Commissioner, who is responsible for updating the electoral rolls and roll extracts that are used in State elections.

In terms of implementing the Bill, the Electoral Commissioner will work with the Department for Correctional Services and the Australian Electoral Commissioner to ensure that the Bill is able to be implemented at the next election.

Mr President, I commend the Bill to Members and I seek leave to have the Explanation of Clauses inserted in Hansard without my reading them.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Electoral Act 1985*

###### 4—Insertion of section 27B

This clause inserts a new section:

###### 27B—Provision of information to Commonwealth Electoral Commissioner

The proposed section provides that the Electoral Commissioner may provide to the Electoral Commissioner under the Commonwealth Act any information in the Electoral Commissioner's possession related to the preparation, alteration or revision of the electoral roll.

## 5—Amendment of section 68—Certified list of electors

The clause amends section 68 to provide that the certified list of electors is not to include the names of electors not entitled to vote by virtue of proposed section 69(3) to be inserted by clause 6.

## 6—Amendment of section 69—Entitlement to vote

The clause inserts a new subsection 69(3) to provide that a person who is, as at the close of the rolls for an election, a designated person, is not entitled to vote at an election.

*Designated person* is defined to include the following:

- a person in custody serving 1 or more sentences of imprisonment or detention for an offence against the law of the Commonwealth, a State or Territory, and the total period of imprisonment or detention is 3 years or more;
- a person subject to an order for detention or released on licence under either the *Sentencing Act 2017* or the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*;
- a person subject to a continuing detention order under the *Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015*.

A person *in custody serving 1 or more sentences of imprisonment or detention* is defined to exclude persons detained under an order under Part 8A of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*, but is defined to include the following:

- persons on home detention under the *Correctional Services Act 1982* or the *Sentencing Act 2017*;
- persons detained in a training centre under the *Young Offenders Act 1993*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

**CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (18:14):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

At the last state election the government committed to a zero tolerance policy in relation to drugs in prisons and pledged to introduce legislation to support this policy in its first 100 days. Stopping drugs entering our prisons remains a priority for this government to protect both employees and prisoners.

All correctional jurisdictions are challenged by prisoner drug use and attempts to introduce drugs into prisons. The number of prisoners detained in South Australia for drug related offending is significant. The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) has dedicated resources to ensuring it has sophisticated infrastructure, technology, and systems in place to prevent attempts to introduce drugs. In the 2017-18 financial year there were over 5,000 drug tests and nearly 100,000 searches conducted in South Australian prisons to detect contraband and illicit drugs.

This Bill will assist DCS to block potential avenues for drug incursion and increase the safety, security and integrity of the prison system.

The *Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018* (the Bill) provides for amendments to be made to the *Correctional Services Act 1982* (the Act) to provide the power to:

- prohibit members of outlaw motorcycle gangs (OMCG) and organised crime groups from visiting prisons;
- limit the rights of child sex offenders to be visited by persons under the age of 18 years; and
- institute workplace testing of prison officers, staff and contractors for alcohol and illegal drugs.

Prisons have traditionally been prime locations for members of OMCGs and organised crime groups to recruit new members. These same groups also attempt to continue their criminal activities and associations whilst in custody. This includes seeking to profit from the introduction and distribution of contraband to prisoners, and to protect their criminal interests and enterprises through witness manipulation and intimidation. Drugs and associated contraband that make it into the prison system are also considered a valuable currency. As such, it is vital that the influence of organised crime groups such as OMCG is impeded and the conduit for trafficking of drugs into prisons is obstructed.

In the last financial year over 162 prisoners known to be affiliated with outlaw motorcycle gangs (OMCG) were detained in South Australian prisons and 144 individuals were banned from visiting prisoners.

In its current form, the *Correctional Services Act 1982* provides no power to prevent members of organised crime groups from entering prisons and associating with prisoners.

This Bill will introduce an amendment that specifically recognises criminal organisations as defined in the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. This will enable the Department to work closely with South Australia Police to limit the power and control of organised crime groups and sever links between prisoners and their associates.

Despite the strong intent of this amendment, the Bill does include a discretionary measure available to the DCS Chief Executive (CE) to approve visits in exceptional circumstances only, ensuring that necessary family and community connections are not completely disengaged.

Currently the Act prevents a person under the age of 18 years from visiting a prisoner whose current sentence is in relation to a child sexual offence. This Bill strengthens that provision by ensuring that a person under the age of 18 years cannot visit a prisoner who has ever been found guilty of a child sexual offence. This amendment strengthens an existing provision and ensures that the protection of vulnerable children is the overriding consideration.

This amendment does allow for the CE to approve child visits where appropriate. This allows the wellbeing of a child to be taken into consideration by the CE in his decision making.

The Bill also proposes new provisions that provide for workplace drug and alcohol testing of staff, officers and employees. The term 'officer or employee' includes all persons employed directly by the Department and those who are designated as an officer of the Department (for example G4S staff who operate the privately run Mount Gambier Prison). The Bill also allows for the testing of contractors. This ensures that the Bill includes staff employed by other government departments and any persons working at a correctional facility (such as tradespeople undertaking maintenance or building works at a prison site). This is because we do not want anyone in our prisons under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

Introducing drug and alcohol testing of staff strengthens the government's and the Department's stance against the scourge of drugs and sets a high standard of professionalism, integrity and transparency. The provisions, which mirror SAPOL's approach to staff testing, enable both random and targeted testing in a range of situations including:

- following a critical incident;
- if there is reasonable suspicion of recent drug or alcohol consumption; and
- as part of a testing program to ensure the integrity of those who are employed in designated departmental positions.

It is anticipated that the testing will focus on common drugs of concern as determined through consultation with SAPOL and SA Pathology.

If the Bill is passed, it is proposed that the Department will undertake a process to appoint a contractor to administer an independent testing program which includes providing breathalysers and drug testing equipment and undertaking the testing, analysis and reporting functions.

The key objective of this Bill is to deliver important reform that supports the government's war on drugs policy and delivers enhanced safety and security in South Australia's prisons. The Bill will also serve to advance collaboration with other law enforcement and justice agencies in the interests of community safety.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

###### 4—Amendment of long title

The long title of the Act is amended to refer the fact that the Act will provide for drug and alcohol testing of correctional services officers and employees and other persons.

###### 5—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Certain definitions are inserted into the Act for the purposes of the measure.

## 6—Insertion of section 6

New section 6 is inserted:

## 6—Criminal intelligence

This section sets out a scheme for the protection from disclosure of information that is classified by the Commissioner of Police as criminal intelligence for the purposes of granting an approval under section 34(4)(e) of the Act or making an order under section 85A(1)(b) of the Act.

## 7—Amendment of section 34—Prisoners' rights to have visitors

Section 34 is amended to provide that a person who the CE believes on reasonable grounds is a member of a criminal organisation, or associates with, or has associated with, a member of a criminal organisation, may not visit a prisoner without the approval of the CE. Another amendment broadens the prohibition on visits by children so that a prisoner who has ever been found guilty of a child sexual offence cannot be visited by a child, unless the child has been given permission by the CE.

## 8—Insertion of Part 7A

New Part 7A is inserted:

## Part 7A—Drug and alcohol testing scheme

## 81S—Interpretation

The scheme provides for drug and alcohol testing of officers and employees of the Department. The scheme is substantially similar to the scheme in the *Police Act 1998*.

One key difference is that the CE is able to require drug and alcohol testing of an officer or employee on the ground that the CE considers that the officer or employee should undergo such testing.

Also, provision is made to allow the CE to require a person who enters a correctional institution to undergo drug and alcohol testing, subject to the person's consent.

## 81T—Drug and alcohol testing of officers and employees

## 81U—Drug and alcohol testing of applicants to Department

## 81V—Drug and alcohol testing of other persons

## 81W—Procedures for drug and alcohol testing

## 81X—Biological samples, test results etc not to be used for other purposes

## 9—Amendment of section 83—CE may make rules

This amendment is consequential.

## 10—Amendment of section 85A—Exclusion of persons from correctional institution

The power of the CE to exclude persons from correctional institutions is extended to apply to a person who is a member of a criminal organisation, or associates with, or has associated with, a member of a criminal organisation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

**PETROLEUM AND GEOTHERMAL ENERGY (BAN ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 18:16 the council adjourned until Thursday 6 September 2018 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***IMPLEMENTATION TASKFORCE**

**47 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). Who has been appointed to the new Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment's Implementation Taskforce to manage the transition from the previous departmental structure?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

Membership of the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment's Executive Group tasked to manage the transition from the previous departmental structure is:

- Mr Michael Hnyda
- Ms Megan Antcliff
- Mr Lino Strangis; and
- Mr Marco Baccanti

**TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT**

**48 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). How many FTE staff are employed by the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

As at 31 July 2018, there were 142.21 FTE's employed by the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment.

**TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT**

**49 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). Can the minister confirm if Marco Baccanti, the Chief Executive of Health Industries South Australia, will continue his work under the new Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

Mr Marco Baccanti, Chief Executive of Health Industries South Australia transferred to the Department of Trade, Tourism and Investment and continues to work in the health industries portfolio area.

**BUSINESS MISSIONS**

**50 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). Can the minister advise the council when the 2018-19 business missions will be released?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

The South Australian government is developing a new approach to international trade.

We are engaging deeply with industry in the state's leading export sectors in developing our new approach.

The first element of this is the government's Export Accelerator Program launched on 16 August 2018.

Inbound and outbound missions will continue to play a role. Further details will be announced in coming months.

**TRADE MISSIONS**

**51 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). As of 25 July 2018, what is the number of expressions of interest for the upcoming round of trade missions?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

The Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment has received 126 expressions of interest for the upcoming round of trade missions.

**EXPORT STRATEGIES**

**52 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). What is the minister's benchmark of success in export strategies? How will they be evaluated?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):**

The South Australian government's target is for sustained economic growth of 3 per cent per annum for our state over the next four years.

Significantly growing our exports is a key driver that will shape the state's future prosperity.

Working closely with the chief executives of the state government's economic development agencies, the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment is undertaking a considered analysis of the performance and growth prospects of its portfolio areas, including exports.

The government's approach to trade will be evidence-based and ensure a sustainable, achievable outlook to drive export growth.

#### ECONOMIC INVESTMENT FUND

**53 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). How much funding is allocated to the Economic Investment Fund?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

As at 1 August 2018, \$71 million has been allocated to the Economic Investment Fund.

#### VENTURE CAPITAL FUND

**54 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). What is the status of all projects that were funded by the South Australian Venture Capital Fund since the establishment of the fund to date?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** The Minister for Industry and Skills has advised:

Since the establishment of the South Australian Venture Capital Fund in July 2017, the fund has made two investments to date—Myriota Pty Ltd and Kid Sense Pty Ltd, both companies are still in operation.

#### VENTURE CAPITAL FUND

**55 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). What is the value of the funds remaining in the South Australian Venture Capital Fund? Will they be fully expended over the forward estimates?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** The Minister for Industry and Skills has advised:

There is currently \$44.47 million of capital in the South Australian Venture Capital Fund.

#### EARLY COMMERCIALISATION FUND

**56 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). What is the status of all projects that were funded by the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund since the establishment of the fund?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** The Minister for Industry and Skills has advised:

All 51 South Australian start-up companies that have been provided grants under the South Australian Early Commercialisation are still in operation. There are 18 projects that have been completed, with 33 projects ongoing.

#### EARLY COMMERCIALISATION FUND

**57 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). What is the value of the funds remaining in the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund? Will they be fully expended over the forward estimates?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** The Minister for Industry and Skills has advised:

\$2.35 million remains in the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund.

#### TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

**59 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). What other offices, agencies or related entity has the newly formed Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment incorporated that was not originally part of the previous department of state development?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

Resources and responsibilities from the following areas were transferred to the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment:

- Investment Attraction South Australia; and
- Relevant resources from Primary Industries and Regions South Australia delivering trade, investment and export activities.

#### MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT CHANGES

**60 The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (1 August 2018). What was the FTE staffing profile of the former department of state development prior to the latest machinery of government changes?



**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** I have been advised:

As at 30 June 2018 the actual FTE profile relevant to the former department of state development was 626.9. Of these, 449.6 FTEs were employed on an ongoing basis and 177.3 FTEs were employed on a contract basis.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR**

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (21 June 2018).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** I am advised:

1. Yes, this includes correspondence from members of parliament.
2. Public sector employees are expected to be responsive and act in support of service excellence, in accordance with the Public Sector Code of Ethics. This offers more flexibility in how agencies deal with each other.
3. There is currently no specific time frame within which agencies must respond to correspondence from other government agencies and is managed on a case by case basis.
4. Responses to correspondence from members of parliament would need to be provided within the four-week time frame in accordance with this circular.

#### **AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT**

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (5 July 2018).

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing):** I have been advised:

1. Professor David's key concern relates to the strategic direction of the ACFU after his retirement on 30 June 2018.

Other concerns relate to the employment of visiting medical specialists and post-graduate education opportunities.

2. The ACFU, through funding from the South Australian government, supports up to 15 patients per year as international humanitarian cases. These patients are supported for their medical treatment and accommodation and living expenses while in South Australia. These cases continue to be welcomed and there is no plan from the government to alter current arrangements.

#### **QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL**

In reply to **the Hon. R.P. WORTLEY** (5 July 2018).

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing):** I have been advised:

In a 2010 election commitment, the Labor Party announced capital of \$125 million for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital (TQEH) Redevelopment—Stage 3. The project was cancelled in 2014 with the capital funding being re-allocated to Transforming Health capital priorities.

#### **SA HEALTH EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **the Hon. J.E. HANSON** (5 July 2018).

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing):** I have been advised:

The Department for Health and Wellbeing will commence a formal selection process for a new Chief Pharmacist and chief executive of the SA Ambulance Service. This will be an open process managed in accordance with the normal public sector requirements.

#### **DRINK-DRIVING FINES**

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (5 July 2018).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** I am advised:

1. The government of South Australia is aware of the proposal in New South Wales for low-range drink-driving offenders (with a blood alcohol level of under 0.10 who do not have a previous conviction for drink-driving) to be given on-the-spot fines rather than appear in court. The government accepts there is merit in reducing the strain on the court system, and this approach is similar to existing practice in South Australia.
2. The legislation in South Australia provides that first time, category 1 offenders receive an expiation fee of \$613 and four demerit points and are not required to attend court. In South Australia, a category 1 offence is driving with a concentration of alcohol less than 0.08 grams in 100 millilitres of blood.

This is lower than proposed by New South Wales (0.10 grams in 100 millilitres of blood), but reflects the established category of offences in this state and must be balanced against improved road safety outcomes and community expectations.

In South Australia, repeat category 1 offenders are subject to escalating penalties and a first court conviction will see them receive higher fines and a licence disqualification of not less than three months, in addition to four demerit points.

#### DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **the Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (24 July 2018).

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services):** The Department for Industry and Skills has advised:

The state government is investing \$100 million to enhance skills training in South Australia to ensure an equipped workforce across all sectors. To underpin our commitment, we have secured \$103 million from the federal government's Skilling Australia Fund. We are removing duplication of services to ensure tax payer funds are targeted to provide better outcomes.

#### AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (25 July 2018).

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing):** I can advise:

My office first raised issues regarding parliamentary statements with the office of the Minister for Energy on 24 July 2018.

#### CROWN LAND SHACKS

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (31 July 2018).

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services):** The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

There is no evidence to date that relevant environmental laws have not been complied with.

The matters regarding development law have been referred to The Coorong District Council as the relevant authority.

#### FINES ENFORCEMENT AND RECOVERY UNIT

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (31 July 2018).

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing):** The Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services has been advised:

On 16 June 2018, the Fines Enforcement Recovery Unit (FERU) implemented their new Detrack system. This replaced a previous system that was hosted by the Courts Administration Authority (CAA).

Prior to the changes in systems, the South Australia Police (SAPOL) Expiation Notice Branch received information regarding driver's licence suspensions every 15 minutes (during business hours) via the CAA's Justice Data Interchange, which was shut down on 16 June 2018.

The cessation of this 15-minute data transfer from the previous system has required SAPOL to rely on a daily data transfer from the Department of Planning Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI), which was not previously used for this purpose.

The change in process identified a previously unknown problem with the data transfer regarding the lifting of the fines enforced licence suspensions (FES) by DPTI, whereby the notification to SAPOL, is not functioning as designed. Currently, the FERU is unable to replicate the 15-minute notification of the lifting of a FES as previously supplied by the CAA.

The FERU has supplied SAPOL with a download of all the fines enforced licence suspensions that have been processed by them since 18 June 2018. SAPOL has manually uploaded this data and as at 15 August 2018 SAPOL's Vehicle and Licensing System is up to date, however will need to be continually updated manually to ensure the information remains accurate.

SAPOL is working with DPTI to rectify the problems with their data transfer, once this is completed the data will be provided electronically once a day.

As unpaid fines are managed by the FERU and originate from a number of different sources, SAPOL is unable to identify how many people have been impacted by fines related to licence suspensions. SAPOL has put measures in place to ensure that the status of a person's driver's licence is confirmed directly with DPTI via their TRUMPS database prior to any enforcement action taking place.

#### STUDENT ENROLMENT, SEPARATED PARENTS

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (1 August 2018).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The Minister for Education has been advised of the following:

1. The enrolment of students with separated parents is proposed to be covered in the Department for Education's enrolment policy.

The department's enrolment policy has undergone a significant and comprehensive review and internal consultation process. The draft policy, which has been significantly edited and updated, now includes preschool enrolment and will be supported by a suite of procedures.

These procedures will provide site leaders with specific guidance around key policy areas, including preschool enrolment, placement, admission, and transfers, preschool and schools registration of interest process and year level placement.

It is envisaged that the draft policy and suite of procedures will be released for external consultation in the coming months.

2. In relation to family disputes, Ms Maschotta's concerns were considered as part of the overall policy review, in particular the family dispute information. In the meantime, site leaders use the detailed instructions provided by the department in 2012 and are able to seek support on a case by case basis from the department's legal services directorate.

The department is aware of a small number of similar cases, all of which have been managed at the local level. It is not appropriate for schools to be involved in family disputes. Schools are required by the department to make enrolment decisions based on the best interests of the child and their continued attendance and education at school.

#### AIR POLLUTION

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (1 August 2018).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** I have been advised:

The Department for Health and Wellbeing (the department) has no role in regulating fossil fuel projects. However, the department can provide health risk advice, and if necessary undertake health risk assessments, if requested by regulators.

In relation to new fossil fuel projects, the department has not been consulted. There is no legislative requirement to be consulted, either during the planning and development process for these projects, nor their ongoing operation.

#### JUMPS RACING

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (1 August 2018).

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services):** The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

The government has no plans to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ban jumps racing in South Australia.

#### BULLYING

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (2 August 2018).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** I have been advised:

1. Schools have continued to have access to antibullying support and services, including specific services tailored to gender diverse, intersex and sexually diverse students, post the cessation of the funding agreement for the Safe Schools Anti-Bullying Initiative (SSAI) on 13 July 2018.

Schools can contact the department's Engagement and Wellbeing team via a dedicated email box and phone number to receive prompt assistance, discuss their particular needs and be provided with the appropriate support. This may include policy advice, specialist consultancy, staff training and links to other services.

This interim initiative was designed and implemented to ensure that there was continued support following the cessation of the funding agreement for the SSAI, and that the wellbeing of students was not compromised.

This will provide time for the department to work with schools, parents and young people to develop and implement the department's broader antibullying strategy. This strategy will provide universal supports for all students, as well as targeted supports to students at higher risk of bullying for any reason.

2. Schools currently have access to antibullying resources and programs through a number of means. This supports schools to educate students about bullying and respond to bullying concerns in the school community.

The department has recently provided \$298,000 to support schools to implement the PEACE Pack antibullying program developed by researchers at Flinders University. This is an evidence-based program that has been demonstrated to be effective in reducing bullying in schools. It has been implemented in Australia and internationally.

Over 30 schools have been supported to implement the PEACE Pack program and contribute to further development of the antibullying curriculum and resources for primary schools.

The Sammy D Foundation has been funded \$705,000 (excluding GST) over three years to deliver their antibullying, violence prevention and drug education programs in 210 schools.

The antibullying program True Colours is consistent with the Australian curriculum and will be delivered to 45 primary schools.

The Carly Ryan Foundation has been funded \$660,000 (excluding GST) to deliver the Project Connect program to 150 school communities.

In 2017, \$212,000 in grants was provided to schools so that schools could engage a range of online safety programs and services, including cyberbullying programs.

Student education about bullying and online safety is supported through the South Australia's Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum. The department's child protection curriculum and resources teach children about respectful relationships, recognising and reporting abuse, responsible use of technology and cyberbullying.

Schools can also access evidence-based antibullying resources through the national Bullying No Way! website and the national Student Wellbeing Hub.

3. The Alannah and Madeline Foundation eSmart Schools program provides a model for school staff to audit, plan, implement and maintain their responses to online safety, cyberbullying and bullying.

South Australian schools have not indicated a preference for the eSmart program over other programs and services available. In 2017, the department provided \$212,000 in grants to 53 public schools to implement an accredited online safety program such as eSmart Schools. Most schools chose to engage other services and providers to meet the needs of their students, staff and families.

The department takes a whole-of-school approach to bullying that is consistent with national and state wellbeing frameworks and best practice antibullying research and evidence.

Rather than using generic tools and templates, the department is developing resources, tools and templates tailored to the South Australian context and departmental requirements for public schools. This will support schools to implement comprehensive approaches that address all forms of bullying in their local community and meet departmental policy requirements.

4. The government has funded the Carly Ryan Foundation \$660,000 (excluding GST) over three years to deliver the Project Connect workshops on online safety and healthy relationships to school communities.

The workshop on online safety is suitable for Year 5 through to Year 12 students, and the healthy relationships workshop is suitable for Year 8 to Year 12 students.

The program will be evaluated to ensure that it meets the stated goals of empowering students to make wise choices, to look after their digital reputation and keep themselves and others safe while navigating the internet, apps and forming their own relationships both online and offline.

5. The department collects behavioural records arising from bullying incidents in public schools, not on the individual number of bullying incidents.

In 2017, there were 15,422 behavioural responses recorded in public schools related to physical, verbal and written bullying behaviours. This figure overestimates the actual number of individual bullying incidents, as more than one student may be involved in an incident.

There were also 668 behaviour records documented in public schools for cyber-related misbehaviours. This figure includes cyberbullying as well as other online misbehaviours such as students accessing inappropriate content.

Compared to 2016 data, there has been a 2% decrease in the number of cyber-related misbehaviours including cyberbullying, and a 20% decrease in relation to physical, verbal and written bullying misbehaviours.

#### YOUTH2WORK PROGRAM

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (2 August 2018).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** I have been advised:

The Marshall Liberal government is implementing strong reforms to South Australia's training system to address the unacceptable decline in apprentice and trainee numbers in South Australia over the last five years. Under the previous Labor government training commencements fell by 16,900 (66%) to 8,765 from 2012-2017.

The state and federal governments are making a significant investment of \$203 million to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships over the next four years. Through our strengthened relationship with the commonwealth, we have successfully secured \$103 million through the Skilling Australians Fund. This funding reinforces the state government's \$100 million commitment.

Fundamentally, the state government is implementing an industry led training system in South Australia to ensure training is delivered in response to the needs of industry and small business, and importantly, is aligned with real job outcomes.

We are also removing the duplication of programs to ensure taxpayer funds are better targeted. The commonwealth government's Youth Jobs PaTH and Transitions to Work programs will assist young unemployed people into employment.

The Department for Industry and Skills is working with industry to deliver training in line with industry requirements through our Skilling South Australia Strategy.