

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 3 April 2019

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.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I bring up the 16th report of the committee 2018-19.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Question Time

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services about housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have today spoken to leaders in South Australian remote Aboriginal communities whose housing has fallen under the NPARIH agreement and who have great concerns about housing funding, particularly now that this state Liberal government will have sole responsibility for its funding and implementation.

They have reported to me that they have seen no new building in the last 12 months, and have also reported a drastic decline in housing maintenance. Many community leaders held great hope that a renewed NPARIH agreement would put things back on track. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the minister advise who she has consulted with about the ongoing delivery of remote Aboriginal housing in South Australia? In particular, which Aboriginal communities and organisations?
2. What consultations have occurred with the government's most important advisory body, the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council, and also internally with the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation division within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:19): I thank the honourable member for his question. In terms of the ongoing funding arrangements, this was a subject on which the Treasurer outlined some responses in terms of the ongoing funding that South Australia was seeking with the commonwealth. Both the Treasurer and myself, and both our agencies, have been involved in a range of discussions with our respective organisations and stakeholder groups.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes, I am answering the question. In terms of not having that agreement, we didn't have any funding for property and tenancy management services beyond 30 June.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: This year or last year?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In 2019. In terms of delivering essential maintenance and tenancy management services to remote Aboriginal communities, along with operating an Adelaide-based accommodation service, we required additional funding. As I said, we didn't have provision for capital works into 2019-20, so clearly this was a matter of great concern. In the handing down of the 2018 Closing the Gap report in February 2019, it was noted that there is much progress still to be made. There is a proposed housing target to increase the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in appropriately-sized housing as part of the Closing the Gap refresh.

It was with great pleasure that I was given the task by the Premier of attending the Closing the Gap ministerial council last week in Brisbane. I was accompanied by representatives from DPC Aboriginal division. That Closing the Gap conference was to establish really the final arrangements in terms of what would be going forward. I would have to commend the community-led organisations who have, since December last year, worked very quickly to establish that there will be jurisdiction between all of the Australian jurisdictions, with equal representation from Aboriginal-led community organisations.

As a minister, and also as a shadow minister, it has been of some concern to me, as a white Australian-born person navigating Aboriginal communities—and I have worked for several years in making contact with people from various Aboriginal communities to seek their views on a range of issues, particularly in the women's policy space, now that we will be looking after the intensive family service as of 1 July. That is also something that is very much front of mind.

Can I commend in particular two people who have been part of the working group nationally, that is, Cheryl Axleby and Melissa Clarke, who have really led a lot of negotiations. I am very appreciative that they are also taking leadership in South Australia in this space, and I think going forward it will be very helpful to various ministers to have community organisations that we are able to directly engage with to ensure that we are listening to the views of Aboriginal people.

As I have mentioned in this parliament before, we are developing an Aboriginal housing strategy. Several years ago, when the Hon. Jay Weatherill was the minister for housing, he dismantled the unit within housing which was the Aboriginal-specific services. What I have been told is that a lot of Aboriginal people felt that they lost their voice with the last government in terms of housing.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Which ones have you spoken to?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I was specifically very keen to ensure that we had Aboriginal representation on the new Housing Trust Board, which we have done. We are working on an Aboriginal housing strategy as we speak to ensure that the Aboriginal community is properly consulted which, unfortunately, was failed to be done under the previous government.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My first supplementary arising from that answer, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I rule on each supplementary so just let's get this one out.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Which Aboriginal communities or organisations has the minister spoken to about Aboriginal housing, and which ones did she speak to when she was in Brisbane?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:25): The meeting in Brisbane wasn't for the purposes directly—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Which organisations—it wasn't for housing so which ones—

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you have asked—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I call you to order. You have asked a supplementary well within the standing orders; allow the minister to answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The meeting in Brisbane was really to sign off on the follow-up arrangements for Closing the Gap, and I was very pleased to be able to represent South Australia as the—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Name one organisation you have spoken to—

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I am more than fair with supplementaries. Hold your horses; you can ask those as supplementaries. Informal questioning is inappropriate. Minister, let's hear your answer to the supplementary.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Where is the list of communities that you have spoken to? Tell us.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Mr President, I'm trying to not engage with the out of order interjections from the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Go on, minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I was very pleased to represent the Premier at such an important and momentous occasion. I took my riding instructions from our esteemed representative, Nerida Saunders, within DPC, as she attended as well last week. I took the view that in that meeting it was because this process is about elevating the voices of Aboriginal people that ministers should do their best to—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order, Mr President, on relevance.

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The supplementary was directly about any organisation the minister had spoken to about housing, and if she hasn't spoken to a single one she can just say, 'I haven't and I'm not going to.'

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I take the point. The Leader of the Opposition has raised relevance, minister. You have some latitude but the question was specific, so back to you, minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I apologise, Mr President. I thought I was asked about what took place in Brisbane. In that sense I took the view that as a minister I should be respectful of the fact that the process was about elevating Aboriginal voices and therefore I would speak only at appropriate junctures. Unfortunately, some of the Labor ministers who were there felt the need to talk ad nauseam about all the wonderful things that they were doing and then were not necessarily prepared to sign up to the agreement.

I assume there are many people in various Aboriginal communities who are a little bit tired of all the fine words of Labor members without anything being delivered; therefore, we are very pleased that the NPARIH funding has been delivered. As I have spoken about in this place previously, the previous minister in the previous administration did nothing about advancing funding. This is one of the key points in terms of how we are to involve Aboriginal communities in terms of what it is that they want to see happen with housing in remote Aboriginal communities.

As the honourable member has heard on the jungle drums, I will be visiting the APY lands later this month. I have previously been a member of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee and have visited many communities on the lands in that previous role. I have met various people since being appointed in this role and also in opposition.

It is my practice generally that I do not like to name people in this place because of the particularly vindictive and vitriolic nature of the Labor opposition. They then go to people and pick them off, pit people against each other, and are particularly unhelpful for the genuine advancement of these matters. But, I would have to say, I find it really—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I am just going to give you a time warning here. We are very close to the four minute mark.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Isn't that just for Dorothy Dixers?

The PRESIDENT: It is not necessarily a tight rule because normally it applies to questions from your own side, but we are getting on and I'm anxious to get to crossbenchers.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I apologise. Mr President, I accept your judgement. But I do find it quite rich for a party which dismantled the Aboriginal housing within the South Australian Housing Trust, who did not appoint somebody to the Housing Trust Board, which is the organisation which is going to be delivering housing for Aboriginal people into the future, and for not having an Aboriginal housing strategy to be even asking these questions.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, Leader of the Opposition.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Thank you, and a very specific supplementary: has she met with any Aboriginal organisation or community about housing, and has she ever met with the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council about housing?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:30): The answer to the first question is yes. The answer to the second question is no.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary arising from the answer where the minister informed the chamber that there are a range of discussions still continuing, and the matter is ongoing in relation to funding for remote Aboriginal housing: has there been an agreement reached or has any money been provided by the commonwealth government in the minister for housing's knowledge?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:31): My understanding is that the funding was published in yesterday's federal budget papers.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary: in relation to the minister's original answer when she said there were ongoing discussions and I think has since changed her mind, how much money and what was the nature of the agreement that was published in the budget papers?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:31): The federal government contribution that has been published is \$37.5 million. The nature of the agreement will be, I am assuming, under discussion prior to that money being transferred to South Australia.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary: would it surprise the minister to learn that the nature of that agreement, which she seems not to know about, is a one-off payment of \$37.5 million when the last payment was \$289 million and, if she is aware that that is the case, who is going to make up that shortfall of nearly \$250 million?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:32): We will be announcing the nature of the total package in the future.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, the last supplementary was really pushing the envelope so keep it tight.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): The \$37.5 million—and the minister might like to clarify if that is a last one-off payment and that is the final payment ever from the commonwealth for remote Aboriginal housing—what will that go towards? Has she had any discussions whatsoever about what sort of maintenance or new builds that will go towards, or does she just not know and not care?

The PRESIDENT: I'm ruling the second half of that question out of order. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:33): I have had several discussions with the South Australian Housing Authority about the nature of maintenance and new builds. What we want to do is actually ask Aboriginal people what it is that they want, which is a process where we have a—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I have been more than tolerant with—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition! I call you to order. I have been more than tolerant with these supplementaries. I am allowing you a fair opportunity to explore these issues which you're passionate about. Just please let the minister answer in silence.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I couldn't be more clear about the direction going forward—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Allow the minister to answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —in that we are developing a specific Aboriginal housing strategy, and we—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter! Minister, sit down.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, the minister does not need you to answer the questions for her. The Hon. Ms Scriven, you have the call.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding the NDIS.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Do you seek leave?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I do.

The PRESIDENT: I couldn't hear because your own side was jibber jabbering.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As revealed in the 2018 budget estimates, around 55 per cent of NDIS plans in South Australia are underutilised, meaning approved funding for individuals living with disability is not being spent as intended. I note that during estimates an official from the minister's department confirmed, with regard to NDIS underspending, that:

There is some money...sitting with the commonwealth and they say it is being put against Future Fund requirements.

We learnt yesterday that the federal government's surplus will only be achieved through an NDIS underspend of \$1.6 billion for 2019-2020. My question to the minister is: will the minister join with the opposition in expressing disappointment at the Morrison Liberal government for selling short South Australians living with disability?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her question. The matter of underutilisation of NDIS plans, I would have to say, is something that we have been onto for some time, long before the South Australian Labor opposition discovered the comments of the—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, I cannot hear the minister which means I cannot rule on any points of order from the opposition benches or the crossbench. Can we just hear the minister in silence?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We know that the South Australian Labor opposition are unable to come up with ideas of their own, so I think they have jumped on the comments of Senator Jordon Steele-John, who has raised this as a concern. Can I assure the house that this is a matter that South Australia has been raising for some time through various means, including through the Disability Reform Council (DRC) meetings.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, we do not need a commentary.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Dawkins, can you please stay out of it? Minister, get on with the answer, please.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The underutilisation of NDIS plans has been of concern, not just to South Australia but to all jurisdictions. Our utilisation rates are lower than other states, in part because the first people to transition to the scheme were children, also because we are a smaller market, so it is not as easy for participants and providers to connect. We have larger markets, particularly when you look at states that have large regional centres like Victoria and New South Wales. Where those markets are much more robust, it is easier for people to find the services that they are looking for, so it has been of concern for us for some time. It is something that I have raised through the DRC.

The utilisation rates have improved a little bit in South Australia. It was 56 per cent. I understand that it may have risen to 65 per cent. We are very keen for those rates to increase because clearly that means that people aren't getting the supports they need. We know that it is a national problem. In one of the trial areas in Barwon, where the NDIS has been operating for several years and the market is much more mature, they have seen those rates certainly increase. This is something we have raised on a very regular basis with the commonwealth because we think it is of concern. I am glad that the Labor Party have finally realised that it's an issue, and it is something that we will continue to lobby the commonwealth government on.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:39): A supplementary: since yesterday's budget, what representations have you made to your federal counterparts to express your alleged concern that South Australians living with disability are being forced to go without for the sake of a flimsy budget surplus?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:39): The honourable member invites me to behave like the South Australian Labor Party and jump on the comments. They have realised that one of the Greens senators has raised this as a concern and suddenly realised that it's an issue.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Allow the minister to answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: This is an issue that I have specifically raised through the Disability Reform Council and we have, from memory, put papers forward and motions forward to it. It is a national problem and we will continue to raise it with the commonwealth government.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven, just sit there and allow your own members to calm down. The Labor benches, I will wait until you are calm and then I am going to allow one of your own members to ask her supplementary question in silence. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:40): How much of Scott Morrison's \$1.6 billion NDIS clawback is coming from South Australia's allocated funding? What practical impact will this have on clients and service delivery, and—

The PRESIDENT: We will go with that one question.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:40): The figures that she is quoting, I would never take any stock into.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It's in the budget papers.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Those figures would need to be verified—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —because I never believe anything—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Allow the minister to answer your own questions.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! Allow the minister to answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I never, ever believe anything that the Labor Party say, because they get things wrong all the time. I could go back through the *Hansard*—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I could go back through the *Hansard* and point out the error of their ways—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I take it as read that any figure that any member of the Labor Party ever quotes needs to be verified.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:41): A further supplementary: how much of the NDIS clawback is coming from South Australia's allocated funding?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:41): That's the same question; I have answered it.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:41): I have not referred to \$1.6 billion, which is what you are saying you are querying from the federal Liberals.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven, that's not a supplementary. I rule that out of order. The Hon. Mr Hood, point of order.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Mr President, we are now 23 minutes into question time and so far Labor has asked two primary questions which have been well answered. I am sure the crossbench would like to have some opportunity to ask some questions, sir.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you for your concern for the crossbench. I will keep it in mind. The Hon. Ms Bourke.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I remind the Labor—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Labor benches, either remain silent and show some respect to the Hon. Ms Bourke or I will call the next member. The Hon. Ms Bourke.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:42): My question is the Minister for Human Services. Will the minister condemn the federal Liberal government's budget for containing no new money for homelessness, housing affordability or first-home buyers?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, please answer, if you choose.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for her question. Perhaps she wasn't actually listening when her leader was asking questions about Aboriginal housing, but I referred to \$37.5 million for remote housing that was announced in the budget.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, it's going to be hard to get a supplementary out of this, but I will listen to it.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:43): What representation has the minister made to her federal counterparts to express her dismay that the South Australians who are homeless, struggling—

The PRESIDENT: That's got the inflection. I will allow a supplementary, 'What—

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Representations.

The PRESIDENT: —representations has the minister made,' for what?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: What representation have you made to your federal counterparts regarding South Australian budget cuts through the federal government?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:44): Once again, the honourable members do like to mix their issues up and in so doing portray that they don't really know what they are asking, but that's okay, perhaps they need a bit of briefing.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Homelessness funding is already provided through the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement, so South Australia receives a budget allocation which is going towards homelessness providers in South Australia already.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding country health services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Members of this council would be well aware of my advocacy for country South Australia in a range of spheres. I have been encouraged by recent support given to country Australians suffering from natural disasters, among other difficulties. I also know the minister has spoken in this place on country health matters on a number of occasions. Will the minister update the council on support for country health services?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing advocacy for country health. The Marshall Liberal government was elected with a commitment to address the damage done to country health services over 16 years of Labor neglect. I have seen this firsthand in recent trips to country South Australia,

including a visit to Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Balaklava last week. I had the opportunity to tour the tired facilities such as the Port Augusta ambulance station and the Port Pirie Regional Health Service. I also heard from locals about the difficulties that can be faced accessing appropriate health care, particularly GPs in country areas.

Country GPs is one of the points where state and commonwealth responsibilities overlap. That is why I was delighted last night to hear of the Morrison Liberal government's recent commitment to provide \$62 million additional support for rural generalist training. Commonwealth funding is usually targeted on expanding primary care provisions. Given rural hospitals are so reliant on the primary care GP workforce, this increased support also assists our attraction and future recruitment of hospital GPs.

The investment is likely to mean an expansion of junior doctor training positions in rural areas, including postgraduate year 2 doctors, which will help South Australia as it builds the training pipeline. This investment builds on the doubling of medical interns that was delivered in the last 12 months. The funding will also help to increase the number of GP registrars based in rural SA general practices. The investment will complement the investment by the Marshall Liberal government of \$20 million for our rural health workforce strategy.

I am advised that SA Health has been invited to meet with representatives of the commonwealth later in April to explore how the two investments might work together. This is in addition to the funding already committed. Working with the Morrison Liberal government, we have secured \$8.6 million for upgrades for the Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital and a further \$3.9 million for Strathalbyn aged care. The Morrison Liberal government's budget includes a further \$187 million over four years to lift the freeze on the MBS—a freeze put in place by Labor. This will provide further support for GPs and lead to less out-of-pocket expenses for patients.

These investments add to the Marshall Liberal government's own investment in country health services: \$140 million to address the backlog in country capital works; \$20 million, as I said, for rural health workforce strategy; and \$50 million in individual projects in rural areas such as the Mount Gambier hospital and the Healthy Towns Challenge. These investments are a clear demonstration of the benefits the Morrison and Marshall Liberal governments are delivering together to provide the support for country health services so long ignored by Labor.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:48): Will this investment ensure that rape victims will not, as one woman recently had to do, travel from Port Lincoln to Whyalla and back just to have a rape kit done, and that the forensics are available locally in these regional and rural areas, not just the GPs or nurses trained in the appropriate responses?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:48): Yarrow Place, which is a division within the Women's and Children's Health Network, a statewide service, and country health services are actively trying to recruit further health professionals, both nurses and doctors, to undertake training to be able to provide sexual assault examinations.

While I was in Port Pirie, I specifically discussed this issue. It is clearly adding to the trauma of sexual assault to put a woman—usually women—in a situation where she isn't able to take a shower and needs to be transported to Adelaide and have the trauma of the assault compounded by the trauma of being constrained to maintain the evidence. Of course, just in terms of time spent, my understanding would be that the forensic quality of the evidence would be poorer for the fact of the delay in taking it.

This is an issue that was raised with me in opposition. It's an issue that I have certainly been involved in discussions with in government. I am hopeful that as many health professionals as possible will take up this opportunity. To go directly to the honourable member's question, certainly it will expand the number of rural GPs. I hope that those rural GPs will also take the opportunity to take the additional training that is required to be able to undertake examinations.

Examinations are actually ordered by the police rather than by the health services, so I have limited transparency in terms of how many are done and how many people are required to move to the city, but we certainly know, both from people who need the examinations and from health

professionals, that it is a significant issue of access to health for people in regional areas, and I know that health professionals in country South Australia and Yarrow Place are actively trying to address that issue.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:51): Supplementary: will the support for regional health services include support for the Keith hospital, or will their emergency department close within days?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:51): I am ever thankful for the ongoing stream of Dorothy Dixier questions I get from the opposition. The honourable member wants to contrast her former Labor colleagues, John Hill and Jack Snelling, who both cut the spending to the Keith hospital, with my record.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Show some respect for the supplementary from the Labor front bench. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In contrast to minister Hill—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leader of the Opposition, I just called you to order. That does not mean a two-second pause.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I take the honourable Leader of the Opposition's point. He doesn't want to hear the answer. If that's the view of his side, I will sit down.

The PRESIDENT: Don't bait the Leader of the Opposition. Get on with the answer, minister.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Open under Labor: closed under Wade. That will be great.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I don't need the commentary. I don't need the commentary and, minister, don't bait the Leader of the Opposition. It is a good question and an important answer, I am sure. Please proceed with your answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The honourable member is asking me to account to this council for our resourcing of the Keith hospital, and I am proud to do so, because in contrast to two of the last three Labor ministers, who cut—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister has latitude and the minister is entitled to answer the question as he so chooses, which was asked by the Labor front bench. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I can understand the embarrassment of the Leader of the Opposition at the wanton neglect of country health for so many years. I can assure you that the people at the Keith hospital—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, you are trying my patience today. Please, I can't hear the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The people at the Keith hospital well remember when John Hill cut their funding. The people at the Keith hospital well remember when Jack Snelling cut their funding. What they also remember is that I gave an additional \$400,000 emergency funding last December. Let's be clear: that was in addition to the \$1 million base funding. That was in addition to the \$1 million—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Childish, childish, childish—\$1 million base funding.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! You are disrupting the minister in his answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The embarrassment of the opposition is clear to see. I can understand it. Jack cuts, John cuts, the Liberal Party is giving \$400,000 emergency funding, a 40 per cent increase in that funding, in this financial year alone.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I call you to order. This was a question asked by the Hon. Ms Scriven—a question from your side. It is reasonable for members of the council to assume that the Labor members wish to hear the response to their own member's question. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Mr President, I would ask you, please don't sit me down. If they keep asking Dorothys, I have the right to bat them back.

The PRESIDENT: Do not bait them, answer them.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: They are so embarrassed: John Hill cut, Jack Snelling cut and—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Are you going to close Keith down? Tell us what you're going to do.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, please!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —I have increased the funding of the Keith hospital by \$400,000 of emergency funding—\$400,000.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Calm down. Order! I am going to allow the minister to answer. I am no longer timing the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you for your latitude, Mr President. I will make the point: the Keith and District Hospital is not a state government hospital. The Marshall Liberal government is keen to strengthen health services in the country; that is why we are investing in the McLaren Vale district hospital, that is why we are investing in the Ardrossan hospital and that is why we are investing in the Keith hospital.

We are investing this financial year, in base funding, \$1 million and then emergency funding of \$400,000. No other hospital in South Australia is getting a 40 per cent increase in their budget, particularly no private hospital with state government money. I made it clear to the Keith hospital at the end of last year that they need to manage their budget. If the Labor Party wants the wanton disregard for budget management that infected the public hospitals under their watch to infect private hospitals, the whole system will collapse and not just the public health system.

Funding has been increased by the emergency funding and, unfortunately, it has been spent three months early. I wrote to the board in December last year and I said, 'The money that will be available will be the last payment for 2018-19.' I said, 'I would encourage the Keith and District Hospital to adjust the level of services, at least in the short term, if it is not able to fund all of the services it currently delivers through to 30 June.'

What was I doing? What was the appalling thing I was doing? I was asking a hospital, which had already spent its \$1 million base funding, that is now receiving an additional \$400,000—a 40 per cent increase—'Could you please stay within the \$1.4 million.' Isn't that shocking? On top of that, what I got last week was a letter from the Tatiara council, on behalf of the Keith hospital, asking next year, as well as having the 40 per cent emergency funding built into their base funding, for it to be increased by another 10 per cent.

If the honourable members opposite want to urge us to increase the funding for the Keith hospital by 50 per cent, I would like them to explain to me: how do I explain that to every other South Australian patient requiring services from SA Health?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I would like silence to be maintained for the Hon. Mr Frank Pangallo.

ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:57): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question regarding the Adelaide Aquatic Centre and the Adelaide Football Club.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: On 28 February, I revealed that discussions were well advanced for the club to take over the dilapidated Adelaide Aquatic Centre at North Adelaide and build new headquarters and training facilities. This was met with denials by club hierarchy and brushed aside by the council. It now seems those informal approaches were far more developed and have been going on for months.

At the weekend, it was announced that the federal government would, in last night's budget, contribute \$15 million to the move, the same amount it would cost to replace the centre. This week, the Adelaide city council, which has been quite precious about the hotel development at the Adelaide Oval, announced that the Crows had already made an unsolicited bid for the area of Parklands in North Adelaide known as Park 2 and that it has recommended they can proceed to stage 2 of the council's unsolicited proposals process.

The possible outcomes are that all or part of the proposal proceeds to stage 3 on an exclusive consideration basis, that the proposal should not continue to be considered on an exclusive basis but that it warrants a competitive bidding process or that the proposal is not suitable for further consideration. Given that the Lord Mayor has in the last few days been spruiking the project, along with a committed handout, the latter seems an unlikely outcome. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Considering the estimated cost of the project is around \$61 million, is the state government going to follow the federal government and provide funding for the Crows? If so, what amount?
2. Has the Adelaide Football Club approached the government about securing a loan through the South Australian Government Financing Authority for the project?
3. As a project of this type would involve significant change of use to the Parklands, do the Treasurer and the government believe the proposal requires consultation with residents and businesses to gauge broad community support before it proceeds?
4. Considering the Adelaide Aquatic Centre attracts 750,000 unique visits each year, how does the government propose to provide a swim centre accessible to the public in the city?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for the question. No proposition for funding has come to me as the Treasurer of the state. My views in relation to these general issues—in the absence of any specific proposal, we are speaking about a hypothetical. I accept the member has put a hypothetical question to me. My general attitude to these sorts of questions is I would take a power of convincing that we should be providing a grant equal to the commonwealth grant, evidently of \$15 million. But there has been no proposition put to me as Treasurer.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:01): My question is to the Treasurer. How much money has been allocated in the 2019 commonwealth budget for the government's signature infrastructure policy, GlobeLink?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:01): I don't believe there is any specific funding for the specific project funding of GlobeLink, because there actually has to be a business case for GlobeLink, which the state government in its last budget undertook funding for. Commonwealth infrastructure projects, for the benefit of the member, require a business case and something as potentially expensive as GlobeLink would require consideration not only by Infrastructure Australia but Infrastructure South Australia as well.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:01): Supplementary: as part of doing those various preparatory works, has the Treasurer or anyone else from the government, that he's aware of, met with Big W after the demise of the Monarto distribution centre only recently?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:02): I have already put on the public record my position in relation to what, if any, connection there might be in relation to the Big W distribution centre and GlobeLink. Until the business case for GlobeLink has actually been concluded and considered by the state government, we are not in the position to be able to indicate whether there would be any connection at all with a Big W distribution centre and any potential final recommendations from a business case for GlobeLink.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:02): Supplementary: will the Treasurer now meet with his federal counterpart, Nicolle Flint, who has put out extensive material stating that, 'Our GlobeLink plan will deliver benefits across all our local community'?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:03): I'm always very happy to meet with the very hardworking, assiduous, meticulous and deserving to be re-elected member for Boothby.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:03): Further supplementary: will he be correcting her on her language used in regard to her material, given that it seems to be presenting the material contrary to what the Treasurer has outlined as a fait accompli?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:03): I certainly am a mere state Treasurer and I would not even contemplate what the member is inviting me to do: that is, seeking to correct the language of a federal member of parliament who is quite clearly beyond my jurisdiction.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:03): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer outline the impact of last night's federal budget on South Australian small businesses?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:04): I'm delighted to respond to that particular question. As a small and medium-sized business state, small business and policies that impact on small business are critical to economic and jobs growth in the small business sector.

The policy announcement last night in relation to instant asset write-off for small businesses—that particular scheme has not only been extended for a period, I think, of up to two to three years, but eligibility for the scheme now has been extended beyond small businesses with turnovers of up to \$10 million to small businesses with turnovers of, I think, up to \$50 million. So a considerably larger number of small and medium-sized businesses in South Australia will now be eligible for this particular incentive. Also, the extent of the incentive has been extended from \$25,000 to \$30,000.

The length of the scheme has also been extended. If you combine that with some of the other initiatives in the federal budget in relation to tax relief, both personal and across the board, and combine that with the brilliant initiative of Premier Marshall in relation to the abolition of payroll tax for all small businesses in South Australia from 1 January this year—a combination of both state government policy and federal government policy directed towards small and medium-sized business—should help turbo charge small and medium businesses in South Australia in terms of jobs growth and creating economic growth in South Australia.

As I said, if I come back to my original statement, the health of small business in South Australia is critical for a state like South Australia, and we are delighted to see recognition of that fact from the federal Coalition government, and we were delighted to see some of the other policies directed towards small business growth in the federal budget yesterday as well.

AUSLAN INTERPRETERS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing on the topic of Auslan interpreters in emergency departments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Patients and carers who are deaf or hard of hearing need access to Auslan interpreters as soon as possible when they present to emergency departments so that they can make informed consent. Without that interpreter present, doctors will have failed their obligation to receive informed consent for those patients. Hospitals refusing to provide an interpreter to patients is discrimination, and of course hinders the hospital's duty of care.

I have received a case, the details of which I will not go into today—I will communicate that to the minister separately from this—showing that, at least at the Women's and Children's Hospital, emergency departments are not currently providing those Auslan interpreters in a timely fashion to assist patients and their families who are deaf or hard of hearing. Hospitals not providing those interpreters is, of course, discrimination under the Disability Discrimination Act 1992, by failing to provide reasonable accommodations, and means that that hospital is failing in its duty of care. Additionally, pressure put on individuals in this NDIS environment to provide their own interpreters is not within the framework of a public health system delivered in the appropriate way.

My question to the minister is: can he now clarify that Auslan interpreters should and will be provided to deaf and hard of hearing patients and carers in our hospitals and short stay emergency departments on request, as needed, in a timely way?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for her question. Let us be very clear: deaf and hard of hearing South Australians have the same right to access the health system as the rest of the community. Access, of course, is physical access, but of course it is also communication access. There is no point in getting through the door if you cannot actually communicate with someone.

There is no doubt that the health system has a responsibility to give that same right of access to all. The Marshall Liberal government has made very clear its attitude to inclusion, both for the deaf and hard of hearing community and for the disability community, which is why this parliament recently passed the Disability Inclusion Act, brought to this place by my honourable colleague the Minister for Human Services.

The issue of access in relation to the deaf and hard of hearing, and also people with disability, has been brought starkly to mind in terms of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. In spite of spending \$2.4 billion, there were significant disability shortcomings, such as the lack of a publicly-accessible changing place. The house will obviously remember the advocacy of the Hon. Kelly Vincent in that regard.

In relation to people who are deaf or hard of hearing, one of the problems in that hospital is the lack of facilities for the toileting needs of assistance dogs and, of course, amongst accredited assistance dogs are dogs that support people who are deaf and hard of hearing. That is, if you like, touching on the physical aspects, but the honourable member is completely correct to highlight the importance of communication in terms of access to hospitals.

SA Health hospitals have an obligation to ensure that communication is possible with all individuals, including those who are deaf or hard of hearing, across all our health services. Obviously, there is a range of communication challenges: people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities, people with dementia who often have problems with communication, and of course the community that the honourable member highlights, the deaf or hard of hearing community.

To ensure quality and safety for patients and to enable clear communication, Auslan sign language interpreters are arranged for patients who are deaf or who have hearing loss, irrespective of their NDIS eligibility. No patient should be charged for interpreter services; likewise, no patient should be expected to use their NDIS resources to access health services.

The honourable member asked me if I thought they should be provided and the answer is yes. In terms of the access issues I note that the honourable member identified particular issues at the Women's and Children's and I am more than happy to follow those up, because we want a health system that is of high quality and value for money for all South Australians and that is accessible to them.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:11): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer agree with comments made by Coalition finance minister Mathias Cormann that South Australia is \$1.3 billion better off despite a revision in the GST over the forward estimates?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his question. I often find myself in furious agreement with my federal finance colleague Senator Cormann. He is an excellent minister in an excellent government. I was asked to comment on similar statements made by our excellent Prime Minister Morrison in a similar vein two or three weeks ago. The statements being made by minister Cormann are correct; that is, all states have actually seen some growth in GST because there has been some growth in the national GST pie.

However, the reality is that in all states, Labor and Liberal state treasurers have been singing from the same hymn sheet today. The size of the growth in the national GST pie has actually not been as big as previously estimated by the commonwealth Treasury. Yes, the size of the pie has grown—so what Senator Cormann is referring to, as I understand it, is correct—but it has not grown at the same rate as commonwealth Treasury was predicting last year or in December last year or indeed even after the Commonwealth Grants Commission update in February-March this year.

As I said, the reality is that all state and territory treasurers have been singing from the same general hymn sheet today in relation to GST; that is, the expected GST returns have been significantly reduced because, sadly, the total GST pie has actually grown at a slower rate. People haven't been spending on consumption goods to the same extent as had been previously predicted; dwelling investment and expenditure has actually declined nationally, in particular to a very large degree in the Eastern States, in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane, as the property market has experienced a downturn.

For all those reasons what Senator Cormann is saying is substantially accurate. I haven't checked the exact number that he is talking about but certainly, yes, there has been some growth but what I and other state treasurers, Labor and Liberal, have been saying is also exactly accurate as well.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CRISIS LINE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about the government's commitment to addressing domestic and family violence. Can the minister please provide an update to the council on the use of South Australia's Domestic Violence Crisis Line since the service hours were extended in December last year?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her ongoing interest in this important area. As honourable members may recall, during the election campaign, the Liberal Party—the Marshall Liberal opposition and now government—made a range of commitments to address the terrible problem in our society of domestic and family violence.

We were very pleased that in the 2018-19 state budget, the Treasurer confirmed that \$11.9 million dollars over four years would be provided for a suite of measures. These have been the subject of extensive consultation with the sector, both through a statewide round table and through a range of regional round tables. Some of these include the extension of safety hubs into regional South Australia, peak body funding for the coalition of women's domestic and Aboriginal family violence services for a personal protection app, improvement of data collection and communications, 40 new crisis accommodation beds, interest-free loans for the non-government sector and for a domestic violence disclosure scheme.

One of our commitments was to provide funding for the domestic violence crisis hotline to operate 24/7. That service has been in operation on a nine to five basis for some 30 years. The sector has been calling for that service to be made 24 hours. Clearly, people who are experiencing domestic and family violence need help at all hours of the day and night and so we were very pleased that that has been included in the budget through \$1.6 million to Women's Safety Services. Once the funding was made available the service recruited people and provided specialist training, so it started operating in November last year.

The data is both alarming, but in some ways it goes to that we may be reaching more people, which is the positive side. If we look at the nine to five figures in terms of the number of calls per month, on average up until October/November last year the average was about 630 calls a month. It peaked in October/November to 708. Now that it is operating 24 hours a day, those numbers per month are 900.

I should say that the crisis line diverted to the generic homelessness service and to 1800RESPECT after hours in the past, and we don't have data to enable a direct comparison at this stage. But on my own calculations over a three-month period, the 24-hour service has been receiving about 900 phone calls a month, so it is a very significant increase. We are pleased that people who are in this situation are able to access specialised advice on that line and we trust that their lives will be improved as they are able to seek help when they need it.

DONOR CONCEPTION REGISTER

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about the donor conception register in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: South Australian donor-conceived children, the assisted reproductive industry and other stakeholders have, as we all know, been calling for better and more cohesive access to information for more than 30 years, and the government advisory bodies and committees have openly supported the establishment of a donor conception register for at least the past 17 years.

The extensive January 2017 report on the Review of the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988, authored by leading legal health academic, Dr Sonia Allan, for the then South Australian minister for health, made a number of recommendations including articulating the urgency for a donor conception register in South Australia.

The recommendations were either supported or given in-principle support by the former Labor government in its response to the review. Despite this, a South Australian donor conception register is still non-existent and South Australia remains one of the few jurisdictions not to have one. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister provide details of any undertakings that were made during the meeting between Dr Allan and the minister on 1 June 2018 regarding the establishment of a donor conception register in South Australia?
2. When will South Australians, in particular donor conceived people, expect to see the implementation of such a register?
3. Has the government approved a budget for the implementation of a donor conception register? If not, why not?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am not sure whether it's completely in order because my understanding is that you have a piece of legislation before the house that would require us to establish a register. In my view, that makes the question out of order because it relates to something that is on the *Notice Paper*, but be that as it may.

The PRESIDENT: Is the minister directing me?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: No, be that as it may. I am not raising a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: If the minister is going to raise it, I will have to rule on it. Which bill are we actually referring to?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I wasn't raising it as a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: No, but you have raised it and it's now to the President's attention. Which bill are we referring to? If it's in the other house, that's okay.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Mr President, a further point of order on that: it's actually specifically related to the contents of that bill in what the bill seeks to do, not the general issue, so it may well be in order.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am happy to address the general issue.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. I appreciate that, minister, but now that it has come to the President's attention, which bill are we referring to?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am not aware of the bill I was referring to.

The PRESIDENT: Can the honourable member assist me? Which bill does the question address?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: And I am happy not to address the bill but to address the general issue.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I know you are happy and want to satiate the question asked by the Hon. Ms Bonaros, but since it has been raised, to which bill does it refer?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I am just trying to find the number on the *Notice Paper*, Mr President.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It would be something like 'assisted reproductive technology'.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No. 16, Private Members' Business, Assisted Reproductive Treatment (Review Recommendations) Amendment Bill.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: No. 16, thank you.

The PRESIDENT: Obviously, I don't have the benefit of an intimate knowledge of that bill, so my ruling, minister, will be that those parts of the question which relate generally to the topic but not specifically addressed by the bill are in order. The minister can shape his answer in accordance with that ruling, which means: be very general.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am happy to answer but I wonder if it might be more facilitative if I give an undertaking to the honourable member to make a contribution on her private members' bill, if possible, this afternoon or on another occasion.

The PRESIDENT: No, minister, it's not a conversation. It's a response to a question. I am going to take it that you have taken it on notice and will bring back a reply or you can respond to the member's question in writing or, in fact, in the body of the debate.

Ministerial Statement

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:23): I table a copy of a ministerial statement, which I understand has been made in another place today by the Premier, on the subject of the federal budget 2019-20.

Matters of Interest

SA PATHOLOGY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:24): I rise today to speak on the privatisation of SA Pathology. Every time we go for a blood test to investigate or keep track of an illness or have a tissue sample from a pap test or a suspicious mole sent off for analysis, the wheels of the pathology industry are put to work.

Pathology is big business and many in the private sector see the profit motive rather than public health outcomes as the reason to be in the business of pathology. Pathology is at the heart of our healthcare system. It provides the accurate and timely information that so affects our population's health, and allows clinicians the insights they need to properly manage the health of patients. By putting a bottom line of profit ahead of services, this government would indeed threaten people's lives, something that no government should be seen to be doing. Indeed, all governments should be seeking to improve and protect the health of their citizens.

Pathology directly reduces the cost of health care. It provides that certainty needed to achieve the minimum hospital lengths of stay and to avoid unnecessary treatments and unnecessary hospital admissions. We cannot expect SA Pathology to be cost competitive against private providers, so the arguments of contestability are moot. Private providers will not do the same tests that SA Pathology does because they simply are not profitable. SA Pathology does public testing that is not on the Medicare Benefits Schedule and as such is not funded to make that profit. They do not get money for it, which is why others will not do it, so how they can ever be contestable?

The danger is that where we lose the critical mass of SA Pathology, we will lose the expertise and the depth of services and cross-subsidisation to ensure that those tests are done in a timely way. Indeed, those tests no longer covered by the MBS mean that the patient will bear the full cost. That would be the case for people with established diabetes who need a haemoglobin A1c test, which is rebated for only four tests in a 12-month period. These tests are required for monitoring that disease and if the patient needs more than four tests in that time frame, they may well be required to pay the full price—they certainly will be required to pay the full price in a privatised system.

About 85 per cent of all pathology services are bulk billed, and that is the highest rate of any medical speciality, which is as it should be. It is worth noting that non-Medicare funded pathology is mostly purchased or funded by government authorities other than Medicare, such as workers compensation, public hospitals or, in fact, the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

It is also worth noting that some one in seven workers within SA Pathology have been told—not through formal communications, but through an announcement in the press and on the radio—that they may well be losing their jobs in the next few years. They have been told this in a context that SA Pathology is being deemed somehow inefficient, unviable and in need of privatisation. They have been told this in a context that doctors and nurses, as front-line staff, will have their jobs in the public health sector protected, but these so-called backroom staff are under no such protections and yet they are expert, capable, skilled public health professionals in our public health system.

If you want to know how important these so-called backroom people are, I think we should listen to those very doctors and nurses who have been saved from the health scalpel under this Marshall government. Associate Professor William Tan has called this move one that will create chaos, one that is a weird experiment and has cautioned that it would see the cherrypicking of the most lucrative and profitable sections of SA Pathology by sourcing those out to the private sector as a false economy because you would lose that cross-subsidisation for the more expensive tests and it would also put in danger the training and skills we need to keep in this state to ensure we have the best outcomes.

It is like an episode of *Yes, Minister* where the most profitable and efficient hospital had no patients. That is what we are looking at if we privatise SA Pathology.

CLOSING THE GAP DAY

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:29): I rise today to acknowledge the growing success of the annual Closing the Gap Day event held in South Australia. This year, the event was hosted in the Goyder Pavilion at the Wayville Showgrounds. I attended the event on behalf of the Premier last Wednesday 27 March.

I think we are all now aware of the significant gap that exists between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in terms of health and life expectancy, educational achievement and employment opportunities. The national Closing the Gap campaign works to address some of these major inequalities and has seen some of Australia's peak Indigenous and non-Indigenous health bodies, NGOs and human rights organisations working together to achieve national health and life expectation equality for Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Sonder, formerly known as Northern Health Network, has reported that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people can expect to live between 10 to 17 years less than non-Indigenous Australians. Perhaps more concerning, the 2019 Closing the Gap report has revealed that, while progress has been made over the past decade, only two of the program's ambitious targets are currently on track.

These disappointing figures make it clear that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders do not benefit from mainstream health services to the same extent that non-Indigenous Australian people do. The reasons for this include health services which are not as accessible to remote Aboriginal communities and that mainstream health services often lack the level of cultural sensitivity required to effectively serve Indigenous peoples.

Closing the Gap Day is an important event to raise awareness for these issues and to help close the gap by 2030. Closing the Gap Day is the annual focal point of the national Closing the Gap campaign. It is a free, all ages event which seeks to bring people from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities together. From this they can share information and take meaningful action in support of achieving Indigenous health equality.

The first national Closing the Gap Day was held in 2007, involving five large state events and more than 300 community events. It has since become an annual occasion in which all Australian states and territories participate, now being the largest and highest profile Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health event in the country.

The Closing the Gap Day in South Australia is organised and coordinated by Sonder, with the support of the Adelaide PHN, Nunkuwarrin Yunti and SA Health's Watto Purrinna. This year the event boasted stalls from over 65 health service providers, sharing valuable information and promoting services to ensure better health outcomes for Aboriginal people and communities.

Former Sydney Swans AFL player and Hall of Fame member, Michael O'Loughlin, emceed the event, which showcased a number of talented Indigenous performers. These included the Merrg, Vonda Last, the Dusty Feet Mob and Joshua Warrior. Attendees enjoyed a free lunch and were able to receive free health checks, including measurements of blood pressure and blood glucose, free immunisations and consults with traditional healers.

It was a truly family friendly event with a yellow brick road competition that encouraged people to visit participating stallholders and get involved. There were also plenty of activities for the kids, including a jumping castle, inflatable bumper cars, footy games, a petting zoo and face painting, with prizes for a number of lucky participants.

I had the pleasure of meeting Sonder's CEO, Mr Sageran Naidoo, who was blown away by the overall community engagement and participation at this year's event. Mr Naidoo recalled that in previous years the Closing the Gap Day event had attracted only a few hundred attendees. This year, however, Sonder has confirmed that there were over 2,000 attendees, which exceeded the organisers expectations by over 1,000 people.

Whilst it is evident from the annual Closing the Gap report that there is still much work to do to achieve equality in terms of Indigenous and non-Indigenous health and life expectancy, the outstanding turnout and community engagement at the Closing the Gap day event in our state this year shows the growing level of awareness and support for this important cause.

VIETNAMESE BOAT PEOPLE MONUMENT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:33): It is with great pride that I rise to speak about the Vietnamese boat people monument, which was approved by the City of Adelaide last week, to be built alongside the River Torrens at the corner of Kintore Avenue and Victoria Drive. This monument tells the story of 2 million Vietnamese people who fled their war-torn country. I am one of those two million people who threw themselves to the mercy of the sea, searching for somewhere safe to live, free from war, terror and corruption.

The monument symbolises and commemorates a journey as seen through the eyes of two young Vietnamese Australians. It is the concept of family through its strength and its survival across

generations and the sacrifices families from one generation made so that others may flourish. It is an opportunity for a safe and better future in Australia.

The monument is also a gift of gratitude from the Vietnamese community to the wider Australian community for welcoming and accepting us when we sought safety and sanctuary. The Adelaide city location was chosen so people from near and far can visit. More importantly, this location connects the monument with water. Water is an essential element of the monument. It represents the passage by water we faced coming to Australia.

The location is adjacent to the Torrens Parade Ground and the ANZAC memorial walk, places where we commemorate and remember those who fought and those who died, including soldiers from the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War and the boat people are connected in history. These events significantly shaped our region and the spirit of our nations. Placing this monument near the Vietnam War Memorial respects the interconnectedness of these two important events.

The monument is designed to gently sit upon the earth and will enhance its surroundings in harmony with the natural environment. It will invite people into the greenery and open space. Visitors can interact, walk around and within it, exploring from different angles and positions. The monument recognises the plight of the Vietnamese boat people. Its design is symbolic. Thereby, the design can be appreciated and enjoyed by people of all cultures.

My hope is that the monument provides an emotionally uplifting and thoughtful place for visitors, a place to feel at peace. The monument will encourage visitors to think about their own journey, especially younger and future generations to reflect about their families' present and past journeys.

Many people have gone above and beyond in their support for this project. I say thank you. I especially acknowledge the City of Adelaide Lord Mayor Sandy Verschoor, elected members and staff. Their support has been tremendous, particularly in getting this project off the ground. I also pay special acknowledgement to former lord mayor Martin Haese and current Deputy Lord Mayor Houssam Abiad, whom I met very early on for coffee when this project was just a dream.

I thank our Governor, Hieu Van Le, who himself arrived in Australia as a boat person, for his ongoing support. I also wish to acknowledge our former premier of South Australia, Jay Weatherill, who was crucial in ensuring the state government's support for this important project. This monument will outlive generations past and present, and will be a special place for people to visit where they can learn and reflect with a sense of both peace and purpose for many years to come. I look forward to officially unveiling the Vietnamese boat people monument next year.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:38): 'First, a feeble spark, next a flickering flame, then a mighty blaze ever increasing in speed and power.' Nikola Tesla, the father of the alternative current motor, could have easily been talking about the electric car. Now, 76 years after his death, his name is on the world's hottest electric vehicle, made by another eccentric figure, the billionaire Elon Musk.

Today, all the talk is about what will power our wheels soon. This week, the Labor Party's shadow for climate change, Mark Butler, sounded the death knell for gas guzzlers. In a promise lacking detail, he wants a national EV target of 50 per cent of new car sales within 10 or so years. National motoring body, the NRMA, wants petrol and diesel cars banned as early as 2025. With only 7,300 on our roads and 1,350 sold last year, that might still be in the realm of electric dreams without sizeable rebates, incentives and infrastructure that would eliminate range anxiety, that draining feeling EV drivers get when they are running on empty a long way from home or a charging station.

In addition, the federal government would have to find a new way to tax motorists for the billions now raised from fuel excise to build our new freeways and maintain our network of roads. There is now a buzz around EVs that appears irresistible. The world's biggest car makers are rolling out models. Volvo says it is ditching combustion engines. Tesla has unfilled orders for 400,000. The motoring world is falling in love with EVs, but we are not talking about something that is entirely of this modern technological age.

People were tinkering with electric vehicles as far back as the 1800s when batteries were first invented. Ferdinand Porsche, of sports car fame, developed an electric car called the P1 in

1898 and the world's first hybrid electric car, powered by electricity and gasoline. At the turn of the 20th century, EVs dominated car sales and were considered a status symbol. In New York, they accounted for a third of sales and the city had a fleet of electric cabs. They had it over early models of petrol-driven cars—no noise, pollution or the need to crank start them. Charging was not an issue in the big cities with electricity grids.

The future looked bright until Charles Kettering came up with the electric starter in 1912 and they struck black gold (crude oil) in Texas. As the price of petrol fell, sales boomed for the much cheaper Model T Ford, which could travel longer distances and sold for around \$650, compared with the EV's \$1,750. By 1935, they had all but disappeared. There was a brief revival in the 1970s when oil prices peaked, creating petrol shortages. NASA also did its bit to boost the technology with its lunar rover becoming the first manned vehicle to be driven on the moon in 1971. However, limited performance and that curse of range anxiety saw interest quickly wane.

The next phase came in 1996 when General Motors made the EV1, based on technology they developed in winning the 1987 World Solar Challenge from Darwin to Adelaide with the SunRaycer. This was the first mass produced, purpose-designed EV of the modern era as a result of zero emissions policies in smoggy California. The EV1 was an impressive performer, clocking a land speed record of 295 km/h, but it was cloaked in controversy.

Between 1994 and 1999, GM made only 1,117 units, which were leased rather than sold in a curious marketing experiment. Conspiracy theories of big oil interference erupted when GM reclaimed the cars and crushed them, giving rise to the documentary *Who Killed the Electric Car?* Sixty survived and were donated, minus the essential technology, to museums. Today, we have come full circle. Along with a new breed of EV, there is remarkable research and development happening in several countries, with vehicle-charging electrified roads and rapid wireless charging technology.

In January, a Senate Select Committee on Electric Vehicles recommended Australia develop a national EV strategy to accelerate the uptake of EVs. I have waded through last night's budget to see if there were any incentives for this brave new world of urban travel. Thomas Edison once said, 'We will make electricity so cheap that only the rich will burn candles.' If only that were true.

WHYALLA RIPPLES SUPPORT GROUP

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:44): I rise to speak on the important work of the Whyalla Ripples Support Group, an organisation I first heard about when I had the privilege of attending the South Australian Community Achievement Awards last November, along with the Minister for Innovation and Skills and the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

At this ceremony, Whyalla Ripples won the 2018 Flinders University Rural Health South Australian Regional Achievement Award in recognition of their dedication to providing support and education to the families and loved ones of those struggling with ice addiction within the Whyalla community. This was certainly a remarkable achievement, given there were no less than 280 nominations for this particular award alone.

On the evening, I had the opportunity to meet with one of its founders, Karen Harrison, following her poignant acceptance speech in which she detailed some of the very serious risks and dangers of crystal meth and the realities of the recovery process for addicts and users of this substance. Karen attributed the organisation's success on the night to the work of its committed network of volunteers who selflessly sacrifice their time and energy for the betterment of some of the most vulnerable South Australians in the third most populous city within our state.

Whyalla Ripples was formed in 2015 after Karen had personally found herself in desperate need of help when members of her own family were experiencing the all-consuming detrimental affects of ice addiction. After she learnt there was no support group in the area for people in her position, she, along with mental health clinician Bonita Scott, took charge and formed Ripples. When Cheryl Targett from the Whyalla mental health service joined them, they appointed an executive committee, became incorporated and then sought funding.

Over the past three years, they have had up to 30 attendees at their regular meetings with speakers that have included: ambulance officers, mental health workers, nurses, lawyers, police,

representatives from Life Without Barriers, the Whyalla Suicide Prevention group, Country and Outback Health, the Red Cross, Grandparents for Grandchildren SA, Mission Australia and Whyalla corrections. As residents from Port Augusta were travelling to Whyalla to attend these meetings, where they could obtain support, guidance and advice, Port Augusta Ripples was soon formed in response.

Recently, I was fortunate enough to visit Whyalla and its surrounds, and I had the pleasure of meeting with local mayors, councillors and other service providers in the community. This certainly left me with a greater insight into the issues of most concern to residents in the area, which included the social and economic impact of substance abuse.

Members would no doubt recall Adelaide was labelled the 'ice capital' of Australia in late 2017, after a study revealed we had the highest levels of methylamphetamine in our wastewater per capita. Less than a year later, usage was found to have dropped substantially and was partly attributed by commentators to a crackdown on suppliers.

The Marshall Liberal government certainly has no tolerance for pushers of any illicit drug, including ice. As we know, it is highly addictive and notorious for ravaging the health and wellbeing of its users and those closest to them. I would like to commend Whyalla Ripples on its significant contribution to its local community and to congratulate its volunteers for receiving formal recognition of its achievements. Their partnership with the state government in assisting residents of rural and regional South Australia who are most in need is noted and appreciated.

As I said, they won the award from several hundred nominees, which in itself is an outstanding achievement, but there was recognition on the night of the great work that these people are doing. As I said, I was in Whyalla a few weeks ago and had the opportunity to meet with the individuals involved in this network. They are doing great work in assisting people who have succumbed to addiction.

I met with the most senior police officers in the city, who gave credit to the organisation on their support of their law enforcement. It is a clear case of a not-for-profit community organisation doing things that are benefiting the whole community. They work tirelessly, and I want to sincerely congratulate them for all that they do.

WOMEN IN SPORT

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:48): In a very timely matter of interest, I rise today to speak about women in sport, their accomplishments and the respect they deserve. Of course, over the weekend, Adelaide's AFLW team did our state proud by winning their second premiership in the three-year history of the women's league. I extend my congratulations to the Crows women's team for their tremendous effort throughout this season, and for their accomplishment in winning the grand final in front of a record crowd of 53,034 people. It was truly a groundbreaking day for sport.

Notwithstanding this incredible achievement, women's sport and women in sport continue to attract criticism. In recent weeks, AFLW Carlton athlete Tayla Harris was captured in a picture mid flight while she was kicking a goal in a match against the Western Bulldogs. The photo is extraordinary and displays Tayla's incredible athleticism, strength and technique.

Unsurprisingly, 7AFL displayed this remarkable photo on their social media platforms. However, within just hours of posting the image, Tayla was aggressively targeted and endured sickening abuse. I have seen some of the comments that were published, and am absolutely disgusted. The comments are vile and derogatory, and in my 82 years on this earth I have never come across such abhorrent and despicable language.

Similar pictures of men have been published for decades, and they have never attracted similar comments. People merely see the picture as a man kicking a ball, yet when the subject is female people feel entitled to make completely irrelevant comments. Criticism should be about the game or an athlete's skill, they should not be misogynistic and sexualising someone doing their job.

Tayla has expressed her discomfort at these comments and described it as sexual abuse, and I agree with her. I condemn the cowards who hide behind their keyboards and say these contemptible things. Instead of deleting the vile comments or taking action against the online abusers, 7AFL deleted the photo. Although 7AFL has now conceded that this was the wrong move

to remove the photo, it sent the wrong message to athletes, their young fans and the community in general.

Unfortunately, this response is symptomatic of general attitudes towards women and to what is acceptable behaviour. We are often too quick to react, often against the victim rather than looking at the behaviour and the actions of the perpetrators. Although we have come a long way in the last decade with women in sport, they are still widely discriminated against in all levels of competition. This includes unequal pay, under-representation in leadership positions, inequitable access to resources and facilities and under-representation in the media and in sponsorship deals.

As demonstrated by Tayla Harris, women in sport also face harassment and a lack of respect for their sporting achievements. Young girls need to see that there is a clear and fair career pathway for them to work as full-time professional athletes. Currently, nearly all elite women athletes juggle competitions and training with full or part-time work or study, sport-related travel, family commitments and sponsorship requirements, if they are lucky enough to be sponsored.

For example, Crows player, Dr Jessica Foley, had to work a 14-hour shift after playing in a preliminary final. In June last year, the AFL signed off on a 20 per cent salary increase, which increased the men's average salary from \$309,000 to \$371,000 per year. In comparison, the average female salary is about \$10,000, with the top female AFL players earning \$24,600. Wage disparity between sexes is not uncommon in all fields. However, the chasm is particularly evident in professional sports.

I can already hear the cries of naysayers, who will argue that the AFLW season is shorter, and therefore is not comparable. However, fans and players are advocating for a longer women's season, which would enable athletes to work professionally in their sport without having to supplement their income with external work. Extending the season and allowing these players to earn a full-time wage will demonstrate that they are valued as players.

It would also increase the credibility of the AFLW, which will generate more interest, talent development and participation in sport. Most importantly, it would send an important message to young girls and change the culture surrounding women in sport. I acknowledge that we have come a long way, but there is still a fair distance to go. I would like to think it will be done in my lifetime, but I am not hopeful. I would love to be shown to be wrong. In the meantime, I want to thank the current women who are experiencing the struggles to participate in their sports and are inspiring future stars to follow in their footsteps.

RURAL DOCTORS ASSOCIATION

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:54): The current status of the rural GP workforce is the worst it has ever been. These are not my words, they are the words of the president of the Rural Doctors Association. Mr Acting President, you, the Hon. Dennis Hood and the Hon. Connie Bonaros—we are a small handful of the many threads that are woven together to make the South Australian tapestry, but do we give the same value to each of these threads, to every South Australian? Last week, when flying to Kangaroo Island for the GM crop committee and then when driving to Kadina over the weekend, it was hard not to think how we, as upper house members, are able to provide the services needed to support our vast and diverse state.

As I have mentioned previously in this chamber, I grew up in regional South Australia on the Yorke Peninsula where my family still runs a farm and a successful agricultural engineering business. I do not live in a fantasy world where I am going to argue that regional health services will be comparable to the emergency services available to our state-of-the-art metropolitan hospitals, and I am not going to argue that Labor got it right every time.

What I will argue is that if you start removing the basics like SA Pathology you will start stripping the threads of a community one by one. We need to attract and keep people in regional South Australia and not discourage professionals, families and teachers from moving into our regional communities by removing basic services like SA Pathology. Not only are they basic, they are life-saving procedures. Given that 30 per cent of South Australians live in rural South Australia it is important that we have a viable rural health service and viable workforce.

We know that health outcomes in our rural communities are poor compared to their metropolitan cousins. Many in this chamber—like the Hon. John Dawkins—understand that regional communities are built on the strength of those individuals who will do anything for their community. However, you need the basic services to keep people there, services like schools, hospitals, sports clubs and one or two pubs.

When the Ernst and Young SA Pathology report was made available to the then state minister Jack Snelling to explore opportunities to contest regional SA Pathology services he was quick to rule out the adoption of that recommendation. Why? Because minister Snelling listened to the feedback from rural communities and the pathology industry.

I have spoken in this place before about the Liberal government's catchy #RegionsMatter. As recently as today, when I have been chatting to rural communities about health, SA Pathology has been a hot topic of conversation in regional communities. They are feeling like they do not matter. We know that SA Pathology has been providing very important services in many rural communities. They provide some emergency blood products, including blood transfusions. Regional communities know that this is very important, considering the number of road fatalities and accidents that happen in regional communities. Without the support of SA Pathology being an on-site service many lives would be at risk because of the quick turnaround that is required in those circumstances.

Communities are concerned that their GPs will no longer have a good working relationship with SA Pathology clinicians if SA Pathology is privatised. If their tests are required to go interstate there will be a delay in response and also treatment. Those opposite might scoff when members on this side of the parliament talk about regional SA. It is the actions of a government not the hashtags that are relevant and that matter.

It does not stop at SA Pathology; it continues on to services available through our regional hospitals as well. We heard today about the Keith hospital. Why would it be up to a community to organise a GoFundMe page to keep a service available in that community? It is another broken promise by the Marshall Liberal government.

When the Hon. Rob Lucas was shadow minister for health and wellbeing, in 2013 he stated that the Liberal Party supported the Keith community in its campaign to keep the hospital open and it will continue to do so.

Time expired.

Motions

WORLD AUTISM AWARENESS DAY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:00): I move:

That this council—

1. Supports South Australians living with autism to fully participate in society using their fundamental rights and freedoms;
2. Recognises World Autism Awareness Day on 2 April 2019;
3. Recommits to ensuring South Australians living with autism are given every opportunity to participate at school, in the workplace and out in their communities; and
4. Thanks all service staff and volunteers who help provide the valuable support needed by South Australians living with autism.

I am sure almost everyone in this place is more than willing to join me in celebrating the fact that yesterday was World Autism Awareness Day. It is celebrated on 2 April every year and has been for quite some time. Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) refers to a group of developmental disorders, including autism and Asperger's syndrome, Rett syndrome, pervasive development disorder, or otherwise not specifically specified disorders which are also known atypically as autism. The word 'spectrum' is used because the range and severity of the difficulties people have with an ASD experience can vary widely. A diagnosis can range from mild to severe. While approximately 75 per cent of people with autism also have an intellectual disability, ASD also occurs in people with an average and above average IQ.

Given current trends and a plethora of data, we can assume an ongoing 12 to 15 per cent increase in people diagnosed on an annual basis. This is consistent with both national and international trends and might reflect an increasing prevalence of rates or could possibly reflect an increase in detection rates or both.

I think it almost goes without saying that in this place many people would have no problem with supporting any motion which purports the kind of words and which speaks to the inclusion and support which this motion outlines. However, I do want to go into a little more depth in my speaking to this motion. It is one that is very close to my heart as someone with a close family member who has a diagnosis of autism. For the person I know, the diagnosis is not severe but it is life-changing.

It is important to recognise that every person with ASD is unique, with different skills behaviour and interests. There is considerable complexity and diversity within the autism spectrum community. As the saying goes, 'If you've met one person with autism, you've met one person with autism.' However, there are common characteristics that—thank you very much to the Hon. Clare Scriven, that was a joke.

There are common characteristics that people with ASD share to varying degrees. These include difficulties in communication, social interaction and repetitive or restricted interests and activities. Indeed, such is the growing prevalence of ASD that my experience of knowing a loved one with ASD is not really all that unusual these days. I am very certain that many of us will know someone, maybe even a family member or just a friend, who has a diagnosis of autism. In fact, in 2015, the Australian Bureau of Statistics identified that there were 164,000 Australians with an autism diagnosis and this included around 80,000 children aged between five and 14 years of age.

That same data indicates that be it at work, at home, in a group of friends, or even at a local sport club or other pastime, 85 per cent of Australians have personal contact with a person with autism. These kinds of statistics make it pretty clear that, for many Australians, autism is actually part of their everyday lives. Despite this, and despite my relative comfort around those with autism, figures show that around two out of every three Australians have said that they have no idea how best to relate to a person with autism—that is two out of every three. Further than this, only 4 per cent of people with autism and their families agree that people in the community know how to support them—4 per cent.

The fact is that having a friend or family member who has autism will teach you a lot. Different rules do apply to everyday tasks that you once took for granted. There are places you feel you can go and places that challenge you in different ways.

Many families of people with autism, and indeed those who have autism, do not feel supported to fully participate in all the things that many of us want to do to be fully appreciated and to participate in society. There is a disconnect. I rush to add that it is not deliberate on anyone's part, but there is a disconnect between everyone wanting to participate and being given the ability to do so. It is occurring in the main because of a lack of understanding of how best to approach everyone being involved and it is in this regard that this motion is brought to this place by me.

We need to always be looking for ways we can facilitate everyone participating and also recognising the ways we are already doing so. So what are the main challenges that are being faced by those with autism and their loved ones and friends? Well, 29 per cent of all NDIS participants have a primary diagnosis of autism. This represents the single largest cohort of people in the scheme. Waiting times for the diagnosis in the public system can be, and usually are, between 12 months and two years. For those with a diagnosis of autism, up to 70 per cent of them also experience co-occurring mental health conditions.

Many of those with autism, on an international level, have a life expectancy of between 20 and 36 years shorter than the general population. The unemployment rate for autistic people is 31.6 per cent—a rate three times that which generally affects people with a disability and six times greater than those without one at all. Only 65 per cent of those with autism achieve results which propel them beyond year 10 in school; 6.5 per cent of those with autism currently hold a bachelor's degree.

It goes without saying that these statistics, more than just being numbers on a page, have a very real effect on people with autism and their families. They outline the challenge facing many who have caring responsibilities for loved ones, or just as friends, let alone the challenges for the person themselves. It is anticipated that many people with ASD will be supported through the NDIS. However, it is important to note that some people with ASD will not meet the eligibility criteria for the NDIS but will still require services and support to enable them to live fulfilling lives.

Autistic people and their families typically experience significant social isolation, with 51.6 per cent agreeing that they feel socially isolated and almost 40 per cent believing they cannot leave their home due to concerns about discriminatory behaviour or negative reactions in the community. That is 40 per cent believing they cannot leave their home.

All of this can, and probably does, paint a bit of a grim picture. Unlike myself and my loved ones, not every family or group of friends with a person they know who has a diagnosis of autism will have access to the same resources that I do. Many families struggle financially, socially and mentally with the everyday struggles of being denied opportunities. However, actions are being taken to help those with an autism diagnosis. Things have radically improved from where they were merely a decade ago.

We have fantastic groups supporting those with autism who operate day in, day out and who advocate on behalf of change in the community in attitudes and support. Autism SA, for example, provides a range of services, including diagnostic, early intervention, advisory, school inclusion programs, training and development, as well as day options and respite. Such services allow participation in the community, sporting and cultural activities, and it is these events that are vital for people with ASD to prevent social isolation and discrimination.

Raising community awareness and understanding of autism, like that done by Autism SA and other organisations, is essential to encourage inclusiveness and improved attitudes towards people with ASD. There are significant social costs in failing to be inclusive of people with autism and consequent loss of health and wellbeing for people who suffer from it. Groups such as Autism SA deserve support and respect for what they do, and I take the opportunity here and now to recognise and thank them for all they do.

Looking more broadly across Europe, a number of nations have developed a national autism plan. Indeed, a detailed analysis of those nations has discovered that these plans are having a very real long-term effect, that being that those with autism are more accepted. They are given more opportunity and, importantly, they feel more positive about their lives.

Closer to home, there has recently been a Victorian government inquiry into services for people with autism spectrum disorder. This, among other things, made a recommendation that there be a national autism strategy for Australia. As a brief aside, I can highly recommend to anyone who is after more detail or data on autism spectrum disorder, its costs and its effects and the growing need for further understanding of it, to have a read of that Victorian report: it is very educational.

Indeed, there has been a growing demand for a national strategy in Australia for some time, and it was pleasing to see a motion passed in the Senate only yesterday, on World Autism Awareness Day, to the effect of supporting just such a thing. Importantly, in this motion there is an encouragement to partner with autistic people and their families and carers in developing such an agreement. While I am aware that often the more input you receive the harder it can be to tailor to individual needs, there is much scope here to listen to the community to make sure that whatever is put in place meets the needs of the community now and the ability to adapt and change as those needs change.

In summing-up, I do not expect anyone here in this place to in any way oppose much of anything that I have just said. We all have the best of intentions of supporting those with ASD and I am certain that many of us would go the extra yard to do so when presented with that opportunity. We all acknowledge the service staff, volunteers and organisations that support those with ASD. We thank them, we applaud them and we recognise just how much we rely on them to make this world a more inclusive and better place for those with ASD.

But it is important that days such as World Autism Awareness Day are recognised and celebrated, and we do so gladly and with great meaning with motions such as this. However, it would

be remiss of me, in putting forward the fairly agreeable motion that we have before us today, not to also use this as an opportunity, and I do use it as an opportunity. It is an opportunity to implore that we start doing more than just supporting motions like this. We should start paying more attention to the significant numbers of those around us who have ASD. We should start looking at our own actions and how we can make them more inclusive and less discriminatory towards those who have ASD.

There is a lack of assessment and diagnostic services, a shortage of qualified diagnostic clinicians and a real lack of early intervention and behavioural support services for those who have ASD. This is something that we can remedy slowly over time. More than that, we can look into how to institutionalise such support into the decision-making of our existing community, private and public organisations. We can look to ending the shortage of services, their high costs and their poor integration of services, especially in rural and regional areas.

For both children and adults with ASD, access to education, health and mental health services and programs is limited, with long waiting times for support. There is also a lack of knowledge among education, health, mental health and disability service providers about autism. It is important that these professionals are provided with education and training so as to address that knowledge gap. With the diagnosis rates of autism spectrum disorders growing steadily, we need to ensure the broader community is sensitive to the needs of people with ASD. Better understanding the complexity of ASD can only be achieved through personal experience and educational campaigns. That is why World Autism Awareness Day is so important.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. C.M. Scriven.

COUNTRY CABINET

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:13): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that community cabinet meetings were first introduced in South Australia by the Rann Labor government in 2002, with such meetings including both metropolitan and regional locations;
2. Acknowledges that country cabinet meetings were established by the Weatherill Labor government five years ago;
3. Recognises that country cabinet visits were linked to the Fund My Idea initiative, which involved local people in local decision-making about grants; and
4. Calls on the Liberal government to show respect for regional South Australia by reinstating country cabinet meetings.

The Marshall Liberal government and, in particular, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development often ends his speeches in parliament by saying 'regions matter', reminiscent of #RegionsMatter. This has been happening for a year now, but hashtags do not help people. Hashtags do not listen to people and hashtags do not visit the state's regions in a way that is open to all residents. Instead of spruiking his empty hashtag catchphrase, the minister should spend more time encouraging his leader, the Premier, to follow Labor's lead and hold regular country cabinet meetings.

Refusing to hold cabinet meetings in the regions is a slap in the face to people in the regions who voted for a Liberal government and expected to see that Liberal government in their regional town or city. They expected to be able to speak to cabinet ministers who visited them, not to have to travel hundreds of kilometres, hoping they are seeing the right minister for their issue.

The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, who is also the local MP in a regional area, will tell you time and time again that his government's ministers do visit the regions. Local people in my home area, Mount Gambier, are complaining they have barely seen the Premier in the area at all since the election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Indeed. As the Hon. Mr Hanson mentions, it is outrageous. And as the Hon. Ms Bourke says, North Terrace and South Terrace is the government's view of where people should visit.

These things do not go unnoticed in the regions. There is a growing resentment against the Marshall Liberal government for their lack of interest in the regions now they are in government. Absolutely no money was allocated in the 2018 slash-and-burn budget for country cabinet meetings. Clearly, what that means is the Marshall government does not care about the regions and what people living in those regions have to say.

If they held country cabinet meetings around the state, they would get a much better understanding of issues facing regional residents. If they held country cabinet meetings, the Marshall Liberal government would understand that residents in Kalangadoo are crying out for support after the state government slashed the female facilities program, which has put their planned \$300,000 facility upgrade in jeopardy.

If they held community cabinet meetings, the Marshall Liberal government would learn about the Nangwarry Football Club, which tragically suffered a fire late last year. The opposition leader and I visited this club last month and were told about just how much this club pulls the local town together and the need to keep the club operating. Sports minister, Corey Wingard, has been urged to come down and meet the club but has not done so.

If they held country cabinet meetings, the Marshall Liberal government would understand how important it is for the town of Kalangadoo that their police station stays open. Instead, Kalangadoo now relies on police patrols from other towns. This is despite the Liberals' promise prior to the election and despite the current police minister finding extra resources for police stations in Adelaide.

If they held country cabinet meetings, the Marshall Liberal government would understand how angry the South-East was when the health minister cut the community paramedic program, despite pleas from local health professionals and residents and despite the results showing how useful that program had been. It was only reinstated after a strong local campaign with the local GP and community members.

There is a constant pattern emerging from the Marshall Liberal government of cutting services, making bad choices for regional residents and then making their backbenchers bear the brunt of residents' anger. I am sure the member for MacKillop in the other place in particular is quickly becoming frustrated with his Liberal Party colleagues' attitudes, where ministers do not want to take the time to get in their car or catch a flight to listen, as an entire team, to the needs and concerns of people in every corner of South Australia. Instead, they fly in for the day, shake a few hands, have a few photos and then hop on a plane and are back in Adelaide for dinner. In the case of the member for Unley, they do not even bother to respond to contacts from local media when they are visiting the regions.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: Bingo!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: 'Minister Pisoni bingo' is what I think I heard from the Hon. Mr Hanson. That is how much this Marshall Liberal government cares about the regions. Regional communities have been duded by this government's broken promises, undelivered policies and a lack of funding, including cutting funds to Primary Industries and Regions South Australia SA (PIRSA) and the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI).

This government broke its promise to increase rural road speeds to 110 kilometres per hour, despite campaigning heavily on this in the lead-up to the election—this is a backflip that will not be forgotten by the community or by regional media. It cut \$26 million from regional road funding; it has given no direct financial support to producers affected by the drought; it has cut the female change rooms funding; ignored the state's 277,000 recreational fishers in its first budget; and closed TAFE facilities in Roxby Downs and Coober Pedy.

As we have heard today from the Hon. Ms Bourke, it is threatening to privatise SA Pathology, undermining the important work this service provides in regional communities, and, of course, it has scrapped country cabinet meetings. The Marshall government is proving over and over again that regional communities are not a priority, they are just a hashtag for opportunistic campaigning.

The year 2019 is the five-year anniversary of when country cabinet meetings first began under the Labor government. Over four of those years, premier Weatherill and his entire team

listened to the concerns of 6,200 people who attended country cabinets in regional South Australia. Country cabinet meetings were held in every region in South Australia. The public forums were very popular and gave all members of the community the opportunity to directly question ministers in a very open way.

Also throughout that time, more than 22,000 votes were cast in the Fund My Idea initiative. The Liberal government, which continuously claims that #RegionsMatter, scrapped this very worthwhile initiative. Up to \$50,000 was allocated by Labor through Fund My Idea at each country cabinet for projects assisting the region to meet its economic and social needs. Project proposals were received from communities and voted on by those communities. Anyone from the country cabinet region could submit an idea if the project and applicant met the eligibility criteria. The idea behind the initiative was to fund local projects that would help local communities thrive, projects that would deliver ongoing economic development or that would support communities address a key social issue.

Examples of some of the projects that were funded under Labor include Gener8 Theatre, which received \$30,000 to finalise a program working with young people and community groups to use theatre as a way of raising awareness of the harm caused by the drug ice. A total of \$20,000 went to the Firefighters Memorial Wall, which was established in Naracoorte, paying tribute to those volunteer firefighters who lost their lives while fighting bushfires around South Australia.

There was \$26,000 for the Far West Mojo project, which was to share a local voice in West Coast Aboriginal communities, providing digital journalism skills that can lead to commissioned works and recognition by mainstream media, the Red Cross leading the project and joining forces with Youth Hub.

Funding of \$30,000 was provided to the Loxton Stadium redevelopment to assist in stage 1 of the redevelopment, replacing the ageing infrastructure of the existing indoor and outdoor courts, the work contributing to a broader plan of redeveloping the entire sporting complex over several development stages to create a premier sports and recreation hub in Loxton.

A grant of \$18,350 was provided to the Fox Creek Mountain Bike Park Trail Extension. The Human Projectiles Mountain Bike Club will extend the popular Fox Creek mountain bike trail. The grant allows trails to be built for intermediate riders, with a focus on cyclists aged 12 to 18—particularly important to keep the youth in our regional areas active and involved—as well as developing family-oriented park facilities, including playground equipment.

The decision to scrap Fund My Idea and country cabinets should not come as a surprise. In the last state budget, the Marshall government ripped more than \$36 million from Primary Industries and Regions South Australia, the key government agency that has a focus on the regions and regional development. I can guarantee that the South Australian farmers and pastoralists who live in drought-affected areas would very much welcome a visit from the Liberal cabinet so they can show all ministers firsthand just how extreme their situation is.

The Marshall Liberal government should follow New South Wales' lead and provide immediate and tangible help to communities in drought-affected areas. Recently, we received a letter from a pastoralist 400 kilometres north of Port Augusta, Sharon Rankin. She and other pastoralists in a similar situation want to know why South Australia is so different from our neighbouring states in desperate need of drought relief. Why is there no freight, fodder or supplement subsidy for South Australia? Is there any help with agistment and is there anything for fuel, apart from the government rebate scheme?

It is time minister Whetstone and the entire cabinet visited South Australians in need and answered these questions face to face. I urge the Liberal government to show real respect for regional areas and visit them firsthand as a cabinet through a country cabinet process. Just a few weeks ago, we saw in New South Wales the result of the Liberal National Party ignoring, neglecting and taking for granted regional residents in New South Wales.

We saw double-digit swings in many Liberal-National seats, where the party put them in the 'held' bracket before the polling stations had even closed. Why did they experience such large double-digit swings? Because the Liberal-National parties stopped listening to regional residents,

they stopped working for regional residents and that resulted in regional residents abandoning them in large numbers.

If the Marshall Liberal government continues to treat regional residents as they currently do, they may find a similar response from the voters it is taking for granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Rubbish!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The Hon. Mr Dawkins says that the way the Marshall Liberal government is treating regional residents is rubbish, and I must agree.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Point of order: I did not say that, and you know it. Mr President, I ask the member to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the member to withdraw.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Mr President, if I misunderstood his use of the word 'rubbish' when I said that the Marshall Liberal government continues to treat regional residents as they currently do, then I withdraw.

In contrast, Labor is taking its shadow cabinet to regional areas, and we will continue to do so. We call on the Marshall Liberal government to reinstate country cabinets and show regional people the respect they truly deserve.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

TRADE MISSION CALENDAR

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:26): I move:

That this council—

1. Condemns the government for not publicly releasing a 2019 forward calendar for trade missions;
2. Notes that the government failed to provide any adequate notice for potential exporters to participate; and
3. Calls on the government to release a forward trade mission calendar by the end of every financial year.

I rise today to highlight the importance of trade and investment to our local economy. One-fifth of the Australian workforce works in trade-related activities. Research has consistently shown that the more export opportunities we can create the more jobs will follow. That is why it is appalling that the Marshall Liberal government has scrapped a proactive trade mission policy.

What this means is that our local exporters or potential exporters have no idea what to expect. How can a local business plan to join a business mission if there is no notice to participate? Participation in an overseas trade mission needs planning to be effective—in most cases, at least more than three months of planning, so at least three months' notice in advance. In fact, smaller businesses and businesses in regional areas tell me they need more than that due to the extra complexities involved in being absent from their operations.

I note that the government has recently updated the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment website that has trade missions listed up to mid-April this year. Even the government's commissioned report into trade, the Joyce review, recommended to have a forward calendar so that businesses can plan. Trade opportunities do not come to us; we need to be proactive and do the hard yards in selling our state to the world.

Instead, the Liberals have gone the route of small-scale trade offices. This is effectively a 'build it and they will come' strategy, but they fund these offices to a small scale with a skeleton-staffed team. It is a strategy also built around duplicating the role and function of the federally funded Austrade service. Austrade currently has 11 offices in China, including an office in Shanghai. South Australian businesses already have representation, information and consultancy support available in Shanghai without the extra cost burden to the state. This strategy is hit and miss.

I acknowledge that good staff based overseas can have merit but, equally, it can end as an expensive folly. The government should either do this policy properly, with the appropriate amount

of resources, or not do it at all. The minister has adopted a strategy in overseas trade offices that locks the taxpayers of South Australia into extended costs for years and years ahead, but he cannot articulate the performance measures on which those trade offices will be judged a success. So we have a long-term financial commitment but no performance measures to know whether it is a worthwhile investment.

Port Power has a more coherent trade policy than the Liberal government. Port Power is effectively on a South Australian business mission when they play their next game in Shanghai, China, on 2 June this year. That is because they know how influential a predictable and repeated trade mission calendar is to businesses and sponsors.

Research has shown that trade missions work. In a 2017 Swinburne University study, it was found that attending a trade mission increased exports of a business, on average, by 172 per cent within 12 months—172 per cent. The same study also found that attending an overseas trade mission increased the probability of a new business becoming an exporter within 12 months by 26 per cent.

It is not rocket science. One of the minister's key roles is to ensure the department has a forward plan of outgoing overseas trade missions—trade missions that bring value back to South Australia. The minister has failed in that duty. There is no transparent, publicly available schedule of planned trade missions with which South Australian businesses can seek to become involved. He cannot articulate a trade mission plan. There is no plan. In fact, one of the first things this government did was scrap our regional trade strategies.

As we can see, there are no significant outgoing missions, nor planning for incoming missions. Businesses of South Australia thought that Liberals were their friends. Well, I am sorry to break it to them, but the minister is too busy going to his own functions and taking his own trips. In contrast, under Labor, more than 300 businesses participated in outbound trade missions to 21 countries in 2017 and 60 South Australian businesses became exporters as a result. If minister Ridgway likes his travel so much, I suggest he perhaps opens the opportunity for local businesses to go with him on those trips.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

Parliamentary Committees

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: REVIEW INTO THE OPERATIONS OF THE ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT 2013

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:32): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled 'Review into the operations of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013', be noted.

Firstly, the committee would like to thank and acknowledge the contributions made and wisdom shared to this review by Aboriginal peoples across South Australia. This report on the review of the operation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013 fulfils the requirements set out in the act itself and in the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003.

The committee believes that while the two incarnations of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act of 1966 and 2013 have provided a good legislative framework relative to their time, there are improvements which can be explored and enacted to attune the legislation to current needs.

It is the committee's hope that through this review, the Aboriginal Lands Trust will be able to enhance its engagement in consultation processes with Aboriginal residents and traditional owners on trust-held lands, providing these groups with the opportunity to meaningfully engage in the administration of the land for the benefit of Aboriginal communities and the broader South Australian community.

The committee extends its thanks and appreciation to Aboriginal community members, councils, organisations, members of the trust, and the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation division of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for taking the time to contribute their views to this inquiry.

The review commenced under the previous Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, which consisted at that stage of the Hon. Tung Ngo as the presiding member, the Hon. Tammy Franks, Mr Jon Gee MP, Mr Eddie Hughes MP, Dr Duncan McFetridge MP, and the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC. The review continued in the first session of this the Fifty-Fourth Parliament from 3 May 2018 to the current day, with myself as the presiding member. Mr David Basham MP served on the committee from 3 May to 31 July, and he was then replaced by Mr Fraser Ellis from 31 July. The other committee members who have served through that period are: Mr Sam Duluk, the member for Waite; the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; Mr Eddie Hughes MP, the member for Giles; and the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC.

In accordance with the statutory functions of the committee and section 68 of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013, this committee is required to review the operations of the ALT Act from 1 July 2014 to 1 July 2017. Under the review in particular, the committee would consider: whether the objects of the act have been achieved; how effective this act has been in enabling the trust to act strategically and to maximise the value of its landholding for the benefit of Aboriginal people, providing the trust with more autonomy in its dealings with trust land; and, enabling a process for Aboriginal community involvement and decision-making relating to trust matters.

The committee also considered whether the new skills-based requirement for membership on the Aboriginal Lands Trust Board has assisted the trust in its functions, whether the operation of the act has made an appreciable difference to increasing benefits to Aboriginal South Australians and whether the operation of the act has adversely affected Aboriginal people.

To summarise the recommendations of the committee, initially the committee recommended that the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013 should not be amended without traditional owners in South Australia who were affected by any amendments first understanding the nature and purpose of the amendments and, as a relevant group, giving their consent, and consulting any Aboriginal communities or groups that may be affected and giving adequate opportunity to express their views. The second recommendation states:

Recognising a widespread desire from communities to have greater control over their land, including possible divestment of ALT land to community control where communities have the capacity, the committee believes that there still needs to be a level of protection so that the land is not put at risk.

To that end, the committee recommends that an independent whole-of-state inquiry be undertaken into Aboriginal land ownership and management across South Australia. This inquiry would provide:

- an analysis of current Aboriginal land ownership and management systems in use across all Australian jurisdictions;
- an examination of all current Aboriginal land ownership and management legislation applicable in South Australia, including:
 1. how the relevant legislation interacts; and
 2. any inconsistencies between the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013 and other relevant commonwealth and state act.
- the role of the following stakeholders in the administration of the relevant Aboriginal Lands Trust-held land:
 - Aboriginal community groups and registered title body corporates; and
 - local, state and commonwealth governments.
- advice to the state government and Aboriginal communities relating to opportunities for Aboriginal individual home ownership on Aboriginal Lands Trust-held land;
- recommendations as to the most appropriate Aboriginal land ownership and management system that balances the needs of traditional owners and Aboriginal community residents across South Australia.
- models of protection for ALT land that has been divested to community control.

The third recommendation was:

That, with the support of the state government, the Aboriginal Lands Trust develop an appropriate and effective communication, engagement and consultation strategy that provides both Aboriginal residents and traditional owners with the opportunity to engage meaningfully in the decisions and administration of relevant Aboriginal Lands Trust held land.

The fourth recommendation was:

That the state government includes in its South Australian Aboriginal Strategic Plan the development and strengthening of Aboriginal governance instructions, systems and administration for Aboriginal communities situated on Aboriginal lands. This model would support the operations of the relevant Acts and any divestment of land where appropriate.

In its fifth recommendation the committee recommended:

That an independent analysis be undertaken to ascertain the level of funding required to fully implement all aspects of the ALT Act 2013, the outcome of which is then used to appropriately and adequately fund ALT to perform its legislative functions.

I would like to sincerely thank those who presented oral and written evidence to the committee. They include: the Yalata Anangu Aboriginal Corporation, the South Australian Native Title Services, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the Umoona Community Council, the Davenport Community Council, the Point Pearce Aboriginal Corporation, the Narungga Nation Aboriginal Corporation, the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Raukkan Aboriginal Community Council and the Far West Aboriginal Corporation.

In commending this report to the council, I sincerely thank all members of the committee, certainly those who served on the committee in the early stages of the development of this report. Obviously, my own personal experience is that it has been a collaborative effort. I think we have all worked in a diligent manner to come up with the best recommendations that we can to take the communities forward. There is no doubt that some communities are better placed to go forward in their own management than others; however, we are confident that if this report is undertaken then it will allow the best potential for the broad range of those communities across the state.

I would particularly like to thank Ms Shona Reid, the executive/research officer for this committee for almost all of the work in relation to this review. As many in this chamber know, Shona left the committee late last year to take up the position of CEO of Reconciliation SA, and we wish her the very best in that role. She has been very helpful in the changeover period since her departure, which we very much appreciate.

I want to thank the Black Rod because, in the period between the time that Shona left our committee up until the recent appointment of Dr Ashley Greenwood, he filled the breach, and the committee was very grateful for his assistance in the final stages of the development of this report. I am very pleased that we now have Dr Greenwood on board as our research/executive officer, and I look forward to working with her on future inquiries and our future regional visits. Again, thanks to all those who sit on the committee with me. With those words, I commend the motion to the council.

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

Motions

AFL NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:45): I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates the Adelaide Crows on winning the 2019 AFLW grand final;
2. Congratulates Erin Phillips on winning the AFLW grand final best on ground medal;
3. Acknowledges the important role the AFLW competition has had in growing grassroots participation in women's football and providing role models for the next generation of AFLW players; and
4. Recognises that the crowd of over 53,000 is the biggest ever attendance at a women's sporting game in Australian history and the fifth largest crowd at an AFL game at the Adelaide Oval.

I speak to the motion as a proud South Australian and a fanatical Crows supporter. This year, the Crows side started their 2019 campaign with a different direction and with a new coach, former Crows player, Matthew Clarke. It was a new era for the team, which had won the inaugural season but was not able to repeat their efforts the year after. Season 2019 was the bounce back to form that the

players and supporters had hoped and worked hard for. It was pleasing to watch a Crows team realise their hard work and win their second premiership in only the third year of the competition.

The game itself was a fantastic spectacle. The record AFLW crowd witnessed a display of skill, endeavour and flair in a heated contest between the Adelaide Crows and Carlton. Thankfully, it was the South Australian team that triumphed. The crowd does deserve recognition in its own right. It was a spectacular sight to see 53,000 people pack into the Adelaide Oval and cheer on the Crows as they claimed their second flag. The attendance was not only the single largest for an AFLW match but the fifth largest ever for an AFL game at the Adelaide Oval. A crowd this size shows that the state is right behind both the Crows women and future growth in the game.

I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the role in this fabulous victory of two players who unfortunately suffered pretty bad knee injuries, Chloe Scheer and Erin Phillips. Chloe played a big role in the win, wowing the crowd with a high-flying mark. The victory would not have been possible without our talented and passionate co-captain, Erin Phillips. Her best on ground performance was crucial to the win and has been seen consistently throughout the season. Despite her injury, Erin attended the W Awards last night and won her second league best and fairest—an admirable achievement in the short existence of the competition.

To allow the Crows and football fans in this state to build on the result over the weekend, we must foster growth at a grassroots level. Women's football has become one of the fastest growing sports in this state. Within our local clubs, we now have over 100 registered female teams, a fantastic achievement and a sign of popularity of the game, given there were only a handful of teams a couple of years ago. A take-up as widespread as this requires the right infrastructure in place in order to retain these budding young AFLW hopefuls.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to providing improved infrastructure to South Australian sporting clubs, to enable the further growth of women's sport. That is why we outlined a new government grant program last year, which focuses on the development of female and family friendly shared-use sporting facilities for football, cricket and netball. This grant aims to ensure the development of sustainable, inclusive, functional and fit-for-purpose active, recreation and sporting facilities that will meet the current and future needs of the South Australian community.

Funding for grassroots women's football from the Marshall Liberal government does not end with a facilities grant. Announced in December last year, we committed \$275,000 towards sponsorship of the AFLW Crows team. From these funds, we have enabled the Adelaide Football Club to develop programs and pathways for young women to access the sport across South Australia.

I am also pleased to see that funding for the new Crows training facility from the federal budget, handed down overnight, will include a high-performance facility for the AFLW premiers and a talent identification academy for female athletes. It is my hope that these facilities will enable our girls to remain ahead of the pack for years to come.

Once again, I would like to say congratulations to the Crows women; coach Matthew Clarke; assistant coaches Peter Caven, Andrew McLeod, Tim Weatherald and Narelle Smith; and in fact, the whole club. Never forget: footballers win kicks, teams win games, clubs win premierships. Here is to a repeat next season. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:50): SA-Best warmly endorses the motion by the Hon. Terry Stephens. In three short years, what the Adelaide Football Club and the AFL Women's have achieved is remarkable. The Crows girls deserve every accolade, along with their coach, Matthew Clarke, and his supporting staff. The brand of football they have played this season has been breathtaking. They are part-timers with regular jobs who are paid far less than their male counterparts in relative terms.

AFLW is an elite competition, which continues to grow, paving the way for many more women to participate in a game that not too long ago was essentially closed to women. I still remember the days when narrow-minded sections of the sporting community did not even want girls playing in mixed teams. I remember a story I did for Channel 7 about how a heartbroken young girl's dreams of continuing to play football were taken away from her because the rules said girls could not continue to compete after reaching a certain age. She had a roomful of trophies, many of them won against boys her age.

A shining example of a woman bursting through the glass ceiling of a male-dominated sport is the Crows superstar and co-captain, Erin Phillips. Elite sporting genes run through her blood. Her father, Greg Phillips, was a brilliant footballer with Port Adelaide and Collingwood and the South Australian State of Origin team. Don't we miss that competition! I saw Erin play junior footy a few times with and against boys when one of my sons played in the same competition in the Port Adelaide area. She was simply outstanding.

It was a cruel blow that the rules stipulated that girls could not continue playing in a mixed team when they reached 15 because of the physical nature of the sport that slight-framed girls would encounter. I am sure she would have more than held her own. But you could tell her future was assured in elite sport whatever she chose to play. I heard Erin say today on radio how much she wanted to follow in her dad's footsteps and how, when she was born, Greg was ribbed by teammates that all his kids were girls and he did not have a son to continue in the Phillips tradition. Erin said:

Dad, I know you are watching, and Mum. I hope I have made you proud, and you can stick it up those people who said it to you.

Greg, a big uncompromising man with a gentle nature, nicknamed Kutchie, was also on radio and admitted shedding a tear or two when he heard that.

It is all irrelevant now because Erin has achieved what many men could not and her dad could not be any prouder. She has won an Olympic silver medal, representing her country in basketball. She has played in the top tier of the Women's NBA in the United States. She has won two best and fairest awards in the AFLW, two best on ground in grand finals awards and two most valuable player awards. She was twice made an All Australian. She has been the leading goalkicker. She has won the goal of the year and on it goes. Her champion data stats would make many blokes blush. Erin is also a great ambassador for her state and her country and a top mum of twins, with another on the way with her wife, Tracy Gahan.

I will be writing to the Stadium Management Authority, the SANFL and the South Australian Cricket Association asking them to consider further recognition of the Crows women's achievements, not just for winning two grand finals in the past three years but creating history by winning the first ever AFL premiership played at the ground—something not likely to be done in our lifetime by the AFL men's competition—and doing so before a record-breaking crowd of 53,000 spectators. Even the TV ratings of more than 400,000 viewers on Channel 7 were nothing to be sneezed at, bettering one of the AFL matches.

A stroll around the Adelaide Oval reveals quite a blokey culture, which in some sense you would expect. Famous footballing and cricketing names who have had an association with the Oval adorn stands, various hospitality areas and players' entrances, and there are statues in the plaza dedicated to the legends of footy and cricket. But where do you find areas dedicated to our female sports stars? There is a Hall of Fame area under the western stand, hidden largely from the rest of the crowd, featuring murals of cricketers like Karen Rolton, Shelley Nitschke, Faith Thomas and Joanne Broadbent. There is also the Lyn Fullston Lawns, dedicated to the great South Australian and Australian world champion female test cricket player and coach, and netballer, who died in 2008.

The South Australia Cricket Association wanted to celebrate the history of women's cricket, and rightly so. I believe the SANFL and the Adelaide Oval Stadium Management Authority now need to do the same thing for women's football, which will only grow in stature as a permanent fixture on the AFL landscape. I propose a statue of Erin Phillips, which would also serve as being symbolic of the history-making impact and arrival of elite women's football at the ground, and it should be erected in the plaza area—the first rose among the thorns. The team itself should be honoured in the Oval's sporting Hall of Fame or elsewhere in a place of prominence.

Again, congratulations to the girls, the Adelaide Football Club for their support and management of the team and to the people of Adelaide who made the effort to go to the ground and witness a slice of this state's sporting history that will long be celebrated and feted. I commend the motion to the Legislative Council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.E. Hanson.

*Bills***COORONG ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:57): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish the Coorong Environmental Trust, to provide for the administration of the Trust, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I stand here today to introduce a bill that would be an important next step towards restoring the health of the Coorong and the Lower Lakes. I have had the privilege of meeting many members of the community over the past year or so as we have worked together towards the creation of a bill for a Coorong environmental trust. I want to thank all of those people who have shared their time, their knowledge, their expertise and their insights with me. Their experience and expertise show most clearly how and why this trust has the potential to be so important in restoring the local environment in this very special area, and restoring the health of the Murray River more broadly.

In particular, I would like to thank Faith Coleman and Ken Sawyers, whose guidance, feedback, wisdom and vision have made the bill what it is. The bill will establish the Coorong environmental trust. That trust will consist of members representing organisations with a professional, financial, physical or legal commitment to the ecological wellbeing of the Coorong. It will be an independent trust that operates outside government to manage the Coorong Ramsar site. We want this trust to be independent from the state government whilst still affording the state government the opportunity to use the information and reports from the trust to inform decision-making.

The trust will empower the local and scientific community to manage the Lower Lakes and Coorong in the way that they know and can demonstrate is best, taking some of the politics out of the management of the waterway for the benefit of the local community and, of course, for the environment.

In particular, we have taken out any elements of the trust that would take on or take over any work that is done by government or public sector employees in government departments, as the trust is not set up on the premise of necessarily receiving government funding. As a key element of this trust, we do not want it doing government work that it does not receive funding to do. There is no need for that.

The Coorong needs a trust which is inclusive, independent and creates a unified voice of community members, stakeholders and science, which will aid the government of the day to make well-considered decisions.

This independent and non-partisan advice cannot be provided by a ministerial controlled or appointed board. We have seen how inter- and intra-governmental disagreement, mismanagement and misinformation has impacted the river. This trust would be one that brings everyone together and puts the politics aside and just gets on with the job—that important job being done, as was so aptly put to me at the launch this past weekend, by the very folk who have the mud on their waders (that mud being Coorong mud).

The objective of the trust is to drive the restoration of flows and ecological stability within the lakes and Coorong, with a strong focus on the Ramsar principle of sustainable use. This model is not unprecedented. It is a tried and trusted method for dealing with the complex and challenging nature of managing an estuary. It is also one where we can look to the Peel-Harvey Catchment Council, the Derwent Estuary Program, the Environmental Water Trust, the Estuary Care Foundation SA and the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihutai Trust, for examples.

One of the key elements of this trust that I am proposing in this bill is its dual layer governance structure, which is key to the trust achieving its objective of separating science-based, factual,

ecological understandings and discussions around the Coorong, from the politics of the river and the Coorong, which it always seems to be ensnared in.

That structure will allow everyone to have equal input, encourage non-government parties to feel, and indeed to have, a sense of ownership and, most important, it will help ensure a democratic system for listening to those impacted by any activities within the Coorong, reducing the risk of a single interest group dominating the work of that trust at the expense of the others.

What is special about setting up a trust in this way as well, rather than creating a private trust, is that the parliament will be required to note the reports of the Coorong Environmental Trust. In doing so, this parliament will show our respect for the work of that trust.

It also makes it clear that government stakeholders have the option to support the trust and would be very encouraged to do so and, of course, consider its advice on relevant legislation or regulations.

The functions and the powers of the trust will be as follows:

- to create and maintain a repository for all environmental data and research outcomes relating to the Coorong;
- to prepare an annual 'State of Our Estuary' report, along with presenting an opportunity for community, policy writers and researchers to discuss outcomes;
- to prepare, adopt and maintain a set of rules relating to the membership, management and operations of the trust;
- to provide independent and impartial scientific advice on the state of the Coorong for all stakeholders;
- to provide guidance for future environmental research within the Coorong;
- to clearly monitor and document environmental flow outcomes;
- to coordinate and, if necessary, implement a comprehensive water quality monitoring program;
- to dependently assess proposed solutions to the ecological challenges that are faced by the Coorong;
- to raise money so that it can carry out its functions with financial independence; and
- to perform any function assigned to the trust by regulation.

What this all means for the community here is that we could see an exciting and, most importantly, necessary range of projects and research in the Coorong that are vital to restoring its health. That could include:

- re-funding community information sharing, coordination and citizen science programs;
- expanded water quality monitoring in the Coorong;
- long-nosed fur seal monitoring, impact assessment and management trials;
- clearly identified environmental costs and benefits of all proposed water infrastructure to be made possible; and
- on the ground application of findings.

Ultimately, what this trust will mean is that we are getting back to the science. We are putting science back at the centre of decision-making, and we are putting local communities and stakeholders, those who are most intimately familiar with the Coorong, back in charge of its management.

It was a unique privilege to launch this bill and to stand with others on the Goolwa Wharf last Saturday announcing today's introduction of this legislation. I think it was special because it was the culmination of so many years of work from that local community to bring this idea together, to get a bill drafted and to try to make this trust a reality.

It was particularly special because it had all the colours of the South Australian parliament rainbow. There was blue, red, green and orange: the minister, David Speirs; the shadow minister, Susan Close; the federal member for Mayo and Centre Alliance MP, Rebekha Sharkie, representing SA-Best and the Hon. Connie Bonaros in her absence; the Mayor of Alexandrina Council; the Wilderness Society's Peter Owen; the Conservation Council of South Australia's Craig Wilkins; along with so many from the local community.

We had professional fishers, we had irrigators, we had farmers, we had ecologists, we had scientists, we had environmentalists, and we all stood on that Goolwa Wharf together on that very rainy and windy Saturday morning. There was meant to be the launch that morning of the Dire Straits Tinny Tour. Unfortunately, due to the weather that had to be cancelled and postponed, and I understand that the Minister for Environment and Water will indeed launch that tinny tour at a later date. I am sure we would all agree that we were happy to brave the cold and the wind that day to see that weather and that rain coming in.

In his absence, I note also that Ngarrindjeri elder Grant Rigney passed on his support. He was unable to be there on the morning due to another commitment, but he was there in spirit and the spirit was strong that morning. It was the spirit of *Storm Boy*, the story that we all in this parliament know so well, of this iconic place in South Australia. That boy in the storm would not so often be in those storms in this day and age. It is a very special place.

I want to pay tribute to the particular work of the Colemans. I have mentioned Faith Coleman, who joined us in the gallery today, but Nanny Peri and her commitment to both science and the environment should be honoured. Nanny Peri was trying to assist me with some insights into the beautiful treasure that we have that is our Coorong. Her grandsons suggested she might come up with a haiku. Nanny Peri's effort included 'sparkles and splashes' and 'bioluminescent glow' with 'pelicans landing'. Her grandsons were more to the point with 'fish slime' and 'seal dung'.

I think all in this place, however, would agree that all are things of beauty, and all of those elements of the Coorong are worth protecting and preserving. I hope we will stand with that local community, across not just the political colours of the rainbow but the divides that often happen within these rural communities, and support the trust.

It is my intention that this bill goes to a select committee, and I am certainly in consultation with government, opposition and crossbenchers about the best select committee for it to be referred to, but I hope that this will be the year that we will see a united political front to protect and preserve the Coorong, to put aside the politics and to put that community and the environment first. With those few words, I recommend the bill to the council.

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

Motions

END-OF-LIFE CHOICES

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

1. That, in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on—
 - (a) the practices currently being utilised within the medical community to assist a person to exercise their preferences for the way they manage their end of life when experiencing chronic and/or terminal illnesses, including the role of palliative care;
 - (b) the current legal framework, relevant reports and materials in other Australian states and territories and overseas jurisdictions, including the Victorian and Western Australian parliamentary inquiries into end-of-life choices, Victoria's Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017 and implementation of the associated reforms;
 - (c) what legislative changes may be required, including an examination of any federal laws that may impact such legislation; and
 - (d) any other related matter.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

3. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.
4. That standing order 396 be suspended as to enable strangers to be admitted when the joint committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.
5. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 20 March 2019.)

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:09): I rise to speak in support of this motion. The subject of voluntary assisted dying, or euthanasia, is an important issue that we in South Australia must discuss and investigate thoroughly. Not only is this an issue that could potentially affect everyone at some stage of our lives but it is also an area that Australians are demanding that we explore and act upon.

An independent nationwide poll conducted in 2017 by Essential Research found that 73 per cent of Australians support voluntary assisted dying. Other polls have shown that close to 80 per cent of Australians are in favour of such laws. Currently, worldwide a total of 15 jurisdictions allow voluntary assisted dying. In Australia, almost 60 bills have been introduced into state, territory and commonwealth governments seeking to decriminalise or legalise voluntary assisted dying.

In Victoria, such laws will come into effect in a matter of months. This is significant because not only are a growing number of jurisdictions around the world actively tackling this issue but the vast majority of Australians demand that we take a serious look at this issue. Now, voluntary assisted dying will become an option for around a quarter of Australians. To me, it is our duty as policy and lawmakers to afford this topic the importance and diligence it clearly deserves.

I am well aware of the ethical and moral debate around voluntary assisted dying. There are many who feel very strongly that it would be wrong for governments to pass laws that allow for people to be assisted to die. However, let me say at the outset that I believe it is wrong to sit by while people are suffering and do nothing, especially when we have seen that there are jurisdictions that have enacted such laws with sufficient safeguards to ensure that they are not abused.

One of the most important cited arguments against voluntary assisted dying laws is that we would erode the value of human life. I believe, however, that this depends on how you define the quality of human life. If a person feels that the life they have before them is no longer desirable because of a terminal illness or advanced disease, if they are in great pain and suffering, they should be able to end their suffering with dignity and safety at a time of their choice.

While I appreciate that there are people who would choose not to take advantage of such laws, does their opposition mean that no-one should? Opponents of voluntary assisted dying also talk about the slippery slope of such laws. This slippery slope includes the dire outcome when medical practitioners become involved in ending lives instead of saving them, the potential abuse of these laws and the suffering that could result. Let us take a look at each of these objections.

Currently in Australia, medical practitioners assist people to die on a daily basis. Either the patient has instructed that no life-saving measures are used or their family or guardian decides for them if they are incapacitated. Treatment or nutrition is withheld, machines are turned off and often the patient dies slowly, which can be agonising and highly stressful for loved ones to witness. The difference is that this is called passive voluntary euthanasia. It is largely accepted within current medical practice and is generally recognised and permitted by law. It is also generally not considered to be misused or abused.

In addition, research conducted over the past 20 years has failed to show any significant abuse in jurisdictions where voluntary assisted dying is legal. The argument of potential abuse of these laws is primarily used by opponents to scare people into uncertainty. It is not supported by the experience in these jurisdictions or by the facts. I also simply do not agree with the premise that governments should not pass laws because they can potentially be abused. This is not a reason for not doing something; it is simply a reason to do something very carefully, employing the best advice from legal and medical practitioners.

In Victoria, for example, the new laws stipulate that only adults who have an advanced disease that is expected to cause death within six months (or within 12 months for neurodegenerative diseases), who are able to make a decision about voluntary assisted dying and have been living in Victoria for at least 12 months will be able to make use of this option.

These are sensible safeguards that will ensure that the law is not abused and is actually used to help people. When it comes to complex ethical issues such as this, it is our job as elected representatives to try our hardest to get it right, not to shrug our shoulders and say, 'Too hard.' Finally, let's face it: people are already suffering and ending their lives. As Andrew Denton stated during his speech at the Press Club for the launch of his podcast on assisted dying:

It is a sad irony that by successfully arguing mythical threats to hypothetical grannies, opponents of assisted dying in Australia continue to allow real harm to actual grannies.

The statistics on elderly suicide in Australia are shocking. During the Victorian inquiry, the Coroner estimated that one elderly Victorian died violently by their own hand each week. The National Coronial Information System reports that every week, two Australians over the age of 80 take their own life. In these cases, the most common form of death is hanging, and it is heartbreaking that these people need to die a violent death alone because there is no other avenue available to them.

It seems to me that this is a much more disturbing slippery slope that we are already on. This is not dying or living with dignity. We have a way to stop such suffering, and I believe we have an obligation to do so. According to a 2016 report by the Australian Human Rights Commission entitled 'Euthanasia, human rights and the law', laws for voluntary assisted dying would afford the subject 'legitimacy and transparency'. The report states:

This leads to a broader, related argument in support of a legislative approach which would introduce 'appropriate scrutiny, support and regulation' so that this practice that is 'already occurring' is undertaken in a safe as possible manner.

The law would also provide much-needed certainty, as well as necessary safeguards for patients, and for doctors who provide assistance. Ultimately, it comes down to personal autonomy and having the choice to live and die with dignity, and that should be a choice we are all able to make freely. As the late physicist Stephen Hawking stated in an article published by the Huffington Post in 2013:

I think those who have a terminal illness and are in great pain should have the right to choose to end their lives, and those who help them should be free from prosecution.

Stephen Hawking recognised that while that was not a solution he chose for himself, it should be available for those who do choose it. It is precisely because I believe that life is precious that I see my role in this parliament as doing everything I can to ensure that every person can live and end their life with respect, dignity and autonomy.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:18): I rise on behalf of the Greens to support this motion, and I congratulate the Hon. Kyam Maher for bringing it to us. As he pointed out, it is not the first time he has done so. Issues to do with voluntary euthanasia, dying with dignity and assisted suicide—however they are labelled—have been on the *Notice Paper* of this chamber and this parliament, and also of parliaments around Australia for the last 20 or 30 years.

It has always been my view that the law would eventually pass somewhere. The reason I have always had that confidence is because survey after survey and opinion poll after opinion poll have shown that for the vast majority of Australians, when asked, 'Do you support changes to the law to allow people who are suffering intolerably from incurable conditions to access medical assistance to end their lives?' the answer is yes. The numbers have been going up year on year, from figures of around 60 and 70 per cent decades ago, up to well over 80 per cent.

The majority does not confine itself to political views, it does not confine itself to religious views. The majority of people who describe themselves as Christian, who describe themselves as one of the different denominations—Catholic, Anglican, whatever—when asked whether they support this law reform, say yes. It has been a matter of great concern and distress to many people that the parliaments of this country have not seen fit to enact what the citizens are asking them to do.

As the Hon. Kyam Maher said, we stand on the shoulders of those who went before us. I have tried twice, and I cannot remember what number bills they were—whether it was 11 and 12 or 13 and 14—but certainly many people came before me. As the Hon. Kyam Maher did when he introduced this motion, I, too, acknowledged the people who came before me.

I might just mention one example, and that is the Hon. Sandra Kanck, who represented the Australian Democrats in this place. She was a strong advocate for voluntary euthanasia. As a measure of desperation, she made a speech, not long after I had been elected, where she read onto the record a number of case studies and examples of what the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos referred to: people—a lot of elderly people, but not just older people—who have taken their lives because there was nothing else they could do. She read onto the record in graphic detail some of the measures people resorted to.

It actually shocked me, not the stories she told—I was familiar with the stories—what shocked me was the parliamentary response. I recall that we had a massive debate in this place about whether we could strike the honourable member's words from the record. There were motions without notice flying around the chamber about whether we could strike it from the *Hansard* record. Then someone suggested that we could leave it on the record but take it off the online version so that it was only available on paper.

Then there were questions about whether the parliamentary librarian was sufficiently qualified to assess the mental state of someone who came into the parliamentary library to read the *Hansard*, which was only available exclusively in the library—it was not going to be published anywhere else. This chamber tied itself in absolute knots trying to work out what to do about the Hon. Sandra Kanck's speech.

So this is a matter that has occupied a lot of time in this chamber, and I think the point remains that we know what the citizens are asking us to do—they have been asking us for decades to do it. This motion is not a bill. The motion is, I think, preparatory to a bill, and I desperately hope that it results in a bill. Bills that have been introduced in this council have failed by the narrowest of margins.

I think we heard the Hon. Kyam Maher talking about the Speaker's casting vote in the House of Assembly. My recollection of the first bill I introduced is that that was a single vote as well, and it was a vote that changed at the last minute, something that took people by surprise. So we have got close many times in getting this necessary law reform, but it has not yet happened.

I think the honourable member's approach of having a committee of parliament to look at this in detail is absolutely the way to go. Of course, we could just keep introducing bill after bill, and one of them will eventually pass, but I think that the committee approach makes sense. The advantage of a parliamentary committee is that we can get people into the room and we can quiz them. We can get medical authorities; we can get people from the palliative care sector; we can get experts on human rights and civil liberties; and, most importantly, we can get people with overseas experience, and we can grill them about how these laws work, the types of eligibility criteria, the various checks and balances.

The reason I think it is important for us to be able to do this is that, in previous debates, the amount of misinformation that has been flowing would have made Donald Trump blush, in terms of fake news. All sorts of stories were trotted out that were clearly untrue, especially in relation to the experience in overseas jurisdictions. So a committee is a good way of getting all the evidence on the table.

One thing that did strike me in looking at the examples of countries that do have voluntary euthanasia laws was the number of people who were eligible to take advantage of the laws. They qualified and they actually obtained drugs that they could use to end their lives, and then the number of people who died 'naturally' without taking those drugs was actually very high. The explanation given was that, like probably all of us, people do want to live. If they have a choice and if they can live well then people want to live, they want to live as long as they can.

However, what these people had was a safety net. Whilst they had thought that the pain was intolerable, they had the drugs ready in case it got to that point where they could not live one more

day, yet many of them, because of the will to live, actually survived without taking it but they were so grateful that those drugs were there for them if they chose to use them—and that is the point: it was their choice. I think that was an important lesson that came out of some of the European experience.

I am looking forward to this committee being established and to hearing the evidence taken. I expect that the committee will call for public submissions as well as for expert submissions. I expect that the committee will be overwhelmed with submissions by groups that we know are active in this space. Certainly, there are many people who will write submissions who are against it, and they will be overwhelmingly but not exclusively religiously based—that is the experience here previously and everywhere else. However, you will also have people who will take a contrary view religiously based. We had a group called Christians for Voluntary Euthanasia and they ran candidates for the Legislative Council, I think, two elections ago. Religion has no monopoly on this debate. There will be people who will invoke religion either for or against voluntary euthanasia.

I think it is a good process. I congratulate the Hon. Kyam Maher for bringing it on and I will also take this final opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos. I am very glad that she is now in the chamber because people in the past have said, 'Mark, bring another bill on,' and I say, 'Well, there's not much point bringing another bill on until the numbers and the membership of the council changes. There is a large number of new members and we don't know what their position is,' so I am glad the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos has put her position very clearly on the record.

I am hoping that when this joint select committee finally reports that it comes up with a bill that guarantees what I think is a basic human right of people to die with dignity, that it includes the necessary safeguards and checks and that when it does eventually get put to a vote in parliament that it gets the overwhelming support of the members of both houses. With those words, the Greens support this motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:27): I rise on behalf of SA-Best to support the Hon. Kyam Maher's motion for a joint committee to inquire and report on very critical issues about end-of-life choices. This inquiry plans to investigate the role that the medical community has in assisting people experiencing chronic and/or terminal illness to exercise their preferences, as well as the existing legal framework and reports from interstate and international jurisdictions relating to end-of-life choices.

Importantly, the joint committee will also be tasked with examining the role of palliative care. My colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo has previously spoken in this chamber about the importance of palliative care services. All Australians deserve to die with dignity and to be surrounded by the people they love. It is a fundamental right for each and every one of us. We know that access to high-quality palliative care assists people with a terminal condition to live and die with dignity, as well as ensuring that their carers, family and friends are supported through any decisions that need to be made.

I am extremely grateful to the cohort of individuals, including medical professionals and medical staff, support persons and volunteers, who dedicate their lives to working in the palliative care space. It takes a special kind of person indeed to undertake that work and I know that it is a job that I certainly could not do. They are extremely brave individuals who spend their time guiding ill people, people with terminal illnesses and their families, ultimately through to death and helping loved ones come to terms with their loss.

All of that said, there is much more to be done to improve Australia's standards of palliative care and to ensure that care is available to those who need it most, as well as their families and carers including bereavement support following the death of a loved one.

I will make one final observation that plagues me the most in the context of this debate, that is, the very fine line in my view that already exists between palliative care and euthanasia in practice, and it is a very fine line indeed. Indeed, some would argue it is often a very blurred line. This is not a criticism, it is simply an observation that I am sure anyone who has experienced a loved one going through palliative care would relate to, and I note the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos's remarks in that context.

Some would equally argue the current approach is cruel insofar as it results in slow, painful deaths for our terminally ill. So I look forward to the submissions and ultimate recommendations of

the joint committee with respect to palliative care, and I hope this is one of the issues that is front and centre in that inquiry that will be considered in that context but also in the broader context of this debate as a whole.

Almost 160,000 people died in Australia in 2015. Many of these deaths were expected, with the leading causes of death being chronic diseases. As the Australian population ages, the number of people dying with chronic diseases and, in many cases, complex needs, will inevitably increase. We acknowledge that, even with access to the best palliative care, there will be people who want to pursue voluntary assisted dying. It is an emotive issue that has continued to confound successive parliaments in South Australia, as other members have pointed out. It is one of those rare instances, I believe, where members of parliament often struggle to separate their own personal beliefs or religious beliefs, and their own moral and ethical values and views from those of the broader community.

At some point, I guess we have to question where we draw the line in terms of separating our own personal views from the majority views of our community, without judgement, without fear or favour. The Hon. Kyam Maher referred to previous attempts at dealing with the issue via legislation, stretching right back to 1995, with a recall of a former, and one current, politician who have been brave enough to seek legislative change, albeit without success.

Much has changed in the debate since legislative reform was first attempted in South Australia nearly a quarter of a century ago. Every time the parliament previously considered the issue, if introduced, it would have made South Australia the first jurisdiction in the nation to implement such laws.

We know that in late 2017, Victoria became the first state in the country to legalise assisted dying for the terminally ill, with MPs voting to give patients who meet the established, stringent criteria, the right to request a lethal drug to end their lives. The criteria include completing a three-step process involving two independent medical assessments. They must be over the age of 18, of sound mind, have lived in Victoria for at least 12 months and, crucially, be suffering in a way that 'cannot be relieved in a manner the person deems tolerable'. If the criteria is met, then Victorians with a terminal illness are able to obtain a lethal drug within 10 days of asking to die.

The legislation had an 18-month implementation period and will come into force on 1 June. Victorians are now just weeks away from the introduction of new laws that will allow terminally ill adults to apply for lethal medication up to six months before they are expected to die. The Victorian legislation also allows sufferers of conditions such as motor neurone disease and multiple sclerosis, who have a life expectancy of less than 12 months, to have access to the same lethal medication.

It took more than 100 hours of debate across both houses of parliament and two demanding all-night sittings to pass the landmark legislation. No doubt, this parliament will similarly take its time to consider any proposed legislation that is borne out of the joint committee inquiry into the issue. Western Australia is also on the precipice of introducing legislation dealing with voluntary assisted dying following its own parliamentary inquiry into the issue.

I believe the most common-sense way forward on this deeply personal, emotive and critical issue is by way of a joint committee, and for that reason my colleague and I support this motion. To quote Dame Cicely Saunders, the founder of the modern hospice movement, 'How people die remains in the memory of those who live on.' We are all part of this story. It will affect each and every one of us and those who we hold dear at some point in our lives. We must do better. Death is inevitable but dying unsupported and devoid of dignity should not be.

What form dying with dignity will ultimately take or not take will depend on the deliberations of this parliament. As such, like other honourable members, I welcome any move aimed at guiding us through the issues, evidence, case studies and research, and an inquiry will certainly play a key role in that regard. With those words, I support the motion.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:35): I rise today to speak in favour of the motion introduced by the Hon. Kyam Maher. I commend the honourable member for introducing this motion and for sharing his difficult personal experience. Saying goodbye to a loved one is never an easy task but there is nothing worse than watching a loved one suffer unnecessarily.

I believe that everyone should be afforded a choice when it comes to their end of life. I acknowledge that if legalised, voluntary assisted dying will not be an option that everyone will choose to take, but it should be just that—an option. Every individual should have a choice to die with dignity and to make a decision that is of fundamental importance to their autonomy. Although palliative care can play an important role in relieving pain for some patients experiencing chronic or terminal illnesses, it is sometimes not enough to alleviate suffering.

Support from the Australian public has grown overwhelmingly over the last two decades in favour of voluntary assisted dying. However, despite research showing a clear majority of support by the public, our laws have fallen behind in upholding the expectations of the community. I acknowledge the numerous attempts made to amend legislation and I appreciate members' ongoing efforts in support of this issue.

As we would not be the first state in Australia to legalise voluntary assisted dying, we can take this opportunity to learn from other states and territories and overseas jurisdictions by reviewing current medical practices, legal frameworks, reports and other relevant material. It is important to establish a strong framework to provide a balance for this matter. The framework should provide protections for the vulnerable whilst enabling those who voluntarily make the choice to end their life to do so with dignity. With those words, I am pleased to support this motion.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (17:38): I stand primarily to amend the motion, therefore I move:

Leave out subparagraph (c) and insert a new paragraph as follows:

- (c) what legislative changes may be required, including consideration of:
 - (i) the appropriateness of the Parliament of South Australia enacting a bill in similar terms to Victoria's Voluntary Assisted Dying Act (2017); and
 - (ii) an examination of any federal laws that may impact such legislation.

Voluntary euthanasia is a contentious moral and health issue which generates significant community debate whenever it comes before the parliament. Understandably, feelings run high and it is important to ensure that any reform of the law is evidence-based as well as values-informed. In this context, I respectfully suggest that the motion, as it stands before us, is too open-ended. A rational, respectful and productive discussion, in my view, is more likely if the committee has a focus and a starting point.

I note that 13 pieces of legislation have been introduced on euthanasia since 2005. Each gave parliament a concrete proposal to consider and debate. In the end, those proposals did not receive the support of this parliament. However, recently, the Victorian parliament has supported legislation to allow for voluntary euthanasia and those provisions will come into effect on 19 June this year. In my view, that bill would be a useful starting point for the proposed committee.

The operation of the Victorian model will provide useful data in relation to the provision of voluntary euthanasia in an Australian context, effectively acting as a de facto pilot for other jurisdictions. While each jurisdiction has the authority to legislate in this area, in my view, there will be value in legislation being consistent between jurisdictions. With these considerations in mind, my amendment seeks to bring greater focus to the work of the committee through asking the committee to use the Victorian model as a starting point. I believe this approach will also significantly increase the prospect of a concrete outcome, that is, specific legislation that this parliament can consider.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (17:40): I will be brief. I indicate that I will support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr Wade. The first time I ever dealt with the issues of euthanasia in this chamber would have been about 20 years ago; it might have been a little bit longer. Ironically, the first time I had to make a conscience vote in relation to euthanasia was not about the subject itself. It was about whether we should have a select committee or a standing committee, and I think it was probably the Social Development Committee that looked at the issue way back then.

I commend the Hon. Mr Maher for bringing this motion to the chamber, but, as I said, I support the amendment of the Hon. Mr Wade. I have always supported the pieces of legislation that have come to this place in relation to the legalisation of voluntary euthanasia. A number of those bills have been criticised by some for not being perfect. Having had significant experience in bringing private

members' bills to this place on complex issues without the support of government or other organisations until recently, I recognise the fact that it is difficult to do. I was always prepared to support those bills, even though they may not have been perfect. Indeed, government bills of all persuasions are not always perfect either.

I support this inquiry and I think that the suggestion that the minister, the Hon. Mr Wade, has made is a very good one because the opportunity to look at what is happening in Victoria—which will commence, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros and others have said, very shortly—is a very good opportunity. I support the amendment, but I will support the motion and I think it is a very good idea. As I said, I have had a lot of experience in bringing private members' bills to this place on my own. I have really relished in recent times the support of the government to get an organisation like SALRI to look at the surrogacy issue and hopefully we will progress that soon. On this matter, I support the amendment and the motion.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:43): I thank the honourable members who have contributed on the motion to set up a joint committee. I think it is the most obvious way to go when we are assessing this in the new parliament. I do not think there is any doubt, at some stage during the next three years, that this will be an issue that will be discussed in the form of a bill, and I think a bill is best informed by having a process like a committee.

I rise also to support the Hon. Stephen Wade's (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) amendment. I think it makes good sense to have a focus for the committee and it makes even better sense to have that focus looking at the scheme that, in a few short weeks, will be the first scheme operational in Australia. There was one comment—and I do not always agree with the Hon. Stephen Wade—that struck a chord with me around looking at the merits of having jurisdictions, with something as complicated as this, having some form of similarity.

So I think it does make good sense to have a focus on what has happened and what will be the law in Victoria in what is a very complicated area, for the reasons that we are not now the first and we can look to what is being done. If other jurisdictions enact similar laws—and I am certain they will over time—there should be some degree of uniformity between what states are doing in a difficult and complex area, so it is an amendment from the Hon. Stephen Wade that I am happy to support.

It is an issue that reasonable people have differences of opinion over and struggle with. Since moving this motion, I have had a number of people contact me and talk about some of the areas of voluntary euthanasia that I had not thought a lot about. We have heard contributions from honourable members about the crossover in the palliative care area and the choice that some people make, which is, in effect, what we would talk about as dying with dignity or voluntary assisted dying or euthanasia.

One of the more difficult things that people have talked about since I moved this motion was the effect it sometimes has on others—the choices that some people make when they do not have voluntary assisted dying available to them to end their own lives when they are in chronic pain and the effect it has on those first responders and others around. I know in the Victorian inquiry—I cannot remember the exact figures—the coroner gave evidence that there would be one or two people a week, I think, that are referred to as suicides, but in fact they would be better termed as people taking matters into their own hands without a humane way for voluntary assisted dying, and about the effects that has on those who are left behind. They take their own life in very dramatic ways and those first responders are the ones responding to it.

Just in a couple of weeks, some people have contacted me and raised things that I had not thought a lot about. I think a select committee with a focus on the Victorian bill can be a reasonably focused select committee that does not drag on, like some of our select committees, over many years. It can be a reasonably focused select committee that, as the Hon. Mark Parnell says, might come back with something reasonably solid.

After considering evidence, particularly taking Victoria as the focus, it might be something very similar to what Victoria has done, for this and the other chamber, hopefully, to consider in the very near future. I thank honourable members for their contribution. I look forward to this committee being established and the members of that committee undertaking what is very important work in this area.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

THAI CAVE RESCUE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.G. Wade:

That this council—

1. Celebrates the successful cave rescue of 12 boys and their football coach trapped in the Tham Luang Cave in Chaing Rai province, Thailand;
2. Mourns the death of Saman Gunan, one of the Thai members of the international rescue team;
3. Acknowledges the key role played by Adelaide-based anaesthetist and MedSTAR doctor, Dr Richard Harris;
4. Acknowledges the contribution of the Australian contingent involved in the Thai-led rescue effort;
5. Acknowledges the leadership and professionalism of the Thai government and the Thai Navy SEALs in effecting the rescue;
6. Acknowledges the involvement and support of the international community, including support divers from the European Union, the United States, and China, and participants from military and civilian organisations in various support roles;
7. Recognises South Australia's proud tradition of providing emergency assistance in response to catastrophic events, such as AUSMAT team member deployments to the Philippines in 2013 in response to Typhoon Haiyan, to Banda Aceh in 2004 in response to the Boxing Day tsunami, and to Bali following the bombings in 2002 and 2005; and
8. Pays tribute to the courage and dedication of South Australian health professionals in so many diverse contexts.

(Continued from 6 December 2018.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:49): I rise to support the motion moved by the Hon. Stephen Wade. Honourable members will remember those long days last June and early July when the Wild Boars soccer team was trapped in the Tham Luang Cave in Chaing Rai province, northern Thailand. On 23 June 2018, the young soccer players, aged 11 to 16, and their 25-year-old coach became trapped underground. It was reported that after soccer practice the team was exploring local caves when a storm brought monsoon rains, flooding the cave.

As the world began learning of the 13 young Thais trapped about four kilometres deep inside an intricate cave system, the rescue mission was intensifying. Brave rescuers from around the globe came together to complete the dangerous and complicated mission to rescue the young team and coach.

I expect as we watched, captivated, praying the team would be found and brought to safety, unbeknownst to us Dr Richard Harris, a local Adelaide anaesthetist, and his dive partner, Dr Craig Challen, were preparing to join the multinational dive team including British divers and the Thai Navy SEALs. The two Aussie divers were placed in a small Australian medical team sent to assist with the rescue.

Reporters have described Dr Harris's experience and his descriptions of the events. Reading these accounts, it is truly chilling to imagine what the rescuers faced inside the cave: working in the tight, twisting tunnels filling with water from the streaming rains, with the potential fear that the boys would not be found or what condition they might be in after being missing for so long.

Then, there was celebration when all the boys were found alive in the small dark cave, followed by the daunting reality of how to evacuate 13 frightened young people with no diving experience. This may be forgotten when remembering the jubilation we felt when those trapped were brought to safety.

I am sure honourable members join me in recognising and praising the skills and expertise of the Australian contingent involved in the Thai-led rescue. In the case of Dr Harris, it is likely that most of us did not know of his unique experience and skills before this international event thrust him into the spotlight. Much has now been reported and we have learnt of his medical and specialist rescue training and decades of technical cave-diving experience. We can see why Dr Harris was

asked to assist this mission and understand why he had such an important role, joining the team to bring the Wild Boars to safety.

As the mission entered the last days and the rains poured, we heard media reports about the vital role played by Dr Harris—or 'Harry', the nickname we soon learned. I understand this local Adelaide doctor played a key role, including assessing the boys' medical condition and advising on their order of rescue. It was reported that Dr Harris was the last to leave the treacherous cave after the soccer team was evacuated. For me, this highlights not only Dr Harris's bravery but also his selflessness.

While Dr Harris's role was widely discussed throughout the ordeal, we did not learn much about Dr Challen's involvement until the rescue was complete. I understand that just prior to the mission, Dr Challen had retired as a veterinarian, selling his successful vet franchise. Further, I understand Dr Challen sold the business he had built in the hope of having more time to focus on his passion for cave diving, the passion that gave both him and Dr Harris the unique skill set that ensured the safe return of the Wild Boars. In recognising the contribution Dr Harris and Dr Challen made to this rescue, it is important to note their commendation as the 2019 Australians of the Year. I congratulate Dr Harris and Dr Challen on this befitting honour.

On another issue, I extend thanks to those two heroes of Australia and Thailand for adding their voice to the call to release Hakeem al-Araibi. I understand that the doctors penned a letter to the Thai Prime Minister, calling for Mr al-Araibi's release from the politically motivated charges made against him. It is with gladness that I acknowledge his recent return to Australia, no doubt aided by the words of both doctors.

Returning to the cave rescue, I also acknowledge the leadership and professionalism of the Thai government and the Thai Navy SEALs. While we recognise those committed to saving others, I pause to acknowledge retired Thai Navy SEAL Saman Gunan, and express my sympathy to his family. Mr Gunan, an experienced diver, volunteered to save these young lives and sadly lost his own. Mr Gunan's fate is a reminder of the danger and risk faced by all who assisted in the rescue and those who will continue to come forward to save others.

Finally, I recognise the involvement and support of the international community, including divers from the European Union, the United States and China, and participants from the military and civilian organisations. Without the commitment and contribution of those involved, rescuing the team would not have been possible. While initially there were fears and doubts that the rescue could be attempted to secure the safety of the team, it is a testament to those involved that this miracle rescue disregarded the odds, and the families of the Wild Boars could welcome home their sons.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:57): I am pleased to rise today to support this motion to recognise the extraordinary actions of Australian of the Year Dr Richard Harris in rescuing the 12 boys and their coach trapped in the Tham Luang cave in Thailand. On 23 June 2018, a football team of Thai boys went exploring, and over the next two weeks their struggle to survive and the heroic actions of their rescuers would captivate the world.

Dr Richard Harris was one of many people who worked to save the kids and their coach, and he is rightly praised for his central role. Certainly, without his aid the rescue could have gone very differently. At great risk to his own life, he swam through the narrow tunnels that separated their makeshift camp and the lost boys. These tunnels were so narrow that some parts could not be navigated with a scuba tank.

His first role was to assess the health of the boys who had been trapped in the cave for quite some time, and make sure they were ready to be evacuated. He also played a vital role in the process of evacuating their team and their coach. He was responsible for anaesthetising those he was rescuing to help them escape the cave. This was necessary because the narrow tunnel out of the cave would have been highly stressful and dangerous for an experienced cave diver, and would have been impossible for the children to attempt. Thanks to his extraordinary work, all those trapped in the cave were rescued.

Certainly, the role of Dr Richard Harris deserves to be recognised. I am proud to support this motion that further acknowledges Dr Harris, along with Dr Craig Challen, the co-recipient of the

Australian of the Year Award. I mention also that Dr Harris and Dr Challen have been friends for many years.

Indeed, as the crisis in Thailand was developing, these two friends were about to embark on a trip to the Nullarbor together. When they received a phone call asking for their expertise, within an hour a decision had been made and Dr Harris and Dr Challen were en route to the airport bound for Thailand. I acknowledge the emergency assistance, leadership and lifesaving intervention provided by Dr Harris and Dr Challen, and I commend the motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:59): I rise to speak in emphatic support of this motion moved by the Hon. Stephen Wade. As we have heard, the motion pays tribute to the courage and dedication of all South Australian health professionals, with particular reference to the bravery and selflessness of South Australian Dr Richard Harris OAM who, along with dive partner Dr Craig Challen SC OAM, were integral members of the successful cave rescue of 12 young soccer players and their coach in Thailand who captured the world's attention.

Keen to go exploring after soccer practice, the boys (aged 11 to 17) of the Wild Boars soccer team and their coach entered Tham Luang Cave in Chiang Rai, northern Thailand, oblivious to the dangers during the monsoon season. What followed was a high-stakes international mission that very nearly did not succeed. The flickering video footage of the huddle of anxious and hungry boys found by a pair of British divers nine days later is seared into most of our memories. However, the most difficult part was yet to come.

Monsoon rains had raised the water level in the cave system, and the boys were trapped in an air pocket surrounded by rising muddy water over two kilometres from the cave entrance. None of them knew how to dive. Expert British, Australian, American, Chinese and other international divers joined the Thai Navy SEALs, along with hundreds of local volunteers, to mount one of the most risky and complex rescue operations the world has ever seen. There was no alternative. Leaving the boys trapped was not an option as it would have almost certainly left them to a certain and probably slow and lingering death.

Dr Harris and his dive partner, retired vet Dr Craig Challen, were among the last out of the cave 18 days later after overseeing some of the most fraught parts of the delicate rescue mission, including sedating the children to reduce their stress and anxiety over the underwater diving that each of them had to undertake to be rescued. The heroic efforts of Dr Harris and Dr Challen in ensuring the safety of every single boy captured the hearts of the Thai people, as well as all Australians watching the crisis unfold here at home, bringing both doctors worldwide recognition. The two unassuming heroes would much prefer, I am sure, to spend time beneath the earth's surface in the dark and still depths of an underwater cave, which is what they do as a hobby, far away from the glare of the international media spotlight. By their own admission, both men have had to slowly adjust to their newfound fame.

Like other honourable members last year, I was pleased to attend a reception at Government House in honour of Dr Harris and the international rescue. I think other members would agree that he was and is as humble and modest in person as he has appeared in countless media interviews since. As my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo said during his speech on the motion on the last day of sitting last year, the successful rescue and the pivotal role played by Dr Harris and Dr Challen is indeed the stuff of legends. It has resulted in the men being named this year's joint Australians of the Year, and I congratulate them both on receiving the richly deserved honour.

Dr Harris and Dr Challen are members of the Wet Mules, a diving group dedicated to exploring some of Australia's deepest and most obscure underwater caves. The pair met during an expedition to a sinkhole in the Kimberley region in Western Australia and quickly became good friends. Their friendship has only strengthened because of their involvement in the Thai cave rescue. I am told the pair hope to inspire others, especially children, about the rewards of outdoor adventuring and how it broadens perspective. I certainly wish them both well in that endeavour.

Further testament to their inspiring humanitarian spirit and potentially newfound political clout was the cave diving heroes' more recent efforts to free Melbourne-based refugee footballer, Hakeem al-Araibi, from a Thai prison, as alluded to by the Hon. Tung Ngo. They wrote a letter to Thailand's Prime Minister, Prayut Chan-o-cha, who had insisted that he would not stop legal

proceedings to extradite Mr al-Araibi to Bahrain where he was facing a 10-year prison term for allegedly vandalising a police station, charges he strenuously denied. While we may never know the impact that letter had on the Prime Minister of Thailand, several days after the existence of the letter was known, Hakeem was released from prison and thankfully returned to Australia—an outstanding outcome.

Before concluding, I also want to recognise the efforts of world-renowned Adelaide plastic surgeon and former Australian of the Year 2016, Dr John Greenwood. I think I have mentioned in this place before that Dr Greenwood flew to Greece in July 2018 to treat burns victims of the Mati forest fires with the skin repair technology developed in Australia. Dr Greenwood is the director of the adult burns unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and has been recognised for his world-leading work in burns treatment. In Athens, he assisted surgeons to treat 10 of the most severely burned patients from the Mati forest fires using a biodegradable skin graft substitution known as NovoSorb, which he pioneered with the CSIRO following the Bali bombings in 2002.

Dr Greenwood took 25 sheets of NovoSorb with him to help in the recovery of those burns victims and had to obtain special exemptions for its use as it was not yet approved for use in that part of the world. We know now that NovoSorb is unique because it works better than skin grafts with less risk of infection. It is easier to use and it creates softer and less scarred skin after surgery. It is a stand-out example of brilliant, Australian-led innovation and expertise.

All three of the individuals that I have referred to are stand-out examples of the brilliant work that our medical profession and others have been able to undertake here in Australia, particularly in the context of these overseas missions which have sought to help people in very dire situations. With those words I commend this motion, and I wish them all the very best in their future endeavours.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (18:07): I would like to thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Tung Ngo, the Hon. Russell Wortley and the Hon. Connie Bonaros for their contributions. On 23 June 2018, 12 boys and their football coach were successfully rescued from a cave in Thailand. I would like to reiterate my thanks and admiration to everyone involved in the rescue and the courage they demonstrated. In particular, I would like to acknowledge SA Ambulance Service MedSTAR doctor, Dr Richard 'Harry' Harris. Dr Harris played a key role in their rescue effort.

Since I brought this motion to the council, Dr Harris has been awarded the South Australian of the Year and, jointly with his dive partner, Dr Craig Challen, has been awarded the honour of Australian of the Year. Dr Harris continues to deploy his extraordinary skills to care for the people of South Australia through his role with MedSTAR.

On 21 February, it was my privilege to attend MedSTAR's 10th anniversary celebration. At that event, it was my privilege to present Dr Harris with a certificate signed by the Governor, the Premier, the Chief Executive of the SA Ambulance Service and myself. The citation read:

We are proud of you and the contribution you continue to make with SA Ambulance Service MedSTAR. You are an inspiration to all South Australians.

On behalf of the government of South Australia and all South Australians we thank you wholeheartedly for your service at home and, of course, for your efforts in the rescue of the 12 boys stranded in the flooded cave in Chaing Rai Thailand.

Here ends the citation. Thank you, Dr Harris, and I thank honourable members for their contributions. I commend the motion to the council.

Motion carried.

Bills

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

I am pleased to introduce the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2019, which amends the Rail Safety National Law. The National Law is contained in a schedule to the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012.

In December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments agreed to implement national rail safety reform, that created a single rail safety regulator, and to develop a rail safety national law, which a rail regulator would administer. The national rail reform:

- supports a seamless national rail transport system;
- ensures existing levels of rail safety are maintained;
- streamlines regulatory arrangements and reduce the compliance burden for business; and
- improves national productivity and reduce transport costs generally.

The Rail Safety National Law commenced operation on 20 January 2013. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator was established as a body corporate under the National Law, with its scope now also enacted through legislation in all jurisdictions.

The National Law was developed by the National Transport Commission, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator, together with jurisdictions and all these entities contribute to identifying legislative amendments. Ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council, which consists of Commonwealth, State, Territory and New Zealand Ministers with responsibility for transport and infrastructure issues approved this Rail Amendment Bill on 9 November 2018.

South Australia, as host jurisdiction, is responsible for the passage of the National Law and any Amendment Bills through the South Australian Parliament. Once commenced in South Australia, each participating jurisdiction has an Application Act that automatically adopts the National Law and subsequent amendments into its own legislation, except in Western Australia, where its Parliament needs to approve all amendments.

During its first five years of operation, the Rail Regulator has successfully discharged its obligations under the National Law including facilitating the safe operation of rail transport in Australia. This has been achieved by providing a scheme for national accreditation of rail transport operators and promoting the provision of national policies, procedures and guidance to industry, further progress in the consolidation of national rail safety data information and education and training for safe railway operations.

This Rail Amendment Bill constitutes the fourth amendment package to be considered by the South Australian Parliament. The first rail amendment package commenced on 1 July 2015, the second on 1 September 2016 and the third on 1 July 2017.

This Rail Amendment Bill extends the drug and alcohol provisions of section 127 of the National Law which governs the requirement for a rail safety worker to submit to a drug screening test, oral fluid analysis or blood test or a combination of these. For drug and alcohol testing, the Rail Amendment Bill:

- inserts section 122A to define what constitutes a urine test;
- amends section 127 to include urine test as a method of testing;
- inserts section 127A that requires a rail transport operator to do all that is reasonably possible to facilitate an authorised officer in exercising drug and alcohol testing powers;
- inserts sections 128A, 128B and 128C to prescribe offences and penalties for hindering, obstructing, assaulting, threatening or intimidating an authorised person or interfering, tampering or destroying a urine, oral fluid or blood sample; and
- amends section 129 to ensure that urine, together with the existing oral fluid and blood for drug testing cannot be used for any other purpose.

This Rail Amendment Bill also:

- amends section 244 of the National Law to provide an additional exception for the release of documents where lawfully provided for under the South Australian *Freedom of Information Act 1991*;
- allows the Rail Regulator to access the use of private sector auditing, as approved by the Transport and Infrastructure Council, for the purpose of auditing the Rail Regulator's annual financial statements;
- amends definitions in section 4 of 'level crossing' and 'rail or road crossing' and deletes the definition of 'railway crossing' to support consistency in the National Law;

- creates penalties for public road managers who fail in their risk management duties at a road or rail crossing, consistent with the penalties for a rail infrastructure manager in Section 107(1) of the National Law for the same offences;
- gives the Rail Regulator the explicit ability to enter premises for drug and alcohol testing; and
- amends section 200 to substitute 'level crossing' instead of the deleted 'railway crossing'.

Variation regulations that will support the operation of the Rail Amendment Bill will be tabled in this Parliament approval following the Parliamentary process.

This Rail Amendment Bill has the support of major stakeholders, including the Australasian Railway Association, Australian Local Government Association and the Rail Tram and Bus Union.

I commend this 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 Rail Safety National Law

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of *level crossing* to address issues of national consistency in relation to the management of road and tram interfaces. The amended definition also clarifies that it includes a pedestrian crossing that crosses a railway (whether or not it is signed) and a pedestrian crossing that crosses a tramway where the crossing has a level crossing sign.

This clause also makes a technical amendment to the definition of *rail or road crossing* to incorporate the current definition of *railway crossing* (which is being deleted as this is no longer required as a separately defined term).

5—Amendment of section 43—Annual report

This clause amends section 43(2) to remove the reference to 'public sector auditor' and inserts a regulation making power to allow for the national regulations to make provision in relation to the preparation and auditing of financial statements. This is to allow for the ability for audits to be conducted by appropriately qualified private sector auditors (in accordance with the prescribed requirements).

6—Amendment of section 107—Interface coordination—rail infrastructure and public roads

This amendment inserts a penalty in relation to the existing obligations of a road manager regarding rail and road interfaces. This is the same penalty that currently applies to rail infrastructure managers to reflect that they have a shared responsibility with respect to interface coordination.

7—Insertion of section 122A

This amendment inserts an interpretation provision for the purposes of the amendments made by other provisions of this measure in relation to urine testing by the Regulator.

122A—Interpretation

The proposed new clause inserts a definition of *urine test* to cover both the screening and analysis of a urine sample for the presence of drugs.

8—Amendment of section 127—Authorised person may require drug screening test, oral fluid analysis, urine test and blood test

Section 127 of the Act provides for the drug and alcohol testing of rail safety workers by the Regulator. This amendment inserts a reference to a urine test to extend Regulator testing to the testing of urine samples.

9—Insertion of section 127A

This clause inserts a new provision to ensure that a person with control or management of railway premises must facilitate an authorised person in the exercise of the powers under the Act in relation to drug and alcohol testing by the Regulator.

127A—Facilitation of testing

The proposed new section provides that the manager of railway premises must give all reasonable assistance to an authorised person to undertake drug and alcohol testing of rail safety workers at the premises. This includes such things as allowing the authorised person to enter the premises, making rail safety workers available for testing and making other persons at the premises available to provide assistance to the authorised person in carrying out the drug and alcohol testing.

10—Insertion of sections 128A to 128C

This clause inserts new offences to support the facilitation of drug and alcohol testing by the Regulator.

128A—Offence to hinder or obstruct authorised person

The proposed clause makes it an offence to intentionally hinder or obstruct an authorised person who is exercising powers under Part 3 Division 9 of the Act which deal with drug and alcohol testing by the Regulator. The maximum penalty for this offence is a fine of \$10,000.

128B—Offence to assault, threaten or intimidate authorised person

This clause makes it an offence for a person to directly or indirectly assault, threaten or intimidate an authorised person or an assistant of the authorised person. The maximum penalty for this offence is \$50,000 or two years imprisonment, or both.

128C—Interfering or tampering with, or destroying, samples

This clause inserts an offence of unlawfully interfering or tampering with, or destroying an oral fluid, urine or blood sample provided or taken for the purposes of drug and alcohol testing by the Regulator under Part 3 Division 9. The penalty for this offence is \$10,000.

11—Amendment of section 129—Oral fluid, urine sample or blood sample or results of analysis etc not to be used for other purposes

Section 129 of the Act provides that an oral fluid or blood test or the results of an analysis of an oral fluid or blood sample cannot be used for a purpose that is not contemplated by Part 3 of the Act or an application Act of a participating jurisdiction. This amendment extends the operation of this section to urine samples and urine testing.

12—Amendment of section 200—Temporary closing of level crossings, bridges etc

This amendment is consequential on the proposed changes to the definition of *level crossing* and deletion of the definition of *railway crossing* in section 4 of the Act by this measure. The amendment changes references to a *railway crossing* to references to a *level crossing*.

13—Amendment of section 244—Confidentiality of information

This clause amends section 244(3) of the Act to allow for the disclosure of information made or given in accordance with the *Freedom of Information Act 1991* of this State as applied by the Rail Safety National Law (and as modified by the national regulations).

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

**NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RETAILER RELIABILITY OBLIGATION)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

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

CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (PSYCHOLOGISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

At 18:11 the council adjourned until Thursday 4 April 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***SCHOOL OVERCROWDING**

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (20 March 2019).

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

The Department for Education (the department) acknowledges that enrolment growth has occurred at Eastern Fleurieu School's 7-12 campus in Strathalbyn in recent years due to local population growth, as well as school enrolment practices. The department has provided support to the school through capacity management strategies which includes the need to prioritise enrolments of students residing in the local catchment area. In addition, the department is providing immediate support through the provision of additional accommodation in the form of two dual modular buildings which will provide four general learning areas. The new learning areas will be operational in term 2, 2019.

The department has undertaken demographic analysis and modelling to identify schools that require additional capacity to support the transition of year 7 into high school by 2022. As an outcome of this analysis, on 19 February 2019 the Minister for Education announced that a number of South Australian public schools, including Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School, would share in funding of \$56 million to improve facilities, meet projected enrolment demands and to transition year 7 into high school. Further to this, on 20 February 2019 the Minister for Education announced that four schools, including Glenunga International High School, Norwood Morialta High School, Unley High School and Brighton Secondary School, were identified as high demand schools and allocated \$65 million in total of capital works funding. That announcement, referenced in Ms Bonaros' question, reflected on specific challenges in those four schools and was in addition to the support for other schools, including Eastern Fleurieu School, announced the previous day.

Eastern Fleurieu School's 7-12 campus already caters for year 7 and the projected local growth is not to the same extent as the high demand metropolitan high schools.

Additional spaces required in managing the additional year 7 transition in 2022 will consider areas for innovative learning which may include the provision of general and specialist teaching areas, laboratories, workshops and other supporting amenities. The department will continue to work closely with the school community to consider the needs of the campus in developing the project brief for the announced capital works funding for the school to ensure the school's current needs and long term aspirations are being met.

The department continues to provide ongoing assistance to Eastern Fleurieu School staff in the provision of advice and data to support effective decision-making in regard to utilisation of space and management of enrolment intakes.

Capital works funding has been allocated to a number of schools in regional South Australia, and in the region surrounding Eastern Fleurieu School's 7-12 campus at Strathalbyn, including Willunga High School (\$2m), Mount Compass Area School (\$8m plus additional funding as part of the \$56 million announcement) and Victor Harbor R-7 School (\$5m).

The department will continue to monitor the factors which influence enrolment demand at the school and respond accordingly.