

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 16 October 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 27th report of the committee, 2018-19.

Report received.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I bring up the 28th report of the committee, 2018.

Report received and read.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Department for Energy and Mining Report, 2018-19

Question Time

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment regarding overseas investment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The minister has, in the past 18 months, travelled overseas some eight times, including six trips to China. On 1 May 2019, the minister was asked whether there were actually any tangible benefits or results coming out of his travel, and he said:

I have already sent some emails and I have received some...

The minister went on to say of those emails that they were, 'Only a couple, only single syllable words.' The minister told the chamber of the persuasiveness of his monosyllabic emails by saying:

There are already some contacts, and I know they are wanting to come to Adelaide. One of them is coming for a vacation and is definitely coming here for a visit as part of his vacation.

When pressed on this one vacationer the minister said:

I don't have the exact dates. There are people coming...

We don't need to, apparently, worry about the highest rate of unemployment in the nation because according to our minister there are people coming. There are people coming.

The PRESIDENT: Keep the rhetorical flourishes to a minimum, please. Get on with the question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: In relation to signing agreements and making deals, on 4 July 2019 the minister told the council of his deal-making prowess and that others are so convinced because they say:

You're a good bloke; that sounds like a great place...

The minister went on to tell the chamber of his understanding of international trade completion to say, 'Yes, [it's] a deal. It was a handshake.' The minister also garnered significant media attention when he compared attracting investment to sexual relationships. He even, on a separate occasion, revealed that a Chinese dignitary throws away the name cards of Australian businesspeople. Finally, as recently as yesterday, when he was asked what specifically he had done to contribute to tourism in this state, the minister said:

What I do as the minister is provide some good, solid leadership and a strong relationship with the Tourism Commission. I am constantly embarrassed by the number of people who say, 'Thank God we have a great government and a great minister.'

He simply could not help but to congratulate himself on how good he thinks he is.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, this is not a brief explanation. Get to the question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Now that the minister has made six separate overseas trips to China in the last 18 months, can the minister outline one single business that came to SA, one single job created in this state that could not have been created if the minister had not had six taxpayer-funded trips to China?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:23): I guess I thank the honourable member for his interest in growing the South Australian economy. It's interesting, they talk about the number of trips overseas that I have done as Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. I would like them to actually just spend a moment, when they have got time in their office, staring out the window, to look at the number of trips that the Hon. Leon Bignell and the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith did. If you actually look at the number of trips that they did, I think you will see there is a stark contrast. When it comes to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: If you want to hear the minister, you need to remain in order.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Where we are heading with this—the South Australian government—is that we have sector priorities. We are opening trade offices around the globe. We have opened China and Japan. We will be opening an office in Houston very shortly. We will be doing one in Dubai and one in Kuala Lumpur.

The honourable member asked about jobs and export deals. The Infinitus group from China—my meeting with them, inviting them to come to South Australia, resulted in the largest single ever export of wine to China. I met with them and invited them here to South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I allow supplementaries with leave. You know that it annoys me you shouting out questions—which happen to be, surprisingly, within the standing orders—from a seated position. Let the minister finish and then you can have your crack.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The honourable member asked about this. There is one very good tangible example of a visit to China to meet the company, to talk about bringing their high-value salespeople here. We talked about wine. They then came to Australia, met a range of wineries, and it resulted in the single biggest order ever to China in the history of the South Australian wine industry.

Our approach, as you know, is different from the former government and the 200 or 300-people trade missions. Of course, they have already done an arrangement ahead, so then the premier and the minister turn up, they cut the ribbon and they get the accolades for something that has already been done. That is not our approach. Our approach is to focus on our nine important sectors. What we do is have a whole range of meetings with those particular stakeholders in country, whether it's in China, whether it's in Japan, whether it's in the US, whether it's in the UK, or whether it's in Germany, to continue to promote the things that are good here.

For example, the UK space collaboration, which is called space Catapult, wanted to have a space bridge, following a meeting between their space agency and our space agency. On my return, I wrote some letters to the UK government and now we have a space bridge bringing technology from the UK here to South Australia.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order: I think it was from 4 July, but I stand to be corrected. The minister is repeating almost verbatim the answer he gave then.

The PRESIDENT: He may well have been, but you have asked him a very broad-ranging question about what he has achieved in trade. If you want to ask specific questions, then come to me about relevance, but after what you have actually asked the minister, he could talk about his whole portfolio if he wanted to. Do not take that as a permission, the Hon. Mr Ridgway, to go on a frolic.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you, Mr President. I can hardly be held responsible if the honourable members talk all the time and don't listen to the answer. The members opposite ask what we have. We have some clear sector strategies. Look at international education, the number of jobs that is bringing to South Australia, with the highest number of international students in the history of this state. It is unbelievable.

Look at some of the other activities around space, as I mentioned yesterday. There is great excitement about South Australia. In our sector plans, we are having a whole-of-government approach. A number of ministers meet with people when we are overseas, and we are continuing to grow the nine important sectors.

Yesterday, I was asked, as the honourable member mentioned, about tourism. What have we had? We have had extra money for the winter campaign, an extra \$30 million provided in the budget by my good friend the Treasurer to continue to market South Australia. We are now at \$7.6 billion. The members opposite yesterday were critical of being at \$7.6 billion. Go back out into the regions and talk to the operators that are having some of their best and most buoyant times. I met with the Caravan and Camping Industries Association yesterday. They have had some of the best years they have ever had. The RAA have some record figures with tourists into our region.

I find it bemusing that on the topic of tourism, where 43¢ or 44¢ of every dollar is spent in the regions, these people sitting opposite (some of whom, in fact, if I look at them—one, two, three, four at least—belong in the regions) can't see that that's a great benefit for regional South Australia. They are critical of it.

We are constantly looking at ways to grow the economy. I had a range of meetings that I would love to talk to you about in the United States, where I had to sign non-disclosure agreements. We have record numbers of international students. Tourism expenditure is at a record high. We have had some of the biggest wine sales. Our wine industry is now booming, as we know, now over \$2 billion. Every time we go overseas, we talk and play to our strengths. Wine is one of our strengths.

Members opposite have the very crude, blunt and almost insulting comment about a pub crawl I did on the Fleurieu Peninsula. When they mentioned that, they insulted all the hardworking mums and dads who borrow money and try to grow our economy and give businesses an opportunity. Members opposite simply do not understand.

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): A supplementary arising from the answer that was just given: the wine deal that the minister talked about, is it the minister's contention that that would never have happened if it was not personally for his involvement?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:30): I met with the representatives. As I said earlier, if the honourable member had been listening and not yelling and screaming, when I met with the Infinitus group they said to me, 'Do you do wine in South Australia?' I said, 'Matter of fact we do; why don't you come down here and have a look?'

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: They had an interest, and in particular I said that we actually produce 80 per cent of the nation's premium wine, and what could we do in South Australia? I said, 'Come down and we'll arrange some appointments.' The appointments were arranged, and look what happened—the biggest single order ever in the history of this state. Mr President, they think it is a joke. Well, that is why they are not in government. We actually like to grow our economy—they are the joke.

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary arising from the original answer: can the minister point to one single job that has been created in South Australia as a result of his eight trips overseas, and in particular his six trips to China?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:31): Again, if honourable members would just sit quietly and listen: international students are a good example—now at record numbers—I expect well into the 40,000s. Every four students creates one job. So we go from 35,000 to 45,000—there is another 2,000 jobs. I have been to international education—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: They are not interested.

The PRESIDENT: I actually cannot hear the minister; I would like to hear what the minister is saying.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Supplementary, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I don't know if he has finished yet. Have you finished, minister?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I can't hear myself either, sometimes. What they have to understand is that, when we are in China, I do a range of things, and one is to attend the international education seminars and conferences to actually be part of the team that says, 'Come to South Australia.' We get increased numbers; we get more jobs in South Australia. It can't be simpler than that.

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Further supplementary: given that the minister is unable to outline one single job that has been created—one single job—can the minister outline what specific attributes he thinks makes him the best person in parliament to lead these portfolios?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:32): Mr President, that is a strange sort of question. It is a great honour and privilege to be the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment in the Marshall government, and in fact it is a great honour and privilege to be a cabinet minister. I am sure there is a range of people who could do the job that I am doing. I am delighted that I have the opportunity to do it. And we have an exceptional team in the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment who support me.

I highlighted some months ago that I think my capacity to develop some relationships with overseas clients is a great attribute. What I tried to demonstrate some months ago was that it is not just about turning up with 200 businesses, as did the former minister and very good friend of these people opposite, the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith, who would come into town with this great caravan of activity, hundred of thousands of dollars. This is about repeat visits, this is about building relationships.

We have nine key sectors that we are trying to build on; we want to tell the world about those key sectors. Because of the behaviour of the previous government, most of the world do not even know South Australia exists. So what I bring to the role is a person who is honourable and honest, a repeat visitor who actually builds some relationships and some trust, and we then get people and tourists to come to South Australia and invest and to grow our state's economy.

E3SIXTY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am sure the minister would like to hear the question, and he does not want his own front bench interrupting. Will the minister advise what investments the company E3Sixty has made in South Australia, how many South Australian jobs they have created, or how many employees in total they have?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for her question. E3Sixty is a company that I met with in Sydney. I had an opportunity and I met one of the representatives briefly in a meeting I had here in Adelaide at a function and they said, 'Please'—they were in the recycling business, and I wanted to actually explore the opportunities in the circular economy with that particular company.

We had a very interesting meeting. I haven't had an update from the department or from E3Sixty yet as to exactly what their next step will be but they are a company that is interested in investing in recycling. As members opposite would know, the Prime Minister has made a commitment that we are not going to export any more waste. China obviously has some issues with handling our waste so we have some really good opportunities in that particular part of our economy, and so I met with them just to discuss further opportunities for them to invest in South Australia.

E3SIXTY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:35): Supplementary: could the minister advise at which function he met with these people in Adelaide?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:35): It was at a social function. My recollection is that it was at an event, I think, in the Parklands. It might have been WOMADelaide or one of those things. I don't remember exactly which one but it was an inappropriate place to have a business conversation. I reached out to them, we had a discussion by phone, and an appointment was organised for the next time that I was in Sydney, I would go and have a sit down and talk to them about what opportunities there were to invest in South Australia.

E3SIXTY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:36): A further supplementary: first of all, could the minister take that on notice and provide details of what function it was?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:36): I will take it on notice but it was an informal meeting. If I've got that in my diary I will provide the honourable member with the information in my diary. What is important is the actual proper business meeting we had in Sydney.

E3SIXTY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:36): A further supplementary: could the minister advise has his department ever provided him with a written briefing about E3Sixty?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:36): I will take that on notice. I am not 100 per cent certain on that. I certainly made sure that some introductions were made, but whether they have actually taken the next formal step and I was provided with a briefing, I will provide an answer to the honourable member.

E3SIXTY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:36): Could the minister also advise whether his department provided any advice, if not a written briefing?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:36): I will take that on notice.

LUXE HAUS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:37): My question is for the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Will the minister advise why the infamous South Coast party house, called Luxe Haus, which is owned by a convicted sex offender, was removed from the South Australian Tourism Commission website, precisely when it was removed, and why did it take so long to remove the house from the website?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:37): I am just seeing whether I have some information around it provided to me but I don't believe I have. We know that Luxe Haus has been subject to some significant media interest, and I think all members would agree that, if what we read in the media is accurate, probably a fair bit of inappropriate (by community standards) behaviour that goes on. Certainly, I know that the Tourism Commission counselled the manager, I think, or the person who controls the marketing. They had some discussions around the activities that went on and the behaviour that was there.

Clearly, they have breached that again, and my understanding is, and I am advised, that the Tourism Commission has now removed it from their website. It was never involved in any marketing campaigns, it was on there and there was a link to it, and my understanding, I am advised, is that they have removed it.

LUXE HAUS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:38): Supplementary arising from the answer: did the minister previously personally request that the Luxe Haus be removed from the South Australian Tourism Commission website?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:38): Those sorts of things are operational matters. You let the marketing team at the Tourism Commission actually have discussions. I know I was advised that they were having discussions, as I said in my previous answer. They were having discussions with the Tourism Commission, or the Tourism Commission with the manager, or the people who do the marketing around what was acceptable and what was not acceptable, the behaviour, the use, the time, the noise and all of the things that have gone on.

We have recently seen some reference to footballers and cars being set on fire. Cars being set on fire in anybody's street, anywhere in the city, is not acceptable, but it is very much an operational matter. The South Australian Tourism Commission has now made a decision and, as I said, I was advised that they have taken it now from the website, that the behaviour that's ongoing and the activities at that house are not ones that we want to portray as being the norm in South Australia.

LUXE HAUS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:39): Supplementary: has the minister previously met or spoken with the Luxe Haus owner and convicted sex offender Corey Ahlburg or any associated members of the Luxe Haus? If so, when, where and how often were these interactions?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:39): I don't recall meeting any of those people. I know of the Luxe Haus, and I don't recall meeting any of those people.

LUXE HAUS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:39): Further supplementary: has the minister ever visited or stayed at the property currently known as the Luxe Haus?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:39): No, I am sort of too busy to enjoy much of the tourism hospitality around South Australia. So, no, I haven't been to the Luxe Haus at all.

The PRESIDENT: One more supplementary on this, the Hon. Ms Bourke.

LUXE HAUS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:40): Has the minister received any gifts or complimentary stays at the Luxe Haus?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:40): No.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE SAFETY HUBS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about domestic and family violence safety hubs. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about the government's election commitment to extend these safety hubs into regional South Australia and report on the progress of the hubs?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this area. It was very pleasing for the member for Elder, Ms Carolyn Power, and myself quite recently to attend the second domestic violence hub in Berri, following on from the opening of the first one in Murray Bridge, which I have reported on to this place previously.

The Riverland Domestic Violence Service is the site for the expanded hub. It is operated by Centacare, and there are a range of new services which are operating from that particular site. The Riverland Domestic Violence Service is a specialised crisis supported accommodation service, which has a range of services for people and families in this situation. What has been reported to us is that there is a range of services that are now operating on that site, so that it is a co-located hub.

The services that are now available and able to be referred through there include women's health, ac.care, drug and alcohol support, community mental health, targeted intervention service, Housing SA, Yarrow Place, SAPOL services, SA Dental Service, Relationships Australia, Family Safety Framework, psychology support, Women's Legal Service, Salvation Army and the Victim Support Service.

What has been reported to us is that, since this service has been operating, the people who are utilising those services, particularly the staff on the site who operate the specialised services, are seeing fewer families at the crisis end because they are able to manage the family dynamics much better themselves due to having those services on site. The particular specialist services are having to do less of the referral themselves and therefore negotiating those services on behalf of families, which means that their caseloads are actually reducing to much more manageable levels. So we are starting to see in the Riverland that we are getting more of the primary prevention services in place and fewer people who are in that crisis pointy end, who sometimes need to be removed from the family home for safety reasons, so that is really pleasing.

It is a different model to the service at Murray Bridge, which is operated using an extensive volunteer workforce, which is much more about information at that early stage. We were able to meet with a number of the workers at the site who are very pleased with the progress. We are looking to expand the number of services into a range of other regional areas in South Australia, which will follow various models, including those two. I look forward to reporting more of those and more of the government's fulfilment of its election commitments in due course.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about an ICAC inquiry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Before the 2018 state election, SA-Best's leader, Nick Xenophon, called for a royal commission into SA Health, describing it as bloated, toxic and badly managed. We have already seen plenty of evidence of that. Today, the ICAC commissioner, Bruce Lander, wants to conduct an inquiry because of concerns SA Health is riddled with corruption and failing processes. It seems that Mr Xenophon's concerns were well founded.

My questions to the minister are: does he agree with the concerns that his department is riddled with corruption, and have executive staff reported instances of corruption? Does he endorse

an inquiry with the coercive powers of ICAC, and will the government now provide resources to the ICAC commissioner and conduct an inquiry?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his two questions. The first question is in relation to reports. The Department for Health and Wellbeing and related agencies actively ensure that we comply with our reporting requirements under the ICAC legislation. Certainly, we can always do better, and we continue to do training to remind people of their responsibilities. I acknowledge that that has been expanded recently in relation to what was formerly called the whistleblower legislation.

In relation to the suggestion of a royal commission with coercive powers, let's be clear: the ICAC has coercive powers. It is almost a standing royal commission. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to fixing our health system and renewing the culture of SA Health. You ascribe observations to Mr Xenophon, a former member of this place, that SA Health is toxic, bloated and mismanaged. The Liberal opposition made similar comments before the election and, in government, through attempts to deal with the problems of maladministration. I have made similar comments that there is still a major cultural issue in SA Health.

That is why, soon after we were elected to government, we initiated the KordaMentha diagnostic and recovery plan process. That was a very important step. As the ICAC commissioner himself acknowledged this morning, the engagement of KordaMentha has been an important step to deal with maladministration. I note the comments of the commissioner this morning. Significantly, they echo the observations of the KordaMentha diagnostic report and recovery plan.

For example, in particular, he mentioned the issue of poor record keeping. That issue of poor record keeping was highlighted only yesterday in the media in relation to the coding issues. Not only did we come into government with what I understand was a backlog in coded items for 9,000 episodes of care but there are another 2,000 where the technical competency of the coding was so poor that the state risked losing tens of millions of dollars in resources. The commitment of the ICAC commissioner to deal with maladministration and corruption is strongly supported by this government. That is why we invested \$18 million in the KordaMentha process.

SA HEALTH

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:48): Supplementary: just for clarification, minister, are you saying that you will endorse the inquiry by the commissioner, that it will go ahead? Will the government be providing the resources for the commissioner to conduct such an inquiry?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:48): Let me be clear: I am the health minister. I am responsible for the health department. As minister, I would welcome an inquiry, but the point that I am trying to make is that the ICAC has a standing budget. Any requests for additional resources are not matters for me as the subject minister. It is an issue for the Treasurer and the Attorney-General.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, do you have a further supplementary?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Can I ask one of the Treasurer?

The PRESIDENT: No. Unfortunately, for supplementaries, you are committed when you ask your first question. The Hon. Mr Hanson.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:49): My questions are to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing:

1. Can the minister confirm that a patient was sent home in excruciating pain from the Flinders Medical Centre yesterday as a result of the minister's decision to close hospital beds?
2. Can the minister confirm why that patient, a Mr Dennis Murphy, was in fact sent home?
3. Has the minister been asked by the Premier to respond to an email from Mr Dennis Murphy alerting the government to his plight?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): We will go directly to the assertion in the question: is there a link between the treatment of Mr Murphy and the government's support for CALHN's decision to put beds on stand-by last week? Clearly, there is no link, because the Flinders Medical Centre is not in CALHN. It's not in the relevant network. But let me address what matters most to me. What matters most to me is that South Australians get quality care. I have seen the footage and I am obviously concerned. No-one wants to see their loved one distressed or uncomfortable.

I have received initial advice from the local health network. It particularly asserts that the patient was mobile at discharge. That's not consistent with information I have received, so I am keen to get a formal briefing. I have asked SALHN to provide me with a full briefing at the earliest opportunity. But let's be clear: I want to apologise to the family and to the patient. We apologise to anyone who feels that the health system has let them down.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:51): A supplementary: can the minister confirm whether or not he has, in fact, reached out to Mr Murphy in any way, other than the comments he has just made here today?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:51): I haven't spoken to the patient or the family. The matter was only brought to my attention this morning.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:51): A further supplementary, based on that answer: given that today the Premier has confirmed that he, in fact, didn't know anything about the case, can the minister confirm that he or his office has in any way had any correspondence or discussions with the Premier's office in any way leading out of his viewing the video regarding this incident and also taking great interest in it?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:51): That question was so broad, I clearly have to take it on notice. I have to consult my office.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:52): A further supplementary: can the minister ensure that there is an independent investigation into the case of Mr Murphy and that it is conducted publicly and that the results are publicly released so far as that is possible?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:52): The honourable member's questions reflect a line of questioning in the last sitting block and the fact of the matter is that every adverse event within the health network is looked into. Not every adverse event is put to an independent investigation beyond the health network. The clinical governance processes of any health network in Australia rely on review within as well as review without.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:52): A further supplementary: can the minister confirm that in no way will cases like Mr Murphy's come about because either the stand-bying or closure of hospital beds, such as 25 at Hampstead and 16 at Flinders, and their not being reopened will cause further incidents like that of Mr Murphy?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): I am awaiting further information on this case, but my understanding is that one of the key issues at least is the availability of an MRI machine. I am failing to see the connection between this case and the issue of bed management.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:53): Last supplementary: can or will the minister guarantee that not a single patient will be sent home again, simply because the minister has placed beds on stand-by or closed hospital beds?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): The member would do well to look at my comments yesterday about the importance of having surge capacity, capacity within the hospital, to respond to the needs of patients. I should clarify, too: it's not just, shall we say, the general patients being transferred into the hospital. If you have a hospital that is jammed to the rafters, not only are you more likely to not be able to admit general patients, it's also much less likely that a patient with special needs will be able to get a bed, particularly a bed in the area in which they need it.

For example, whether that is an infectious disease or whether it is mental health, it's very important that we have surge capacity and that we have it, shall we say, broadly across the hospital. What I can assure the people of South Australia is that, by putting surge capacity into our hospitals, we will be better able to respond to their needs when they need care.

PREVENTATIVE HEALTH

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:55): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on preventative care initiatives?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Marshall Liberal government was committed with a commitment to rebalance the health system. There are a number of components to this considerable body of work. One of the important elements is the reinvestment in preventative health after Labor's disastrous Transforming Health experiment. There is a lot of work to be done and much of it is at the community level.

Today in particular is a reminder of this as we mark the second international Restart a Heart Day. Restart a Heart Day falls on 16 October every year and is a chance to raise public awareness of the contribution that individuals can make through a few simple steps, focusing on hands-only CPR. In South Australia, the Ambulance Service is supporting Restart a Heart Day over the past week and today with public demonstrations from ambulance crews of hands-only CPR, including today at the Airport.

I had the chance earlier today in the city to meet with two ambulance officers and to practise the hands-only CPR technique. I thank Brad and Steve for their time and for their skill. The message from SAAS is that following a simple three-step process can have a huge impact on the chances of survival for somebody who suffers a cardiac event outside of hospital. Firstly, call 000. This will summons an ambulance and the person on the other end can provide advice through the process.

Second, push. Put your hands in the centre of the chest and compress the chest regularly. SAAS suggests the beat of the Bee Gees *Stayin' Alive* is the perfect beat. I need to look at Spotify to remember how that goes. It is important not to be afraid of pushing too hard; this will keep the blood flowing. Third is shock. If you have access to an automated external defibrillator, switch it on and follow the instructions. Most public buildings and sporting clubs do have defibrillators.

To put this in context, in South Australia around 1,800 people suffer sudden cardiac arrest each year, that is, five people a day. Only one of those people suffering a sudden arrest outside of hospital survives but, if that person receives bystander CPR and early defibrillation, their chances of survival increase by up to 50 per cent. SAAS runs both simple courses on CPR and I am told that the attendees include South Australians from their late teens through to their 90s.

With the difference this can make to the survival in the event of a sudden cardiac arrest, I strongly encourage South Australians to look into the CPR course or an accredited first aid course. I congratulate SAAS on their work in promoting Restart a Heart Day and thank them for their efforts to raise public awareness around this important area of preventative health.

SILICOSIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the minister for industrial relations on the topic of silicosis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: There is no safe level of exposure to silica dust, and recently the New South Wales Law and Justice Committee heard evidence that:

...any time you are cutting manufactured stone you have to make the assumption that if you breathe the stuff in you are going to die.

Workers have publicly stated:

There's no way you can produce a kitchen purely, without having some sort of dust come off the manufacturing process...Even when it is used wet (and) turns to sludge, the sludge dries, gets on your boots and turns back to powder.

Doctors have said that the industry has not been monitored effectively by government regulators and that the legislation that does exist to manage it is clearly failing the workers of Australia. It is therefore quite welcome that in January this year the state government announced grants funding for widespread health screening of South Australia's stone industry workers over these national silicosis concerns. At the time of that announcement there hadn't been any confirmed cases of silicosis in South Australia.

Since that announcement there has been one case confirmed and, as of 16 September, 66 cases that require specialist follow-up. There has, of course, been a surge in cases of silicosis identified nationally, as hundreds of workers across the country have developed this lung disease while trying to meet consumer's demands for stone in their kitchens and bathrooms. There are now 260 confirmed cases across Australia, and in Queensland alone case numbers have more than tripled since November. My questions to the minister are:

1. What action has the government undertaken, other than funding this testing, to investigate, mitigate and prevent further cases of silicosis?
2. Given the number of cases and similar moves interstate and that there is no safe level of exposure to silica dust, has the government considered a ban on manufactured stone to prevent Australian workers or any workers dying from silicosis in this country?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:00): I will take and be happy to bring back on notice some more detailed responses to the honourable member's questions. As I have indicated before, the government shares the concerns of workers and their representatives and the concerns that the honourable member expresses on behalf of some of those impacted and potentially impacted by silicosis.

The government has convened, through me as minister, a series of working party meetings, which involves MAQOHSC, SafeWork SA, SA Health and ReturntoWorkSA, to look at some sort of coordinated whole-of-government response to the questions of silicosis. That hadn't existed before in terms of trying to get agencies to work together. The member has referred to the fact that we have provided additional funding. I think I might have placed on the public record a response to a question from my colleague the Hon. Mr Stephens, but I will check the record. I know that ReturntoWorkSA has provided funding in terms of trying to provide counselling and support for those workers who might be impacted or think they might be impacted. I will check the record to see whether or not I have placed it on the record. If not, I will do so.

My understanding is that either a draft or a final draft report from MAQOHSC in relation to the audit that they conducted, or the health survey they conducted, will be available soon. Subject to any issues or advice I might get in relation to confidentiality that might relate to individuals, it's my intention to make public as much of that as I can in terms of shared information.

My recollection is that I am still only advised—and I will check this—that in terms of lodged claims with ReturntoWorkSA there is still only one claim in relation to silicosis in South Australia, which I find surprising—heartening, I guess, but I am not holding my breath that that will be the only one. I think my advice—and I will check—is that that actually came separate to and independent of the screening audit that we have commissioned; that is, it was something that was generated separately through another process.

The 66 number to which the honourable member has referred I think is a number that we had provided to one of the ABC programs—*The 7.30 Report*, or something like that—which indicates that the advice we received from MAQOHSC was that 66 had been referred to, I think, respiratory physicians for further consideration. That isn't any indication that they have been diagnosed as yet with silicosis. We hope that most if not all of those will subsequently get the all clear in relation to that

check with the respiratory physician. Again, some evidence of that will be brought to light from the information I will be able to provide from the report MAQOHSC has provided to us.

There is also work going on at the national level. If there are decisions to be taken in relation to South Australia in terms of the engineered stone industry, then a number of those issues are likely to result in action needing to be taken by and led by Safe Work Australia and the ministerial council.

My recollection is that there is a meeting coming of the ministerial council, I hope, in the next month or so—and, again, I will take that on advice—where these issues are likely to be considered. Certainly, there is discussion going on from Safe Work Australia and a number of the equivalent regulatory agencies within the states and territories in relation to the varying views on what should be done at the national level in relation to this industry.

The one remaining thing I would say is that in some of the discussions I have had with the bodies involved in this area, the one relatively positive aspect on the horizon was that coming out of Italy, I think, there is a new engineered stone product which has a much, much lower percentage of silica in it. The engineered stone products about which there is concern at the moment I think have 92 per cent or 90-plus per cent silica within them. There is a new product which has been developed, I think in Italy, which has a much, much lower percentage in terms of silica within it.

There is evidently a very strong demand for engineered stone product amongst men and women of Australia in terms of their kitchen redevelopments. The development of a safe alternative product which might fit that demand—there would appear to be a strong argument for it and potentially strong demand for it. I am advised there may well be a slightly lesser range of colours, which evidently is important to some people in terms of their kitchen product choices, but again in terms of safety of workers who work within the industry that obviously, from the government's viewpoint, is a more important concern than an individual's choice of colours for their engineered stone product within the kitchen.

So, a long response. I will take the member's questions on notice and bring back a more detailed reply in relation to some of the specifics she has asked in her question.

SILICOSIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:07): Supplementary, and it was in my original question: has the government considered a ban on this manufactured stone, and at that national meeting the minister believed was within the month, if that is on the table for that meeting, will the government support a ban on this product?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:07): I don't believe the issue of a nationwide ban on the product is the subject of discussion at Safe Work Australia, but I will take on notice that particular question. Certainly, in the nature of the discussions I have been having with the state-based agencies, the issue of a ban hasn't been the issue that we have been looking at. It has been more the other issues the member has addressed.

LUXE HAUS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment a question about the Luxe Haus.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Earlier in question time today, the minister informed the house that he was quite sure that he had never met the owner of the infamous Luxe Haus, a convicted sex offender, Corey Ahlburg. The minister did say he would go away and check if his memory was faulty to see if he has ever met with Mr Ahlburg before. I hope to be able to jog the minister's memory so he can give us an answer during this question time. Very specifically, has the minister ever been introduced to convicted sex offender Corey Ahlburg at a tourism function through Mr Randall Tomich from Tomich Wines?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. I don't know. I will have to check my records. I meet a whole range of people—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Twentieth of December last year, mate. That gives you a bit of narrowing in. Have a think.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I don't know. I will have to check the records. I meet a whole range of people, and I will check what I was doing on 20 December last year.

LUXE HAUS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): Supplementary: will the minister also check whether at any time, apart from 20 December, he was introduced to and spoke with convicted sex offender Corey Ahlburg through an introduction from Mr Tomich from Tomich Wines?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:09): I meet a whole range of people in relation to this job, through a whole range of different people. I will check my records.

AUSTRALIA JAPAN BUSINESS CO-OPERATION COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister update the council on how South Australia has secured the 2020 Australia Japan Business Co-operation Committee Joint Business Conference and the enthusiasm amongst delegates to visit Adelaide next year?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his question. Yes, I am excited and pleased to inform the council that last week I had the pleasure of attending the Australia Japan Business Co-operation Committee meeting in Osaka and announcing at the close of the conference that Adelaide, South Australia, will host the conference for 2020.

This conference has been around for a long time, such is the longstanding friendship with the nation of Japan. The hosting nation swaps each year—one year Japan, the next in Australia—yet, staggeringly, the last time we hosted this conference in Australia and in Adelaide was in 1990. Yes, that's right: some 30 years ago. In fact, it is only the second time in the 58 years of this conference that we have had it in Adelaide.

Really, you have to ask the question of the members opposite. Clearly, they didn't value the relationship between Australia and Japan. In their 16 years in office, they could have hosted this particular conference, but they chose not to. They chose to turn their back on Japan. We were happy to invite them.

When you consult the website of the Australia Japan Business Co-operation Committee, the last time the conference was here was October 1990. Throughout the conference I spoke to delegates about why South Australia is such a fantastic place to invest, to trade and to visit. I met with a genuine excitement for what next year will bring from the hundreds of delegates who will travel to Adelaide. Almost all of the attendees at the conference had never been to Adelaide and were incredibly excited about the opportunity to visit our great state next October.

I commented during the announcement that probably no-one in the room had been at the conference last time it was in Adelaide but, sure enough, two Aussies afterwards came to shake my hand and introduce themselves and let me know that they had been there before and they couldn't wait to come back.

These connections we make underscore that the Marshall Liberal government is investing in in-market presence in our target markets. Relationships are key to fruitful trade and investment outcomes, and we are thrilled to have opened an office in Tokyo in Japan and recruited the fantastic Ms Sally Townsend as our representative there.

Many of the attendees gave me fantastic feedback on how the office is running under the leadership of Ms Townsend, who is working directly with delegates looking to explore options to invest in South Australia. I look forward to welcoming the delegates who descend upon Adelaide next year for this great business opportunity.

We all know the benefits of conferences like this and how much money they bring into the state but, more than anything, this is an important milestone that signals we are serious about our engagement with Japan and international engagement more broadly to grow our economy through increased trade and investment. Unlike the mob opposite, we see Japan as a market that is highly valuable and see great opportunities where we can collaborate and build fruitful long-term relationships.

SINGLE-USE PLASTICS

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services, representing the Minister for Environment and Water, a question about single-use plastics.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: The government has announced their intention to introduce legislation to phase out single-use plastics and other single-use items. I understand that products such as plastic straws, plastic cutlery and plastic stirrers are the first items to be banned upon commencement of the legislation. Other single-use items, such as thicker plastic bags, will be dealt with in the future, after further consideration by a task force. Given the overwhelming support received from the community and industry for action to be taken on single-use plastic items, why is the government delaying taking action on plastic bags over 35 microns in thickness? Can the minister advise whether the government is considering banning all plastic bags, regardless of thickness?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have to say that I have noticed that the initiative of banning single-use plastics has been very well supported, particularly I think—and I am talking aloud here, which is always dangerous for a minister—by a lot of women, who are very active in the space of recycling and reuse. I know a lot of people who seek, as individuals, to phase out their use through various means, in particular with things like reusable grocery bags that you can purchase, and some of the supermarkets have places where we can recycle some of those single-use soft plastics items, which can then be turned into play equipment.

As recently as when we opened the new site Tika Turka on Gilbert Street, we found that their bike racks are made from recycled soft plastics. I am not aware of the details of the honourable member's particular questions, but I will take those to the responsible minister and seek a response and bring it back to the chamber.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, have you finished your conversation? The Hon. Mr Ngo.

KORDAMENTHA

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. How can the minister claim that KordaMentha, corporate liquidators, have been a success when the minister has overspent the health budget by a record \$476 million in one year, according to the Auditor-General?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): I am gobsmacked. I am impressed that we managed to get a new question rather than repeat the same question. Yesterday, we had a repeat of one from the previous week, so at least I congratulate the honourable member on the staff providing him with a fresh question. This morning, the ICAC commissioner today backed the government's engagement of KordaMentha.

Yesterday, we had the opposition continuing its campaign against KordaMentha in response to progress they had made in relation to coding. This morning we had the ICAC commissioner highlighting the maladministration that has been endemic in SA Health for years, and stating that KordaMentha was an important part of dealing with that maladministration, yet the opposition comes in and wants to have another punch at KordaMentha.

The fact of the matter is that the result of Labor's legacy has been mismanagement in the health system, with CALHN overspending by \$5 million each week at the time of KordaMentha's

engagement. In light of the significant issues within CALHN, KordaMentha's engagement was important financially and organisationally to turn around this toxic culture.

As I said to the Hon. Frank Pangallo earlier today, the KordaMentha appointment was in the context of our awareness of the level of maladministration. One of the very clear themes of the KordaMentha report is that financial and organisational recovery is significantly related to culture, and culture, whether compliance with procurement policies, whether maintaining proper registration and record keeping, as highlighted by the ICAC commissioner today, is such that you cannot run a healthy, efficient health service without a strong administration and strong policies.

The government appointed a new board for CALHN and a new CEO, Lesley Dwyer, and KordaMentha has been working with them to address the significant organisational and financial issues that Labor left behind. In that context, I would remind the house that the KordaMentha target for the first year, in terms of savings, was \$41 million. My recollection is that the outcome was actually \$57 million. In other words, they exceeded their KPI by \$16 million.

There are significant challenges that lay before the health portfolio, and in particular the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. The engagement of KordaMentha is not only helping us renew the culture of SA Health and deal with maladministration but it is also supporting the financial recovery of the health system, and we will not take a lecture from Labor, which gave us 16 years of mismanagement and now criticises us when we are trying to recover from that.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Just because the time for question time has expired does not mean private conversations. You can leave the chamber if you wish and have a private conversation outside.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I just gave you that reminder. The President is about to speak. I now call on members to make statements on Matters of Interest, the time allowed being 35 minutes, each member being allowed to speak for no longer than five minutes.

Matters of Interest

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:20): There has been much interest lately in South Australian buildings that may be constructed of aluminium cladding that is supposed to be non-combustible, but there is a far bigger problem with a far more highly combustible product that the construction industry does not want to know about, and I will go into that shortly.

However, as we know and have seen from high-rise blazes in Australia, notably the Lacrosse fire in Melbourne, in Dubai at the aptly named 79-storey Torch complex, and the tragedy of the Grenfell Tower inferno, the aluminium-veneered material used as a decorative feature on exteriors is a long way short of being non-combustible. As one expert has described it to a Senate inquiry into nonconforming building products, 'It is like wrapping a building in petrol.' It is so dangerous that the Victorian government has set aside \$600 million to remedy the hundreds of buildings it has identified as being of high risk.

After a great deal of prodding that has taken almost two years, the South Australian government has just told us it has identified at least 30 buildings which pose a risk but is refusing to identify them for fear of arson or terror attacks—an absurd reason when owners and occupiers have every right to know if their office or apartment is not only at risk but if it will be covered by insurance.

Regardless of that, our real estate laws already demand that there must be a duty of disclosure by agents and property owners about the bona fides of a building when it is being sold. Today, the appointment of a building auditor was announced, the current Kangaroo Island Commissioner, Wendy Campana, to oversee remedial work on these buildings, a welcome appointment but as long as she is given some authority to enforce the required repairs. Interestingly, the focus is on high-rise buildings; however, fire does not discriminate.

There are countless single, double and triple-storey commercial buildings and homes that also have the suspect material on the exterior. Why are they not being subjected to the same scrutiny? Why are buildings made from expanded polystyrene, also known as EPS, not being subjected to the same scrutiny? It is the same type of crumbling material you find in the production of plastic coolers, hence the term 'esky houses' is used to describe houses made from these building blocks of polystyrene coated with a thin veneer of cement render.

After a change to the National Construction Code in 1996 to let builders use so-called alternative solutions, these foam bricks became popular because they were cheap, lightweight and an efficient insulator. However, it was a big mistake. The building industry says EPS contains a fire retardant, a chemical called hexabromocyclododecane, or HBCD, that has been banned in Europe since 2015. But it does not make EPS non-combustible. Fire experts will tell you it does not perform well in actual fire situations. It softens and melts at 100°Celsius, or if subjected to an open flame opens cavities for fires to spread quickly.

National building and property maintenance company Roscon Property Services told the Senate inquiry that, while these esky homes look like a solid brick home, you could slice them open with a knife, and within 30 or 40 years all these homes, some costing up to \$2 million or \$3 million, would need to be demolished.

There are countless thousands of homes and buildings in Australia made from these flimsy foam fake bricks, and people who own or live in them have no idea they are ticking time bombs or that they are extremely susceptible to leaking, particularly if they have been used on ground floor construction. Now there is an even bigger headache for those with EPS: insurance. Many insurers have ceased cover or introduced limitations on what that they will cover, and of course they have significantly increased premiums.

In the meantime, dodgy building practices continue, as we have seen with the serious problems with new apartment towers in New South Wales. It is time to review the private certification process so there is consistency between the states and territories with certifiers and building inspectors. It is way overdue that a national minimum tertiary qualification be developed and implemented for these certifiers.

ADELAIDE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:25): I recently had the privilege of representing the Minister for Education at Temple Christian College's opening of its new outdoor area at its Paralowie campus, as well as its annual Thanksgiving service. It was great to visit the school and see how it has grown and developed and to have the opportunity to address its impressive staff and students as part of the occasion.

I had the pleasure of getting to know many of those who are part of Temple's leadership team over the years, whom I have known outside of my employment. It is certainly always an honour to be involved in the events of their school and indeed all of the outstanding schools that fall under the banner of Adelaide Christian Schools. In fact, many years ago I donated \$500 of my own resources to starting the school when they were doing a fundraiser to get an amount of money together in order for them to commence building.

For those members who are not familiar with Adelaide Christian Schools (ACS), its fundamental role is to oversee, govern and support numerous independent schools, primarily in South Australia although elsewhere as well. The schools are all coeducational and have several structures, including early learning to year 7, years 7 to 12, and reception to year 12, depending on the particular school.

Under the current leadership of Mr Kym Golding, ACS aims to provide a learning environment founded upon the Christian principles that the schools hold dear. The schools are governed by a board, with membership comprising individuals with vast experience and expertise from a variety of industry sectors, which works closely with committees and advisory groups from each school community to invite local input.

At present, ACS oversees 11 schools with approximately 2,300 students and in excess of 250 staff in total, with each educational facility offering its own distinctive qualities that focus on the role of the family in education, character development and excellence in academics.

The Sunrise Christian School located at Wattle Street in Fullarton was the first ACS school and was the initiative of late senior pastor of Adelaide Christian Centre, Leo Harris. His vision for a Christian faith-based school was endorsed by his church and a school steering committee was established way back in 1977 for his idea to be realised. That school, of course, is still there today and operates very successfully. Pastor Leo personally contributed to the initial donation to launch the project back in 1978, and Sunrise Christian School commenced, as I said, at Wattle Street in Fullarton.

There are now further Sunrise Christian Schools operating at Paradise, Morphett Vale, Marion, Naracoorte and Whyalla. My family is actually a beneficiary of Pastor Leo's endeavour, with my own daughter attending one of their schools. Each location of Sunrise Christian School has its own campus principal and a team of committed staff to support the academic, social and spiritual needs of each student.

As passionate educators, they are constantly striving to be innovative and progressive in their cultivation of a family-oriented learning environment, where the next generation of leaders and influencers can be inspired, motivated and empowered so that they have every chance of reaching their potential at key stages of their development. I can personally attest to their ability to successfully engage students to achieve this. It has been a wonderful experience being part of the school's community as a parent over the last seven years.

After the establishment of Sunrise Christian School, the need naturally emerged for a secondary school in which graduating students could continue their education. In response, the Adelaide Christian Centre formed a committee led by Pastor David Rodway, which formed Temple Christian College. Temple opened in 1983 with 35 year 8 students and two full-time and three part-time teachers under the principalship of Mr Bruce Robson in hired facilities at Tabor College. In 1984, the school purchased and moved into the Thomas Hardy building at Mile End, where it grew steadily.

The neighbouring property, Tintara House, was then purchased in 1998 under principal Mr Brian Hagger AM. In the year 2000, Bethany Christian School in Paralowie approached Temple to start a new secondary school campus adjacent to their reception to year 7 school. As a result, Temple Paralowie began in 2001 and has grown significantly, with students at the campus eventually outnumbering those at Mile End.

Mr Marcel Rijken, a member of the Temple teaching staff since 1987, succeeded Mr Hagger in the role of principal in 2007 after Mr Hagger retired at the end of 2006. I know both Mr Hagger and Mr Rijken personally, and I commend them both for their notable contribution to Christian education in South Australia. In fact, Mr Hagger was invested as a Member of the Order of Australia just this year in recognition of his significant service to education, to independent schools and to the community of South Australia. This prestigious honour is very well deserved. I congratulate him and all the staff at Temple and at Sunrise schools right across South Australia and elsewhere.

GREEN TRIANGLE, FORESTRY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:30): I rise today to speak about a new and innovative program being launched today in the state's South-East relating to the forestry industry. It is a program that offers a pathway to a career in the forest and timber industries. These industries underpin many thousands of jobs in the Green Triangle region and are focused on achieving the world-class, sustainable growing of forests.

Of course, I used to work in this industry, so it is a particular passion for me. Unfortunately, because it is a sitting week, I am unable to attend the launch today in my capacity as shadow minister for forestry, but I think it is certainly worth speaking about today in parliament. Timber is the ultimate renewable. The ultimate renewable forest learning pathway and virtual reality tools are being launched at Mount Gambier High School today, which is a great example of industry and schools collaborating to deliver good outcomes for the state and, in particular, the South-East.

The project has been industry led and is specific to forestry in the Lower South-East, which is one of the region's largest employers. Over time, the forestry industry has suffered from a lack of suitably skilled employees in a number of sectors. Despite forestry being such a large employer in the region, many students have been largely unaware of the career opportunities available to them. The forestry and timber industries offer careers suited to a wide range of skill sets and aptitudes. This program seeks to make young people in the region aware and to broaden their knowledge of the jobs and careers available to them right in their backyard, without the need to leave the region to seek employment.

The Green Triangle Timber Industry Awards play one role in promoting the diversity of careers available. I pay tribute to those awards. They are coming up again in just a few short weeks' time. It is intended that this program will equip students to make a natural progression into traineeships and apprenticeships in the industry as they are much closer to being role-ready when they leave school.

Students who undertake the course will be introduced to a number of forestry concepts, including forest ecosystems, energy flows and regeneration cycles; wood science and research; social, environmental and economic values of forests; forest management practices across landscapes, including sustainability; carbon cycles; forest products and futures; and technological advances such as robotics, automation, GIS, LiDAR and drones.

These are just a few of the topics that students who undertake this course will be exposed to, and they will come out with enormous benefits. The program offers strengthened community, school and industry linkages, support for school linkages to the tertiary sector, enhanced VET in school opportunities and professional development and upskilling for teachers, as well as access to contemporary, industry-focused facilities and industry experts.

Of course, the program will offer accredited training while delivering industry-ready people and a clear pathway to the forest and timber industry. Students can start learning about the forestry industry in year 8 and go all the way through to year 12 so that, by the time they complete their studies in this specialised course, they will be ready to work in the forestry industry if they so choose and see the many advantages of doing so.

I would like to congratulate Mount Gambier High School on being the first school in the South-East to take up this course. I look forward to seeing this approach expanded and grown to allow more young people in the region the opportunity to access a direct pathway to a job in the forest and timber industries and the opportunity to undertake these industry-led courses in their schools.

I also congratulate Linda Cotterill from OneFortyOne Plantations who has been working on this collaboration between the industry and schools, delivering this great opportunity to showcase the power of partnerships. Linda, if I recall correctly, was the winner at last year's Green Triangle Timber Industry Awards in the category of outstanding female contribution to the timber industry. Clearly, her outstanding contribution is continuing and I wish her well, as well as this program.

MEMORIAL DRIVE REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:35): I rise today to speak about the Memorial Drive redevelopment and Adelaide International. If you have driven past Memorial Drive recently, you will notice that there have been some exciting changes for tennis in South Australia. These changes include the construction of a spectacular canopy roof over a refurbished International Tennis Federation-standard centre court. The redevelopment also includes a new sunken show court, six new match courts, a tennis pavilion, a national academy training venue, and many other improved facilities and amenities.

I recently had the pleasure of touring the development site and meeting Mr Lynton Franzi, manager of major projects for Tennis Australia. Lynton is currently leading a dedicated team of professionals to complete the construction of the canopy roof over the centre court near Adelaide Oval. Following the installation of the fourth supporting beam earlier this week, Lynton and his team are well on track to completing the roof early in December. Lynton has had extensive involvement in the sport of tennis throughout his whole life and his passion for the sport is undeniable. I commend him for his dedicated service and for his outstanding efforts in his current role as project director.

The redevelopment has ensured that South Australia is a key player in the tennis world. With state-of-the-art facilities, it is no wonder that Adelaide will play host to the world's top tennis stars in 2020 during the Adelaide International, our first international tennis tournament since 2008. The week-long combined WTA and ATP tournament will commence on Sunday 12 January and it will be held for the next five years. This is fantastic news for our state and I am excited to see what this will bring to South Australia's tourism and economy.

It is estimated that over 100 of the world's best players will be competing in the Adelaide International for \$2 million in prize money and international ranking points. The event will also be televised to a global audience across 200 countries. It is fantastic that South Australia will be centre stage to show the world what we have to offer.

This event will go down in South Australia's history, as it will be the first time we have hosted a Women's Tennis Association tournament. Tennis Australia CEO, Mr Craig Tiley, has estimated that approximately 29 of the top women's players will be attending, claiming there will be no other women's events in the world that will have that strength other than the grand slams. Current number one, Ash Barty, has recently announced that she will be playing in the Adelaide International in 2020. Ash will also be playing alongside two-time grand slam title winner Simona Halep. This is a fantastic opportunity for our aspiring female tennis players in South Australia to see their idols up close and personal.

Memorial Drive has a rich tennis history, hosting major events such as the Davis Cup and Australian Open Championships. The redevelopment of Memorial Drive is imperative to the future of tennis in South Australia. Providing three of the world's grand slam court surfaces—clay, grass and hard court—Memorial Drive will be one of the leading practice bases for Australia's tennis elite and for our budding tennis stars.

Adelaide-born Lleyton Hewitt has expressed his excitement for the opportunity this redevelopment will present for our young people. Lleyton famously won the former Adelaide International in 1998 when he was just 16 years old. I have no doubt that Adelaide will continue to produce tennis superstars due to the improvements of Memorial Drive. I look forward to the continuation of tennis history in South Australia and I eagerly await the further announcements of famous tennis players who will grace our courts next year.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:39): As many of you know, I have spoken in this place previously about the unforgivable and atrocious nature of child sexual assault. Time does not erode the gravity of these offences and I believe that adequate penalties must be applied in all circumstances. Unfortunately, in the past, perpetrators have been able to serve penalties of home detention or pathetically short custodial sentences for unspeakable crimes against innocent children, while they themselves must deal with the lifetime consequences as a victim.

Earlier in the year, this almost happened again with one Vivian Deboo. Thirty years after this monster preyed on children and after three years of fighting his subsequent legal charges, Vivian Deboo pled guilty and was sentenced to six years and seven months' gaol. The community was outraged when Deboo was granted permission to appeal his sentence as he sought to serve the remainder of his term in home detention. Fortunately, the court decided to keep Deboo out of our suburbs and instead restated the importance that he serve his sentence behind bars.

Despite Vivian Deboo's horrendous crimes, there is one shining light that has been present throughout this whole court process. This shining light has been Deboo's victims, the masked brothers, known to many of us as brothers A and B. All too often the victims of child sexual abuse are unseen and unheard, and their experiences are so horrific that few people can cope hearing about it. The masked brothers represented these faceless victims and tirelessly campaigned against their offender. They shone the light on the details of the crimes committed against them and highlighted to the community the type of perpetrator that we as a community do not want to be released on home detention or with insipid sentences.

The masked brothers were able to give the community an image of child abuse and spark a conversation about the reform that is needed. They have shone a light on the inadequacy of home

detention and insipid sentences and the need for legal change. The masked brothers were able to do all this despite the personal challenges that they have faced in front of the man who stole their innocence. This is a remarkable story of perseverance in the face of evil. Despite their hard-fought campaign to ensure that Deboo served his sentence in gaol, the masked brothers' efforts have not finished.

The attention and support they were able to garner captured government's attention. Their campaign reiterated that the community expects that people who commit child sexual abuse must face the consequences of their heinous crimes. The improvements to home detention laws will be a lasting reminder of the masked brothers' efforts to prevent convicted paedophiles from potentially walking our streets or interacting in our communities while serving their sentence.

Perhaps a greater example of the masked brothers' continuing efforts to fight child sexual abuse is the recent announcement that they will form the Sabre Foundation. The problems with persecuting paedophiles do not end with improvements to home detention laws and insipid sentences. There are 1.4 million child abuse survivors in Australia, many of whom cannot afford let alone imagine confronting their offender.

The figure of 1.4 million children is a sobering statistic. It is a shameful statistic. The Sabre Foundation will aim to help fund lawsuits against perpetrators of child sexual abuse, providing a support structure to those left vulnerable due to the harsh hands of child sexual abuse. I commend their crusade against rectifying the evils of the past and their desire to empower victims to take action. These are selfless men.

After years of emotional and time-consuming work, I was pleased to see in *The Advertiser* on Saturday 12 October an article reporting that the masked brothers have been announced as joint nominees for the 2019 Pride of Australia awards. This nomination recognises the admirable work of the masked brothers that I have spoken about today. Each nominee is deserving of this award in their own right. Despite this, I wish to encourage people to support the masked brothers with a Pride of Australia award. They have persisted for a cause that improves South Australia, despite their personal challenges. At the same time, they have never sought any personal accolade but rather the betterment of the community.

I believe that they have achieved real change, despite the challenges. This award would recognise the incredible work that the masked brothers have undertaken and further promote the fight that they continue through their foundation. The commendable work of the masked brothers has arisen from the worst possible circumstances. I wish to congratulate them on harnessing the opportunity to advocate against the evils of child sexual assault, and I would encourage all to support them.

CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF THE BOAT PEOPLE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:44): When I attended the church of Our Lady of the Boat People opening in Pooraka in September this year, I was reminded of the important history and connection between Vietnamese Catholics and Australians. In Australia, freedom to practise religion may be taken for granted in our free state, but for many Vietnamese Catholics in Vietnam it is not.

On 30 April 1975, the North Vietnamese communists overran South Vietnam, and many practising Catholics were persecuted. They were no longer welcome to practise and needed to find refuge further afield. Australia warmly welcomed and accepted hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese refugees and migrants who now proudly call this country home.

The Vietnamese Catholic community have a 40-year history in South Australia. In 1979, the community started, and there were only about 70 refugees who supported each other as they tried to find their place in their new home. Although welcomed, they were unable to find solace within the existing community and felt isolated by the barrier of culture and language. Over the years, the community continued to come together and supported new arrivals by consoling them and sharing meals of tradition.

A dream arose of acquiring their own space, so they started working tirelessly to raise money through fundraising, community contributions and labour. They eventually achieved this dream. In 1995, despite all the challenges that came from every direction, they built their first hall. Over the

years, it had been used as a place of worship and for other social purposes, including accommodating almost 40 groups from different ages and spiritual backgrounds. Eventually, as the community continued to grow, they began to outgrow their hall, and the original dream of having a proper and separate space for worship and another space for social, cultural and religious activities had been rekindled.

They had a dream to convert the first hall into a church and alongside it build a second multipurpose community hall. Once again, the community worked hard and raised money, until five years ago the new church and hall development began. Today, the new \$6 million St Joseph's Hall and the reborn Church of Our Lady of the Boat People is complete. It seats 1,200 people. The name, the Church of Our Lady of the Boat People, honours the Virgin Mary. She is their protector and patron, keeping them safe on their dangerous journey in the sea.

The church features architectural waves at the entrance, reminding the community of the journey Vietnamese refugees made to arrive in Australia. The interior includes features reflecting elements of Vietnam, including fans and bamboo walls, characteristics of traditional Vietnamese design. I was proud to attend the opening of the Church of Our Lady of the Boat People and the blessing of St Joseph's Hall. Being part of the celebrations and seeing the original congregation members share their experiences and hard work with younger Vietnamese Australians gave me much joy.

The Vietnamese Catholic community have faced many challenges throughout their history but have never given up. They have continued to grow, support each other and teach the youth about their culture so they can continue the great work that has been done before.

I want to acknowledge and congratulate the Vietnamese Catholic community for their momentous achievements and for successfully facing every challenge head-on. Thank you to all current and past leaderships and all who have raised money and contributed labour for the community over the past 40 years. This is another way Vietnamese Australians are contributing to our positive multicultural community in South Australia. I wish them many long years in their new church.

RIDE TO WORK DAY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:49): Today was the annual Ride to Work Day, which despite the inclement weather saw hundreds of cyclists pass through the free breakfast that was sponsored by Adelaide city council in Hindmarsh Square, or Mukata, to give it its Kurna name. A number of the regular groups were there this year: Bike SA, the Bicycle Institute of South Australia, Cycling South Australia. Food was provided—a cooked breakfast—by the Rotary Club, and SAPOL was there in force as well. The Adelaide city council was the key sponsor, and the cyclists were welcomed this morning by Lord Mayor Sandy Verschoor.

One initiative this year which they have not done before was a pop-up separated bike lane installed on Pirie Street between Pulteney and Frome. It was only established for 12 hours, from 6am to 6pm. The council got rid of a small number of parallel car-parking spaces for that time and installed some temporary barriers, and this provided a protected cycling environment on both sides of Pirie Street. I have to say it was a joy to ride and not have to compete with cars even just for a few hundred metres.

According to the Adelaide city council, this temporary stretch of protected bikeway is a Splash Adelaide initiative. Splash Adelaide is all about throwing away the rule book to test ideas, foster innovation and remove barriers to enable the community to deliver projects in the city. My feedback to the council is that this gets a big thumbs up from me. We need more separated bikeways in the city in addition to the Frome Street bikeway, which despite some redesign over the years is providing a safe north-south corridor for cyclists entering the city from the south in particular. We still need to do more in relation to other entry points to the city, but I think the political will is certainly there on the part of council to make Adelaide a more cycle-friendly city.

Another issue I think the parliament should look at is the rules surrounding electric bikes. They are becoming increasingly popular, and the technology is improving all the time. Some years ago in parliament we passed a bill effectively adopting the European standard for electric bikes, so-

called pedelecs. The main restrictions before an electric-assisted bicycle can be used on roads in South Australia is that the maximum continuous power output of the motor must not exceed 250 watts; the rider must pedal to access the power, though the motor may operate without pedalling up to a speed of 6 km/h; and, thirdly, the power must cut out when the pedelec reaches 25 km/h or sooner if the operator stops pedalling.

I think at least two of these need to be reviewed. The capacity of the motor could be raised, especially in relation to cargo bikes or heavier vehicles. One suggestion from an expert in this field is that for standard on-road use without requiring registration or a driver's licence, 350 watts is a more sensible limit. There should also be much more powerful motors allowed for other uses, but these would effectively be electric motorbikes and therefore require registration and licensing.

Secondly, the maximum speed before the motor cuts out needs to be revised upwards. A fit rider can easily ride faster than 25 km/h for sustained periods under their own steam; a very fit rider can easily maintain 35 km/h, with up to 40 km/h on the flat. This is not to mention that just about anyone can easily reach over 50 km/h downhill just by rolling without pedalling, if the hill is big enough. So the question is: what is the point of a speed limit that can be broken by anyone on any bike?

I would also point out that there is not a lot of enforcement of these laws. That is not surprising because it is very difficult to detect modifications to electric bikes, and it is not illegal to sell more powerful bikes because they can be used legally off-road without having to comply with the restrictions I have referred to. Even with compliant e-bikes, bike sellers are legally able to disable the speed limiting devices and install throttles or more powerful motors if the buyer says they want to use the bike off-road on private property.

So what I think we need to do is listen to what e-bike riders are saying and what the industry is saying. The overwhelming opinion is that the laws need to be changed to allow users to get the maximum benefits from e-bikes. Rather than one size fits all, we could adopt a class system. My suggestion, for a standard class of electric bike that does not require a licence or registration, is 350 watts and a cut-off speed of 30 km/h. That would really improve e-bikes in South Australia.

Bills

ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TREATMENT (REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December 2019.)

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:55): I rise to indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition and that the opposition gives its wholehearted support to this bill. I have spoken previously in this place about the importance of focusing upon one's health and wellbeing and the positive impact it can have. An important factor that contributes to this is one's knowledge of the history of health issues their family has dealt with, which allows that person to be more aware of the risks they have in regard to developing the same problems.

It improves the communications we have with health professionals and can contribute greatly to proactive treatment before a condition becomes a problem. Unfortunately, not all South Australians have open access to learning their genetic history to be able to be proactive with their health. Donor conceived children are one example of a group who are disadvantaged in this area and unable to access any information regarding their lineage.

Currently, there is no public central register of donors of gametes and embryos. This puts us behind Victoria, Western Australia and New South Wales, who have operated central registers for a considerable length of time. The system as it stands is complex, difficult to navigate and more often than not the information is simply not available.

It is a matter that has been investigated and debated in our state for more than 30 years, with calls for improved and more cohesive access to information, and it is why the Weatherill Labor government oversaw a review into the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act in 2017, conducted by

Dr Sonia Allan, Associate Professor of Health Law at Deakin Law School, who has over 20 years' experience in legal and health policy. We are very honoured to have her in the gallery today.

This bill is a bill that will address the issues and is an important step towards placing safeguards to prevent possible genetic factors in playing a negative role on a child. For that, I thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for introducing this bill.

Dr Allan's review of the current process of donor data collection in South Australia across various clinics revealed inconsistencies in data collection, inaccuracies, misplaced records and extreme difficulties faced by donor conceived people attempting to access this information, even where the donor's consent was given.

The lack of a central register and subsequent difficulty in accessing information has caused both psychological and physical damage for donor conceived people, which Dr Allan details in her report. She outlines the impact on donor conceived people's sense of identity; a lack of access to familial medical history which may assist in risk identification and disease prevention; concerns regarding the risk of donor conceived people unknowingly forming relationships with siblings, or possibly donors, and the psychological effect of donor conceived people feeling they must be wary of accidentally forming such relationships; and a lack of openness, honesty and equality of information.

The review analysed the ethical, social and legal issues that have been raised and debated in relation to assisted reproductive treatment locally, nationally and internationally. It found that there was significant interest from donor conceived people, recipient parents and donors for the establishment of a central donor conception register. We provided our response to Dr Allan's review in November 2017, supporting the vast majority of the recommendations made, including the establishment of a donor conception register.

I am disappointed that, since that time, with the Marshall government coming into power, there has been inaction for well over 18 months. They have done absolutely nothing, leaving the donor conceived community waiting. Dr Allan understandably has expressed frustration with the lack of progress on her review recommendations from the Marshall Liberal government. She wrote to the shadow Minister for Health back in February this year, indicating her disappointment at the government's inaction on this important issue. She noted that, at the time of delivering her report in 2017:

I stated such matters needed to be addressed as a matter of priority. Some two years later it would be more beyond the time to introduce them. I cannot stress to you enough the disappointment that will ensue if this opportunity is lost. The current government's lack of follow through has been disappointing, to say the least. I really would like to see the rest of parliament seize the opportunity to make them act, to finally serve the interests of donor-conceived people, their families and donors, who have been waiting for so long for the establishment of a donor conception register.

The bill before us aims to implement six recommendations arising from the Allan review, largely to establish a donor conception register, protect records and establish the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages as the holder of information rather than the minister.

The establishment of a centralised donor conception register will provide donors, donor conceived children and recipient parents a reliable source of easily accessible information moving forward. We note that the more complex details surrounding the potential retrospective application of the donor register, and how to manage donors who are not open to sharing information, are to be further worked through via regulation. Taking into consideration section 4A of the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988, South Australia, the act provides that:

The welfare of any child to be born as a consequence of the provision of assisted reproductive treatment in accordance with this Act must be treated as being of paramount importance, and accepted as a fundamental principle, in respect of the operation of this Act.

We have a responsibility to improve regulatory oversight and transparency in this area. The best interests of a child is paramount. Accordingly, we should all support amendments that improve the chances of a child's health and wellbeing.

I conclude by noting that the opposition wants the government to go well beyond just supporting the bill before us today. We want to see the government implement a broader list of

recommendations arising from the Allan review, many of these requiring non-legislative change that can only be actioned from the position of government. The donor community has waited long enough.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:03): I rise on behalf of the Greens to support the Assisted Reproductive Treatment (Review Recommendations) Amendment Bill 2018. Whilst this is a bill before this current parliament, it is not an issue that is new to this parliament. Indeed, the concept of a donor registry has been supported time and again through various committees, recommendations and in law. Unfortunately, that support has found a loophole with the wording that the minister 'may'. We will ensure, hopefully today, with these parliamentary processes that the minister 'must'.

This is not the first minister who has not been able to progress the donor register. I note that this debate actually goes back well over a decade. A former minister, Lea Stevens, noted in the early 2000s that competing health priorities did not allow for the establishment of a donor conception register to be further progressed at that time, but that a proposal had been drafted and that she hoped to be able to progress the initiative as soon as funding became available.

My point today is that we can no longer see the political will of the parliament affected because the funds cannot be found. This issue is too important to let languish any longer and I hope that, by our support of this in the council today, we make it clear to this government what should have been clearer to and done by previous governments. It is certainly not the fault of the most recent minister that this was not done on the many other occasions that it could have been done, but today I hope that the parliament will make it loud and clear that it must be done.

I also note the addition of a very important provision in this bill regarding the welfare of the child to ensure that both the health and the welfare of the child who was born as a result of ART is paramount. Those health considerations are something that should be afforded to those people who have been conceived by donor. Not all of us know our parents, not all of us get to choose our parents, but where that information is available the child should be afforded that information in whatever way we can facilitate.

I never knew my biological father. I know who he was but I had very little information about my paternal lineage. As I have got older, some relatives have provided missing parts of that information and now that I am in my 50s it has certainly been a great revelation, many decades after I was first searching and seeking that information. We do not all enjoy the ability to access that information but where we can we should make sure that those people who wish to are able to understand their identity and, particularly with regard to health concerns, have the ability to protect their children and future generations as well as their own personal health where that is able to be accessed.

The bill also ensures a better provision to ensure that records will not be destroyed, that records will be able to be accessed and that records will not only be collected and kept in appropriate ways but kept and collected by people with appropriate expertise in these very delicate situations that we find in this modern day.

With those few words, I commend the Hon. Connie Bonaros for bringing this before the parliament. Our parliament in South Australia has made it loud and clear again and again and again that we support the concept of a donor conception register. I hope that our words today will ensure that this time it is given the political will and the funding that is required to make it happen.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:07): I rise today to speak on behalf of the government on the Assisted Reproductive Treatment (Review Recommendations) Amendment Bill 2018. As Minister for Health and Wellbeing, I would first like to acknowledge the donor conceived South Australians searching for their genetic heritage, including those who are present with us today. I recognise that knowing one's genetic history is a right and integral to the development of identity. Knowing one's family health history can prove critical in many circumstances. I appreciate the honourable member's good intentions in bringing this bill before us today in response to the experiences of donor conceived Australians.

I also acknowledge the review of the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988 by Associate Professor Sonia Allan OAM that I am advised was finalised in January 2017. I met with Associate Professor Allan to discuss her report in June 2018 and again thank her for the expertise

and passion she brings to this issue and recognise her recommendation for the establishment of a donor conception register.

While Associate Professor Allan's report was tabled by the former Labor government on 11 April 2017, the government's response to the report was not tabled until the dying days of the former government, almost eight months after they first tabled the report. The issue has been a matter of public debate or concern for two decades, and I acknowledge the observations of the Hon. Tammy Franks in relation to that history.

Many donor conceived people in South Australia, prior to regulatory requirements coming into place, face considerable barriers to accessing details about their genetic parentage, including details of their donor and any other siblings conceived through the same donor. The establishment of a donor conception register would provide donor conceived people the same right to information about their genetic parentage as those conceived naturally.

I support the right of donor conceived people to have access to their genetic history. However, the government cannot support the bill before us as being the most appropriate next best step. I support the principle but not the bill. The bill aims to force the establishment of a donor conception register. The bill seeks to change responsibility for the establishment and ongoing operation of the register from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages. The establishment of a DCR requires a range of tasks to be undertaken prior to operation commencing, and it is not possible to achieve this in four months. It is the government's view that amendments to the act should be done all at the same time to maintain the integrity and functionality of the act.

Further, the bill specifies that the register should be established within four months. This requirement is impractical and would not allow sufficient time for the tasks necessary to establish a DCR. This is particularly the case with the records from the clinics operating prior to 2004. Due to changes in ownership, records that have not been well maintained, locating and sorting records will take a substantial period of time. These are the circumstances I have inherited as the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Although the bill, as I have acknowledged, is well intentioned, the establishment of the register will be complex and must be done in a careful manner. For example, there are specific sensitivities related to the retrospective changes which will allow for release of identifying information about donors who had donated prior to 2004 on the condition of anonymity, as was previously standard practice within the industry. This bill does not have a contact veto option, and I think that is problematic since a DCR is applying information mining retrospectively.

As I have said, the government is not in a position to support this bill today. I do, however, assure the council and the South Australian community and particularly South Australians conceived by donor conception that I am actively looking at options to pursue the establishment of a register in South Australia. This is an area of need for both the health and the wellbeing of donor conceived South Australians.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:12): Can I start by thanking the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing for their contributions today. To suggest that I am disappointed with the government's response is very much an understatement. The minister would be well aware that this bill has been on the *Notice Paper* for months and months. In fact, I think I have given notice of this at least over eight months ago. To suggest I am disappointed, again, is an understatement.

The issues that the minister has raised could well have been addressed by way of amendment, particularly in relation to the four months. The minister would also be well aware that the reason we would insert a period into the bill is to ensure that we are clear that we would like this dealt with in a timely manner. Had any discussion taken place with us in relation to that time frame, then that is something that obviously we would have been open to addressing.

I have to disagree with the minister in relation to the point that he made about this bill not covering issues of access, because what we all know, and what we know clearly even from the forum that was held in this place earlier today, is that without a register nothing else can happen. The intent

of this bill was to establish a register where all the data that exists on an ad hoc basis could be collated and kept together by one central government agency. I do not know what lengths individuals who work in this sector and donor conceived children and their families have to go to get that message through to the government.

I completely acknowledge that you have not had the benefit of time like the previous government in terms of dealing with this, but there certainly has been a long time to consider the bill before us. I made it abundantly clear in my second reading explanation that issues of access are not going to be canvassed in this bill because before we even get to address issues of access we need to establish a register. That is entirely consistent, I think, with the recommendations of the Allan review, and it is entirely consistent with the views that were expressed even today at the forum that took place on this issue.

Once again, for those reasons and a thousand others, which do not impact me personally but impact the lives of hundreds of others personally, I am extremely disappointed that we could not use this as an opportunity to take a first step, after what has been decades of not addressing the issue of establishing a central agency and doing away with the ad hoc nature by which we keep records at the moment. The reality for many donor conceived children is that they do not have months or years to wait. The reality for many of them is that time is running out to find out any detail regarding their biological history and background.

I am disappointed, frankly. I am somewhat heartened by the indication you have given that work is being done on this, but I maintain my position that the best way of approaching this issue is ensuring that we have a register that is maintained by a government agency. That will serve as the platform, if you like, for the remainder of the issues that need to be considered in the context of donor conceived children, who, by the way, we have always treated as second-class citizens compared with other children simply by virtue of the fact that they do not have the same level of access to records concerning their birth as any other child in this state or other states would have.

Again, I am disappointed, but I am pleased that the majority of this chamber sees fit to pass this bill today. I can assure the minister, and I can assure everybody here today, that I will not be letting this go. On that note, I would like especially to thank the shadow minister for health, Mr Chris Picton, who is sponsoring this bill in the lower house and who I will continue to work with closely on this issue in the hope that we can get the government to see sense.

The issues that have been raised by the minister can be addressed by way of amendment, so I am in fact pleading with the minister to come to the table and have those discussions with us to ensure that we can get over the first hurdle and establish a register. Everything else can follow after that. I made a rather lengthy speech at the start of the second reading stage. I will not reiterate what I said during that but, as we know, the issues surrounding this issue are complex. The establishment of a donor conception register is the first step in addressing those very complex issues.

I want to use this opportunity now to acknowledge a number of very important people who have been crucial in getting to the point where we are today, at least in the passage of this bill in the upper house. I want to start by thanking Amanda Monteith, who was here earlier today. She is a donor counsellor who approached my office a year ago and made an impassioned plea, providing compelling and persuasive arguments for the establishment of a donor conception register in South Australia.

I want to thank Damian Adams and Katharine Dawson-Vowels for meeting with me to discuss the bill and for completely opening up and giving a very raw account of their personal histories, for sharing their frustrations and anguish at the lack of access to information and the impact that has had on their lives and those of other donor conceived children just like them. In fact, I want to thank all the donor conceived people who came to the Q&A forum today, for sharing their very personal and raw stories. Each of their stories is unique and poignant, and every account we have heard from them bolsters the need for a conception register in South Australia.

I particularly want to thank Dr Sonia Allan, also here today, who flew from Melbourne to witness the vote, who has also engaged enthusiastically with my office and with the bill by providing her thoughts, advice and assistance on a bill which I think it is fair to say she agrees goes a long way towards addressing the issues at hand today. It is to her we owe a great debt for providing such a

detailed and forensic analysis of the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act, as she was tasked to do by the previous government, tracing the history of ART legislation in this state and making the comprehensive case for the urgent need for a donor conception register in South Australia.

As I said earlier today in the forum, it is every human's fundamental right to know their genetic mother and father, if they so choose. For the majority of us, the answer is as easy as asking our parents and it is something we take for granted. But sadly, for others, but especially for those donor conceived people, the task is virtually impossible and has led to hundreds of people unnecessarily suffering decades of anguish and uncertainty, not knowing the answer to a question that most of us take for granted.

For me, it beggars belief that in 2019 these draconian laws still exist, despite successive governments agreeing to a donor conception register for close to two decades now. The bill that I introduced had the simple aim of bringing us out of the Dark Ages and into the 21st century and in line with what other states have done in terms of establishing a similar register. The need for such a register here cannot be overstated and I am sure we all agree that South Australian donor conceived people have waited long enough. It is them I am focused on today, not on recrimination or blame as to why it has taken so long, for the very reasons that have been outlined by the Hon. Ms Franks.

Finally, I note that we will soon be debating the Surrogacy Bill in this chamber after it passed the lower house and I commend the Hon. John Dawkins for all his invaluable work in this area on this most worthy issue. It is also timely that we finally deal with the establishment of a donor conception register. I am pleased the bill is going to pass our chamber today because I think it represents a crucial step in the establishment of a register in South Australia but I am extremely disappointed with the response that has been provided by the government. If I give one commitment today in this place, it is that I will keep at it until we get a much better response from this government.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: This clause states that the act will come into operation four months after the day on which it is assented to by the Governor. I take it that the mover would believe that that assent would come after it passes the other place and therefore has much more time than a simple four months where the government could perhaps negotiate with the mover of the bill in the other place to make that time frame manageable. Would that be the mover's opinion?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: That is absolutely my opinion. We have said four months after the day on which it is assented to by the Governor, but obviously, as the member has alluded to, there is ample room within that for us to work out any logistics in terms of the bill but also, if need be, to extend that time frame to ensure that there is ample time for whatever needs to be done for the bill to become operational.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 8) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:28): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (REMOTE AREA ATTENDANCE)**

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:29): I move:

That the Legislative Review Committee inquiry report on the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Remote Area Attendance) Variation Regulations 2019 (SA) be noted.

On 19 June this year, the Legislative Review Committee resolved to conduct an inquiry into the variation regulations that have been developed to support the operation of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Remote Area Attendance) Amendment Act 2017, more commonly known as Gayle's Law. Gayle's Law is legislation the parliament passed in late 2017 in response to the tragic death of Gayle Woodford, a dedicated nurse murdered in March 2016 while working on the APY lands.

Having resolved to conduct this inquiry, the Legislative Review Committee invited some 27 individuals and organisations to make a submission on the regulations. In all, the committee received 16 written submissions. Those submissions came from a broad range of interested and affected parties, from the managers of health clinics operating in remote Aboriginal communities, professional and industrial organisations and chief executives of national organisations like the Royal Flying Doctor Service, to name just a few. The committee also received two submissions from members of the Woodford family.

The submissions contained a variety of views on the variation regulations. Each submission deepened the committee's understanding of the complexity of strengthening the safety afforded to the front-line health professionals working in remote and sometimes unpredictable environments. The majority of the submissions the committee received were supportive of the regulations, recognising both the need and the challenge of providing a degree of flexibility in limited circumstances so that health practitioners in remote areas are able to respond to an out of hours or unscheduled call-out without a second responder, but only if it is safe to do so. The ability to attend a call-out without a second responder in limited circumstances to prescribed locations does not undermine the primary intentions of Gayle's Law, which is to minimise risk to health practitioners when answering an unexpected call-out.

Anyone who has lived in or visited towns like Innamincka, William Creek and Marree or communities in the APY and Maralinga lands will be aware of the challenges of seeking and delivering health care in those remote locations. Limited practitioner numbers, patchy telecommunication systems and vast distances are just some of the issues health practitioners must navigate on a daily basis as they work and live among the communities they serve. A blanket rule, where under no circumstances a health practitioner is permitted to attend the care of a patient alone, could be destructive to community health and risk patient lives in rural communities.

As minister Wade has detailed in this council and in correspondence to the Legislative Review Committee, the purpose of the regulations is to ensure every health professional working in remote areas is protected from harm while balancing their interests in being able to carry out their job with practicality, skill and care. Everyone deserves to feel safe in their workplace wherever that workplace may be. The disallowance of the regulations some three months after they came into operation would undermine the safety of the staff and the sustainability of services they were first and foremost designed to protect.

The purpose of the committee's inquiry was to ensure that those stakeholders who had an interest in making public their submissions in relation to this important issue had a vehicle to do so. The South Australian community, rightfully so, is incredibly vocal and passionate about these regulations and how they support the strong desire we all have to keep our front-line health workers safe.

Both in the formulation of the regulations and their examination by the Legislative Review Committee, key organisations like the Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia, Tullawon Health Service, CRANAplus, the AMA and the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation were consulted. It was vital for the committee to be informed by the insights, experience and challenges of delivering

health services safely in remote areas. However, there will always be risks. Unfortunately, in no situation can a guarantee be made about the absolute safety of every individual. That is simply the reality and nature of the job. I am sure everyone here admires the selflessness and courageous nature of the people who deliver these vital services. The resilience and dedication of these professionals in caring for some of South Australia's most vulnerable individuals is nothing short of inspiring.

When parliament passed Gayle's Law in 2017, it stipulated that a review of the legislation must be undertaken two years after the legislation came into operation, that is, after 1 July 2021. The committee has adopted its final report, with a recommendation that a review be conducted one year after coming into operation instead of two years, consistent with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing's previous public commitment. Gayle's Law has been operating in South Australia for some three months already. In another nine months it will be reviewed thoroughly, I am sure.

I would like to thank the members of the committee, the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC, Mr Dan Cregan MP, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos MLC, Mr Josh Teague MP and Mr Joe Szakacs MP. I would also like to thank the secretary, Mr Matt Balfour, and the research officer, Mrs Lisa Baxter. Additionally, I extend a thank you to all of those who assisted in the development, implementation and examination of the regulations and to all those who made submissions to this inquiry.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:35): Gayle Woodford was a dedicated nurse for—I might not pronounce these groups correctly, but I will endeavour—the Nganampa Health Council in Fregon in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands in South Australia. She was held in high regard by the community due to her ability to provide high-level health service to those in the area, yet unfortunately in March 2016 whilst responding to an emergency call in a public space she was assaulted and killed by a third party.

It was the nature and the alarming circumstances surrounding the death of Gayle Woodford that then created the very serious discussion of: are we doing enough to keep our nurses safe, specifically remote area practitioners and health professionals? That discussion led to the introduction of legislation that was to place restrictions on single person attendances in remote areas by requiring health practitioners in remote areas to be accompanied by a second responder.

This included setting out regulations as to how a second responder is engaged as a second responder for the purposes of a call-out and the predicted circumstances of when a second responder would be required or would not be required. This bill passed both houses in November 2017, with discussions pertaining to regulations commencing in May 2019. The discussions thereafter were about whether or not the regulations met the requirements of the legislation, which there has been a notable amount of debate about, both inside and outside of this place, and which was reviewed by the Legislative Review Committee.

At the time the bill was debated in parliament it was envisaged that risk assessments would be required by health practitioners in terms of determining whether a service needed to be provided as a matter of urgency or whether it could wait until the clinic was open the next day. If an emergency response was required, a second responder would be contacted to accompany the practitioner. The regulations, however, stipulate that a health practitioner can make a risk assessment in the circumstances above in regard to whether it is safe to attend the call-out without a second responder.

The report produced by the Legislative Review Committee reflects differing perceptions in undertaking a legislative review of the regulations as promulgated. Many raised concerns that the current regulations afford health practitioners no additional support or security. Further, the regulations place an inordinate amount of pressure and stress on a health professional who already finds themselves in an urgent and emergency situation. I note that the government acknowledged the ongoing concerns regarding the regulations as highlighted in the minority report and accepts the need for a new set of regulations.

I appreciate the minister's undertaking to work with the Woodford family and stakeholders to finalise the reviewed set of regulations in the near future. I stand by the concerns raised in the minority report that the regulations are not tenable in their current form and cannot be supported. The primary intention of Gayle's Law was to reduce the harm and potential deaths for remote health

professionals. It is my belief that the regulations considered in the report do not meet these requirements as envisaged in the act.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:39): I rise to speak to the report of the Legislative Review Committee on its inquiry into the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Remote Area Attendance) Variation Regulations 2019. As has been articulated already, the need for the inquiry arose following concerns raised specifically by the Woodford family, the ANMF(SA) and others with the current drafting of the regulations that the minister has maintained strike the right balance in terms of:

...both protecting our health practitioners, predominantly nurses operating in remote communities, and supporting them to respond to medical emergencies when it is safe to do so.

I think I have made it quite clear in this place that I do not agree with the minister's stated views and that this has been borne out through the inquiry process. It is terribly disappointing that the only recommendation made by the committee majority was simply a 12-month review, which coincidentally aligned with the minister's public comments about bringing forward the review. In my view and in the view of many, it is simply not good enough and brings into question issues around that inquiry process, which I raised during question time in this place and I will allude to further in a moment.

As members would know, I, along with my colleagues on the Legislative Review Committee, Joe Szakacs and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, annexed a minority report highlighting our concerns and making several very sensible recommendations, which were all disregarded by the majority of that committee. To be perfectly frank, I am not willing to stand here today and reciprocate the gratitude expressed by the Hon. Terry Stephens, because in my view the process was anything but genuine in many regards.

It made for interesting talking with the Woodford family, whom I have had many conversations with and who agreed to wait diligently for that inquiry to play out, only to find out before we had even finalised our deliberations, before we had even seen the final draft of the report, before we had even considered the draft recommendations of the report, that no action was going to be taken, other than, of course, to review the legislation in 12 months, which had already been highlighted by the minister.

Having said that, I am heartened—I hope I am heartened—by the minister's comments in recent days that he has now accepted that the current regulations are not good enough. I hope this matter can be resolved to the satisfaction of stakeholder groups, but for me most importantly for the Woodford family, who I continue to maintain my commitment to in terms of ensuring a good outcome on this issue and who I continue to commit to working collaboratively with to reach a mutually agreeable outcome in line with the actual intent of Gayle's Law as it is articulated in the act itself.

The minister has, in a letter two days ago, had a moment of clarity, I hope, and recognises the need for a new set of regulations to replace the ones that we are dealing with now. I make the point to the minister that what we do not want, given the commitments we have all made to our nurses and to the Woodford family, is more policy on the run, because it is completely and utterly disrespectful, not only to those people who work in this area but to the legacy of Gayle Woodford and to all those groups and individuals who took the time to make submissions during the inquiry, highlighting the many concerns with the regulations.

It stands that nurses working in remote areas deserve nothing less than to be accompanied by a second responder, dispensing with the need for a risk assessment model. It is why, following Gayle Woodford's death, the Nganampa Health Council, Mrs Woodford's employer at the time, abolished the risk assessment framework model for its own health practitioners and instituted instead an escort system. It is my understanding that that escort system set up by Nganampa Health Council works well and they have not had any difficulty finding individuals to fill the position of second responder.

I also agree with the sentiments expressed by the Australian Medical Association (SA) in its submission to the inquiry when it states:

...health practitioners who make decisions in the face of urgent medical situations do so under significant pressures, often with insufficient time to properly evaluate and weigh complex ethical and legal obligations, particularly where the obligations may be in opposition as they are here.

It is my view, and that of my colleagues on the committee, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos and Joe Szakacs, which are also the views echoed by the ANMF(SA), the SA Salaried Medical Officers Association (SASMOA) and the Woodford family, that health practitioners should not be required to undertake a risk assessment in circumstances where they will inevitably be made in haste and under significant pressure, with insufficient time to properly evaluate and weigh up the myriad complex ethical and legal obligations in a matter of seconds, which inevitably could have led to adverse consequences.

A number of submitters raised serious concerns about having to balance the safety of health practitioners with the practical realities of limited funding that health service providers in our remote communities have to contend with, but I say again that that is not a consideration we need to be looking at in the context of Gayle's Law: we need to be looking at the intent of Gayle's Law. We knew when that law was passed that it would need to be backed by funding. It is a sad indictment on the state of our health system in remote communities when submitters like the Aboriginal Health Council of Australia state that, without desperately needed increases in funding to the sector, they would not be able to meet the needs of health service provision with the requirement for the second responder, stating:

While AHCSA and its members recognise the importance of Gayle's Law, and in an ideal world would have a second responder in all cases, the reality is that without substantial increases in funding to the sector it is simply impossible to meet both the need for health service provision in our communities and also fund the staffing that would be required for second responders to attend in all cases.

In the joint submission the issue was specifically highlighted as follows:

There is no detail as to any additional funding made available by the South Australian and Federal Governments so that health practitioners are able [to] comply with the regulations and legislation requiring the use of a second responder for an out of hours or unscheduled callout in certain circumstances.

I specifically raised the issue of funding during the consultation period for the regulations. Issues around funding remain unanswered, and in my view the government has been silent on funding for these vital issues, something that I find completely unacceptable.

The position of the AHCSA is that, if Gayle's Law regulations are to be disallowed, a substantial and immediate increase to funding of our remote services will be required, or the welfare of our communities will be put at significant risk. We sympathise with that position on the variation regulations, that if they are disallowed services will not have the resources to provide care that is urgently needed unless they are provided with a substantial and, importantly, a permanent increase for remote health services.

The submission from the Tullawon Health Service was damning of the present situation, where they currently receive minimal funding from the state government for health service provision, and no further funding whatsoever has been provided in order to comply with the regulations. Specifically, they said:

...the funding we receive from the State Government for our health service provision is minimal and we receive no financial assistance to provide 24/7 Emergency Response Care or Acute Care for the people of Yalata, nor the additional support we provide to those in wider surrounds (such as Eyre Highway accidents of the greater population). It is important to note, that no further financial assistance has been provided in order for our remote health service to achieve these legislative requirements, despite the increased cost it imposes.

It is clear that there is an urgent need for additional and permanent funding for remote health services in this state, not only to comply with the requirements for second responders but also, of course, to meet the health needs of people living in remote communities who generally have poorer access to and use of health services than people in regional areas and major cities, a contributing factor we know to poorer health outcomes for them as well.

There are many other concerns we collectively raised in our minority report. I will not traverse all of them given the number of items we are required to deal with today, but I certainly will have more to say on that when we get to the disallowance motion which we will be considering later this afternoon. It should not be this hard to implement a second responder scheme for our nurses and

other health practitioners working in remote and often difficult circumstances and the reality is that they deserve absolutely nothing less.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:50): I rise very briefly to indicate that, while the Greens were not involved in this particular legislative review process, we are, of course, certainly invested and interested in the issues that it explored. As the previous speaker noted, it is the subject of a motion that is further down the *Notice Paper* this evening, that is, the disallowance of the regulations with regard to what is known as Gayle's Law, with regard to those protections that Gayle's Law seeks to provide where a second responder accompanies that person who is giving that very important health care.

The Greens previously have been reticent to progress with the disallowance of those regulations and the reality is that the government can reinstitute those regulations the very next day in the exact same form. We know that. We know that is the political reality here. We also know that this is a conversation where consensus has not yet been reached. I indicate that the Greens will be supporting a disallowance should it go to that vote, with the expectation that there will not be the time to introduce new regulations in that very short time frame but certainly most cognisant that we do not seek to leave nurses unprotected.

So should the regulations be disallowed and nothing stand in their place, we would be very concerned with that outcome, but this conversation has been going on for a long time now. However, the time clock is ticking in a different way. Should parliament be prorogued, as has been discussed in the corridors of this place if not the chambers, at the end of this year we may lose the ability for the parliament to effect debate on these regulations.

With that, the Greens will be supporting a disallowance of these regulations to start that time clock again to progress this conversation to hopefully reach a consensus that provides protection, not just in the cases that have so far been envisaged but to cover the range of nuanced applications. There is merit on both sides of the debate. We do have concerns that we may put particularly nurses in an invidious position where their indemnity may be endangered, and we certainly do not want to see those unforeseen outcomes, but for the moment we would expect that the government would institute the very same regulations the very next day.

While the minister may shake his head at me, which is somewhat unparliamentary for me to note, I will note that this is a conversation where we have not reached a consensus of the stakeholders, and by disallowing the regulations today we will continue that conversation in a way that I hope will have a more productive outcome than we have seen to date.

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

Bills

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (RENTING WITH PETS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:56): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Residential Tenancies Act 1995. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I am pleased to be introducing the Residential Tenancies (Renting with Pets) Amendment Bill 2019 on behalf of the Greens. This bill addresses an area that is well overdue for reform, and if it passes it will have a significant positive effect on many lives—both human and animal.

As a nation, we Australians love our pets. We have one of the highest rates of pet ownership in the world and many of us see our pets not just as companions but as treasured members of the family. Some people refer to their dogs and cats as their 'fur babies', which shows the important place these pets have within families. So you can imagine how heartbreaking it would be to have to move house and be told that you are not allowed to take your beloved pet with you to your new home.

Having to abandon the family pet in order to have a place to live is not a choice that anyone should have to make. But sadly, this is a reality for many South Australians.

In South Australia, during the 2018-19 year, 259 pets were surrendered to the RSPCA and 108 were surrendered to the Animal Welfare League simply because their owners could not find pet-friendly rental accommodation. That is a total of 367 pets that ended up in animal shelters in South Australia last year due to the lack of pet-friendly rental homes. That is 90 dogs, 223 cats and kittens and 54 other pets left at two animal shelters—equating to one South Australian pet each day of the year.

I am told that the Animal Welfare League has had to divert some of the pets being surrendered to other places while they are undertaking a redevelopment of their Wingfield shelter, so this number is understated. The statistics for the previous two years were significantly higher, so the real figure is probably closer to 400 surrendered pets each year. The number of pets surrendered to the RSPCA due to the lack of pet-friendly rentals represents 10 per cent of the total surrenders to their shelter, so if we can address the shortage of pet-friendly rental accommodation this will have a significant positive benefit.

Despite the great job that both the RSPCA and the Animal Welfare League do with these surrendered pets, the experience of these animals being taken from their loving home with their family to a life of solitude behind bars in a kennel or cage is highly stressful and traumatic. My staff visited the RSPCA's Lonsdale shelter last week to meet some of these surrendered pets, and they told me how affected these animals were by what was happening to them. The impact on them was obvious.

What has been harder to see is the impact that it has had on their owners, most of whom were reluctant to even talk to us about having to give up their pet. This heartbreaking situation needs to change. According to the 2016 census, 28.5 per cent of South Australians live in rental properties, but when you look at the rental market in Adelaide you find that fewer than 5 per cent of rentals allow pets. What is abundantly clear is that there is a massive shortage of pet-friendly rental properties, despite the fact that pet owners can make responsible and reliable long-term tenants. Melanie from Brompton wrote to me recently about her experience. She said:

Renting with pets is a huge issue in SA. If there are 300 rentals listed online in your price range, once you select the 'pet friendly' category that drops to maybe 5 if you're lucky. And those that do allow pets are often in pretty poor condition. It took me about 4 months of hunting on real estate websites every day to finally find a decent place that would allow my dog. And I'm paying significantly more than I budgeted for, but I'd rather eat ramen noodles forever than give up my dog. I was lucky because I was on a week-to-week lease before this, so I had the luxury of taking 4 months to find a place, but lots of people don't have that time. Pets end up dumped in shelters all the time because people can't find pet friendly rentals. It's horrible that people are being forced to give up a family member to have a roof over their head. I'd love to see laws in SA change so that renting with pets becomes a viable option for people. Right now, it is damn near impossible.

I want to put a few other reports on the record. We have asked for people's stories via various social media and other sites. I want to give you maybe four or five of those. Kate wrote to me, saying:

I am trying to get into the rental market from my parents family home. We are finding it extremely difficult finding a house that will even consider pets that suits us, our price and in an area that is suitable. All currently have turned us down as soon as we've said we have a golden retriever. She is family. She is my child. Other people can have their kids in a rental home. Why can't I have my dog who is my child with me? I shouldn't have to give her up to have a roof over my head. You wouldn't abandon a child, why are people expected to abandon pets.

Maria said:

I currently live alone and have a pet dog who I might have to give up because my lease is up in February and my rent is too high to renew. There is a serious lack of houses that are near to my work that allow pets that are at a price I can afford on my own. My other option is to try to hide my dog and risk being evicted if she was to be found which isn't a good option either. I have a high stress job and coming home to a pet greatly reduces that and makes my life more enjoyable.

Charlotte wrote to me, saying:

My partner and I struggled significantly to find a place that would allow our two cats, and prospective dog. When we found our current house, we were upfront with the real estate agent about wanting to get a dog, and he assured us it would be fine. We signed the lease for 12 months and after settling in, asked if we could get a dog. We had been told we could get one by the real estate agent at the open house, so this was just a formality. We found a

dog we fell in love with, and waited to hear back from the landlord. We heard that we weren't able to get a dog at this time, as they had already approved two cats (who we moved in with). They said they'd like to wait until after our first inspection. After our first inspection, we asked again. We received the same answer—no. We asked for some more information about why, and received none.

Months went by, and our first 12 months were almost up. We really liked the house, so we decided to ask the landlord (through the real estate agent) if we could get a dog. We said that it was important to us and would be a large factor in us renewing our lease. A few weeks went by, and we didn't hear back. We asked our real estate agent to follow up. More time went by, and our lease was about to run out, so not wanting to have no place to live, we renewed it, thinking we would hear back about it soon. It's been almost 6 months and our landlord hasn't even bothered to give our real estate agent an answer. We've followed up so many times, but have now accepted that we'll need to struggle to find another place...if we'd like to have a dog.

Dianne posted on my website the following:

While my kids were growing up we had a king charles spaniel and we had to hide her as most places would not allow animals. Now my kids are grown and i am animal free. I would like a cat and a dog or 2 cats, they prolong life, they reduce stress, and they have every right to have a home like humans do. There is a lot of mental health issues today and pets help to make changes in this. I'm not sure of the statistics but one third of the population cannot buy their own home, should we not be allowed a pet because of this?

My story right now is, my kids are all grown up and moved out of our family rented home I stayed with my son for 18 months trying to find a place that would allow me to have a cat, during 8 months of hard looking daily not one came up. The rental market is full of extremely uninhabitable homes that landlords think we should pay top dollar for yet still not allowed animals. The unit I'm in now wants to know if I even get a gold fish, lol, seriously this was stipulated to me while handing my bond over.

The final one is from Kristina, posted on my website:

I own a rental property and I encourage the land agents to accept tenants that have pets because I would not be able to survive without my fur babies. Landlords need to lighten up because karma is watching and to deny people the right to a pet especially when they are alone is very wrong. I hope this bill gets through.

I would say that we do need more landlords like Kristina. A significant part of the problem which my bill addresses is that the default position of most residential tenancy agreements is that pets are not allowed. This bill flips this around, making it the default position that pets are allowed. There will, of course, be circumstances where keeping a certain type of pet or pets in certain types of rental premises will not be appropriate, and the bill allows for these exceptions.

However, rather than the landlord or their agent taking a blanket 'no pets' approach to residential tenancy agreements, if the landlord does not consent to the tenant's application for a pet or pets, they can apply to SACAT and SACAT will make the decision, having considered the circumstances in each case. The Greens believe that this is a much fairer system than we currently have.

The organisations we have consulted with on this bill include Shelter SA, SACOSS, the South Australian Tenants' Information Advisory Service, the Australian consumer advocacy organisation CHOICE, Community Housing Council of SA, Better Renting, RSPCA and the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, who are yet to respond despite having this bill for some time. The CEO of the RSPCA, Paul Stevenson, said in a statement:

259 pets were surrendered to RSPCA SA in FY19 due to rentals not allowing pets. With 62% of Australian households having pets, reform is urgently needed to improve the prospects for humans to rent accommodation with their pets. Effective reform will decrease the strain on RSPCA resources and reduce the trauma experienced currently by owners and their surrendered pets. We support the aims of the proposed bill.

The Greens are not alone in our campaign to make it easier for people to rent with their pets. Shelter SA have also been campaigning to allow tenants to have pets as part of their Make Renting Fair campaign. In their position statement on the Residential Tenancies Act 1995, they say:

A key issue that is essential to redressing the imbalance of power and rights between landlords and tenants is allowing tenants to have pets on the rental premises, for which there are currently no such provisions specified in the RTA.

I have a petition on my website which calls on the South Australian parliament to support laws that make pets welcome in rental properties. The number of South Australians who have signed the petition is growing by the minute. When I drafted these notes earlier this morning, it was 400. It is

now up to 650, just in the last few hours. This is an issue that many South Australians believe is ripe for law reform.

Both Victoria and the ACT have amended their residential tenancies laws to make it easier for people to rent with their pets. My bill has been broadly based on their new systems. An explanation of how the regime will work in South Australia under this Greens bill is outlined in the explanation of clauses which I will seek leave to include.

Pets play such an important part in our lives and have a huge positive influence. They improve our lives in so many ways. Owning a pet has been shown to have psychological benefits for child development and for adults and a positive impact on our health and wellbeing. Basically, pets make us happier and healthier. Let's change the law to make pets welcome in South Australia. Finally, I commend the bill to the chamber and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Residential Tenancies Act 1995

4—Insertion of Part 4 Division 6A

This clause inserts a new Part 4 Division 6A as follows:

66A Keeping of pets on rented premises

This clause allows people to keep a pet or pets at their rented premises, other than in certain circumstances.

Renters are required to request their landlord's consent to keep a pet or pets. The landlord can respond and provide written consent, including imposing reasonable conditions relating to the number of pets, cleaning and maintenance relating to the keeping of pets and any other condition approved by SACAT (the Tribunal). However, if the landlord has not given written consent or applied to the Tribunal within 14 days after receiving the application, the landlord will be taken to have granted consent.

66B Landlord may seek Tribunal orders

This clause provides that a landlord can apply to the Tribunal for an order to refuse consent to the keeping of a pet or pets, or a pet of a specified kind, under a residential tenancy agreement. A landlord can also apply for an order excluding all pets, or pets of a specified kind from the premises under a residential tenancy agreement, from the date specified in the order.

An application must be made to the Tribunal within 14 days after receipt of the application under section 66A(2).

The Tribunal can then make:

- an order to refuse consent to the keeping of a pet or pets, or a pet of a specified kind;
- an order excluding all pets, or pets of a specified kind from the premises;
- an order revoking a consent under section 66A;
- an order varying or revoking a condition of consent under 66A;
- an order permitting a specified pet or pets, or pets of a specified kind, to be kept on the premises; or
- any other orders as the Tribunal considers appropriate

The factors that the Tribunal must consider include the type of pet, the suitability of the premises, the character and nature of the appliances, fixtures and fittings, whether it would result in unreasonable damage or pose an unacceptable risk to public health and safety or any other matter that the Tribunal considers relevant.

The Tribunal may impose conditions on the consent as they consider appropriate.

The landlord may also apply to the Tribunal for an order for a pet or pets to be excluded from the premises where the pet or pets are being kept on the premises without consent.

The following orders can be made for a specified period or if not specified will remain in place until a further order by the Tribunal regardless of whether a new residential tenancy agreement is entered into during the period -

- an order to refuse consent to the keeping of a pet or pets of a specified kind;
- an order excluding all pets or pets of a specified kind;
- an order permitting a specified pet or pets or pets of a specified kind; or
- any ancillary or other order under 66B(4)(f);

An order that does not specify a period will be able to give certainty in the longer term, to the landlord and any prospective tenants about the keeping of pets on the premises.

66C Limitation of landlord's liability

This clause clarifies that a landlord or their agent has no additional duty of care arising from a consent to keep a pet or pets.

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

AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS (PUBLIC ACCESS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:10): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to require the installation and registration of automated external defibrillators in certain buildings, facilities and vehicles, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Coincidentally, on world Restart a Heart Day I introduce my private member's bill, the Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) Bill 2019, which is aimed at saving the lives of over 2,000 South Australians and potentially people visiting our great state each and every year. For many South Australians, when we think of a threat to our lives we sometimes think of bushfires, days like the terrifying Ash Wednesday fires in 1983, an inferno that killed 28 South Australians.

This parliament did something about that threat: our fire protection laws, which passed in the 1990s, demand that buildings and communities have all the equipment and training they need to stop the outbreak and spread of fire. These laws have greatly minimised lives being lost. I am relieved to tell you that the latest figures show that the rate of death from fire is falling. Based on figures for 2008 to 2014, it is about 10 per year in South Australia. That is still high, but parliament saw the threat and did something about it.

However, there is another threat to life here in South Australia that we have not addressed in any systematic or strategic manner, not just in South Australia but nationally, as I believe this is the first legislation of its kind in Australia. Cardiac arrest kills an estimated 2,045 South Australians every year. The Council of Ambulance Authorities informs me that more than 30,000 people suffer cardiac arrests in Australia each year. Tragically, fewer than 10 per cent of those struck down manage to survive.

Why do we accept these deaths? Possibly because we do not think there is anything we can do about it and partly because we have had an ad hoc approach to the provision of AEDs, relying on one-off grant programs, sporting club and other voluntary organisations fundraising efforts, a patchwork of local government and industry initiatives and other well-meaning but inadequate efforts to try to get AEDs into locations where they have been shown to be wanting. I give some credit to the state government, which provides a grant to local sporting clubs to purchase a defibrillator through the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing's Active Club Program.

Sadly, during the latest round of the Active Club Program no clubs applied for such funding for an AED, so I am pleased to say there is something more strategic and effective that we can do about it, and it is surprisingly simple. It is making the automated external defibrillator, the AEDs as they are commonly known, widely accessible. AEDs are proven to save lives. It has been proven that the availability of an AED can dramatically lift survival rates from 10 per cent to 70 per cent of people who suffer cardiac arrests.

St John Ambulance tells me that if someone has a sudden cardiac arrest right here and we are able to get an AED onto that person within a minute the chance of survival is 90 per cent, especially if it is combined with CPR—what is called the chain of survival. With every minute that defibrillation is delayed, the chance of survival decreases by 10 per cent. The chain of survival falls apart if people have to wait for CPR or an AED.

If a South Australian in cardiac arrest has to wait five minutes for an AED to be applied, that person has only a 50 per cent chance of recovery. If the wait is nine minutes, then it is a 10 per cent chance of recovery. If it is 10 minutes or more, then you can say, 'Good night nurse, good morning Jesus,' which leads me to my point: South Australians cannot wait another minute. We cannot put pressure on ambulances to be faster and we cannot train enough people to be expert in CPR, which is quite a physically challenging procedure to undertake as a non-professional. We need AEDs in places we live, work and play, and we need them now.

The bill I put today will save lives because AEDs save lives. Mine is just one voice among many who are unanimous in agreement about what is needed. The Australian Institute of Health and Safety recently called for more AEDs to be installed in workplaces. The Governor-General, General Hurley, has been encouraging all workplaces, public buildings, community centres and schools to undertake CPR training and to install more AEDs.

St John Ambulance and the We are Australian Hearts organisation approached me to introduce a bill that would ensure South Australians are within three minutes of an AED in the event of a heart attack. I am pleased to acknowledge members of those organisations in the gallery today, and I thank them for their expert input and support in developing this bill.

In developing this bill, I was somewhat surprised to learn that in Australia we do not have legislation or consistent funding arrangements to ensure that AEDs, these vital life-saving devices that have been proven time and again to be critical to surviving a heart attack, or not, are readily available when needed. In the meantime, lots of companies in South Australia are already doing the right thing. I know that Coles is rolling them out across their supermarkets and Bunnings is equipping all their warehouses.

One great South Australian company which is also taking this seriously is Peregrine Corporation. It is aiming to put AEDs in 40 of its business sites by the end of December 2019 because it knows the difference it makes. The Peregrine Corporation knows what it means when there are no AEDs around. A couple of years ago, one of its key staff, a man in his 50s, experienced sudden cardiac arrest at home, right here in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. There is almost no chance that an ambulance, even on a good day, can even get to metro locations in under 10 minutes, and there was no AED nearby in the community. A good South Australian was lost that day because there was no AED nearby.

Another of its staff, Dan Lowe, who I believe may be in the chamber today, learned the difference it makes when there is an AED nearby. The Onkaparinga Hills father of three, aged 39, owes his life to an AED and those who acted quickly to use it. Dan collapsed and died for 12½ minutes while doing a workout at Orangetheory Fitness in Hawthorn three years ago. In a life-saving move, the gym had invested in an AED, and with the help of four other gym goers, who Dan now calls his angels, the HR specialist survived. I met with Dan recently, and he articulated what happened very succinctly:

I wouldn't be here today without the defibrillator, and the heroic efforts of my angels, I would have died there and then—it's as simple as that.

It turned out I had an electrical defect of my heart, which I was totally unaware of at the time.

I was at my gym doing a regular workout. Without any warning signs, I collapsed and 'died' for 12.5 minutes before being brought back to life.

I don't remember anything about it—but I know I wouldn't be here if not for the gym having an AED—and my wife would be a widow and my children wouldn't have a father.

The critical importance of AEDs to survival from a cardiac arrest is illustrated by people like Kybybolite footballer, 22-year-old Max Schinkel, who is also lucky to be alive after collapsing on the oval after training in Loxton. Fortunately, his teammates administered CPR and an ambulance arrived with an AED within 10 minutes, with Max since becoming a big advocate for AEDs being available not just in ambulances but in all public places.

Honourable members here know that I give the AHA and Clubs SA criticism where I think it is due. On this occasion I give praise where it is due. Their grants program has led to the installation of 208 defibs at clubs and hotels in regional locations across the state, and all of them are registered with emergency services, so if you call 000 they can tell you about the AED nearest to you. Another 104 AEDs will be installed by the AHA member hotels by February 2020.

Some local governments are doing the right thing too, like Adelaide city council. Councillor Phillip Martin initiated the project 'Saving a life is "shockingly easy"'. Along with 25 AEDs throughout the CBD will be distinctive public art signage designed by Daniel To and Emma Aiston, a smart move because there is no point having AEDs in public places if people do not know where they are. Adequate signage on the outside of buildings and at the exact site of the AED is something my legislation ensures. I hope to see a lot more of Daniel and Emma's signage for AEDs as it is distinctive and highly visible, especially at night.

The Adelaide city council initiative is good news for people who work in the CBD, but I want to make sure that every South Australian has a second chance at life if they get struck down by a cardiac event and not just if they happen to live or work near a business or a council that is doing the right thing. After filing a freedom of information request with the Department for Education, I was astounded when they could not tell me if any of our public schools had an AED installed.

We need AEDs in places we live, work, learn and play. Every business and government needs to do their bit to fit out existing buildings when they build new facilities. It cannot be done by chance, good intentions or as piecemeal projects, as laudable as these are. This bill is designed to ensure that the availability of an AED is not dependent on the generosity and actions of volunteers or the fundraising efforts of sporting and other benevolent individuals or organisations.

AEDs are relatively cheap, at approximately \$1,600 per unit, require no training and can be used by anyone in the community. There is no legal impediment to using an AED, and the Civil Liability Act 1936 good Samaritan clause safeguards individuals who provide assistance in a life-threatening emergency. The training component of this bill simply provides for those who would otherwise be required to complete first aid training, which of course includes CPR, to receive training in AEDs as part of that training.

The bill I am putting forward requires all new buildings over a certain size and all major works over a prescribed value to have a publicly accessible AED installed. It demands that there is clear signage, just like we expect for fire or other life-saving equipment. Once this bill becomes law I know it will save lives because we have seen it happen across the state already, especially in places like Kangaroo Island.

UK born and trained Dr Tim Leeuwenburg has been a rural doctor on Kangaroo Island for the past 15 years, and it was a pleasure to catch up with him last week. He noticed that there was a high incidence of cardiac arrest on the island. In some cases, it could take up to 17 minutes for paramedics to reach a person who had suffered a cardiac arrest. Tim instigated the HeartSafe KI program on the island, and today there are now more than 40 AEDs installed, with 1,200 islanders—that is one in five of them—trained in CPR. KI is now one of Australia's leading Heart Safe Communities.

Tim's team includes his wife Trish and paramedic Mick Berden, and they maintain a database of available AEDs and people trained in hands-only CPR and the use of an AED. The program works in conjunction with the GoodSAM smartphone app, which shows locations of AEDs and those trained in their use. It was not long before they started seeing lives saved.

Lawn bowler John Vigar, aged 71, became the first life saved on the island by an AED three months after it was installed at the Kingscote Bowling Club in 2017. John tells everyone today not to hold back on giving CPR, even if it means breaking a few ribs, and he begs communities to get accessible AEDs too.

Today, I commend my bill to you all, to ensure AEDs are installed right across the state. South Australians cannot wait another minute. This bill clearly legislates the provision of AEDs in a wide range of settings, to ensure that at any critical moment an AED will be ready and available to use and, most importantly, that there is the maximum chance that someone will know where the AED is, or how to locate one, using a modern smartphone app and the 000 number.

This bill aims to vastly improve the accessibility of AEDs, to try to emulate places such as Tokyo, which has 40,000 AEDs, and O'Hare Airport in Chicago, which has one AED every 100 metres. In Singapore, they are in every taxi. Seattle in the US has them on every street corner, thanks to the generosity of an AED manufacturer.

South Australians are dying from sudden cardiac arrest, and they simply do not have to. We do not have to accept 2,045 South Australians dying every year. To get to the technical detail of the bill, the Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) Bill does the following:

- it commences 12 months after the day on which it is assented to by the Governor. This is to give sufficient time to plan for and implement the provisions of the legislation;
- defines that an AED is a defibrillator. They restore normal heart rhythm and can be used by untrained personnel. The definitions section is self-explanatory and is to ensure that a wide range of buildings and vehicles are included in this legislation. They can also be added by regulation;
- defines a designated building or facility. There is a comprehensive list, including public buildings and facilities; sporting clubs; schools; tertiary and skills training facilities; corrections facilities, including police stations; retirement villages and aged-care facilities; residential parks, such as caravan parks; casinos; and theatres. To be clear, this section also uses the definitions of public building and facility consistent with the building code. These can be added to by regulation;
- defines a prescribed building as a building on land used for commercial purposes if it is constructed after the relevant day or major works (which are defined as over \$100,000) are commenced after the relevant day on a building that will exceed 600 square metres. These prescribed buildings can be added to by regulation. This does not cover residential homes;
- the act binds the Crown, but the Crown cannot prosecute itself;
- that an owner of a designated or prescribed building or facility must ensure that one AED is installed for every 1,200 square metres of floor space and that it is an offence to not do so, with a penalty of \$20,000;
- ensures that AEDs are also required in emergency service vehicles, and the relevant authority or owner is responsible for compliance. It is an offence to not do so, with a penalty of \$20,000;
- identifies that a designated entity (and this is clearly defined) must ensure that the AED is properly maintained and tested at least once every 12 months. It is an offence to not do so, with a penalty of \$20,000;
- prescribes that if an AED is installed inside a building or facility, the owner of the building or facility must install a sign indicating an AED is nearby near the AED and outside the entrance to the building or facility, and, if an AED is installed outside a building or facility, then the owner must install a sign saying that an AED is nearby; and
- if an AED is installed in a vehicle, the relevant emergency authority of the prescribed owner is responsible for doing so, and to not do so will incur a penalty of \$2,500.

- that the responsible minister is the minister responsible for the Health Care Act 2008;
- that the minister must keep a register of AEDs;
- the AED register must have the AED's location, times during which it is accessible and information prescribed by the regulations. This must be published by the minister on a website;
- the designated entity with respect to the building, facility or vehicle in which a AED is installed must provide this information to the minister if already installed within two weeks of the relevant day, or in other cases within two weeks of the installation, and also notify the minister of any changes. To not do so is an offence, with a penalty of \$2,500;
- the minister must also make this information available on a smart phone-compatible application. The app must provide directions from the location of the operator of the app to the AEDs;
- the minister must develop and implement a strategy to inform the public about AEDs. The communications must also include information about location and registration of AEDs, the need to install signs and the fact that a person does not need to be trained to use an AED. The strategy must be implemented as soon as practicable after the relevant day, and continue to be promoted for five years hence;
- that the minister must establish a training scheme for AEDs for persons who must complete first aid training under the Education and Care Services National Law (South Australia) or the Work Health and Safety Act 2012, or any other person prescribed in the regulations. They must be provided with training within three years of the relevant day, and then within three years after this; and
- the Governor is given regulatory powers as necessary or expedient for the purposes of this act. You can see the list of standard regulatory powers given.

I conclude my remarks by saying that I am a heart attack survivor at a relatively young age. I was one of the lucky ones, and I owe my life to the brilliant staff in the cardiac unit at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital and my own cardiologist, Dr Joe Montarello. I did not need CPR or a defibrillator. I had a stent, which has been working smoothly for 26 years, and I have made a complete recovery, according to Dr Montarello. Sadly, far too many do not, so I ask honourable members in this place to help save South Australian lives by supporting my private member's Automated External Defibrillators (Public Access) Bill.

I know that South Australians dying from sudden cardiac arrest cannot wait another minute, and I know their families will be eternally grateful if we save just one of these 2,045 people suffering cardiac arrest in South Australia each year. I look forward to summing up the debate after the bill has been through the committee stage.

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

Motions

KURDS IN SYRIA

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (17:38): I move:

That this council—

1. Condemns the military operation Peace Spring launched on 9 October 2019 by the President of Turkey, President Erdogan, and the Turkish military against the Kurdish people and calls on them to immediately cease their invasion and all military operations in Syria targeting the Kurdish population;
2. Notes the sacrifice of the Kurdish people in assisting Australia and its allies to defeat ISIS and calls on the international community to immediately send humanitarian assistance to the Kurdish population targeted by the Turkish military and their allies; and
3. Expresses its deepest sympathies to the South Australian Kurdish community on the senseless loss of innocent lives at the hands of the Turkish military.

The Kurdish forces in Syria have been instrumental in the global fight against ISIS and have fought long and hard alongside our coalition troops. After years of fighting against jihadi extremism, the Kurdish people played a crucial role in creating the now democratic Syrian northern state. Together they established a more just society, where women are considered equal and religious freedom is tolerated. However, Western allies removing support in the region is counterproductive to the long-term fight against ISIS.

Kurdish Syria is a small portion of a territory known as Kurdistan in the northern part of Syria. In 2012, Kurdish-led forces took possession of this territory in northern and eastern Syria, and the SDF—a coalition of Kurdish and Arab soldiers backed by US, British and French special forces—defended the territory by defeating ISIS and liberating eastern Syria in March.

But the battle came at a huge cost. To date, the SDF has reported that 11,000 fighters died in the battle and 20,000 military members and civilians were severely injured. In January, President Trump announced plans to remove troops from Syria, but on 6 October he confirmed the US would begin withdrawing its troops from the Kurdish territory in northern Syria. This was followed by a White House statement, which noted:

The United States Armed Forces will not support or be involved in the operation, and United States forces, having defeated the ISIS territorial 'Caliphate,' will no longer be in the immediate area.

Just three days later, on 9 October, the Turkish military began its assault with artillery and air strikes. After years of fighting against the Islamic state, the Kurds are now exposed to attacks from Turkish forces, who are expected to move further into northern Syria in the wake of the US withdrawal.

The Syrian President, Bashar al-Assad, has moved Syrian troops towards the northern parts of Syria and will confront the Turkish soldiers and their rebel allies to defend their democratic state. The Turkish President, Recep Erdogan, has stated his goal for the attacks is to create a buffer zone separating Syria's Kurds from the Turkish border. The Turkish President's goal seems to be pushing for a demographic change to remove the population along the border.

It is not too far a stretch to interpret this regime's actions as appearing to be an attempt at ethnic cleansing or a type of genocide, which should be absolutely condemned. It is not too dissimilar to previous Turkish actions with other ethnic groups, namely the Greeks and the Armenians, to mention a couple. In an article recently published by *The Sydney Morning Herald*, Eziz Bawermend, the President of the Australian Kurdish Lobby Group, reports:

The Kurdish people of that region engaged in this war against ISIS not just to protect themselves but also, we believe, to protect the whole civilised world from ISIS's evil.

It is important that we recognise how the Kurdish people stood in solidarity to fight for democracy, rights and freedoms. However, this is now under threat. The democratic system introduced into northern Syria is clearly now threatened by the surrounding countries and is no longer a role model in the region, because most of the countries are led by either dictators, military government or monarchy.

Over the weekend, two passionate women of Kurdish heritage spoke out and put a real face on this issue. Their speeches highlighted our responsibilities as a country to support our allies, as well as reminding us of the importance of protecting democratic processes. I thank them for their courage to stand up and speak out on this issue. We can learn from them both.

Although we cannot do anything in respect of our allies' actions to remove protection in the northern Syria area, we must participate in assisting the Kurdish and Syrian people with aid and humanitarian assistance. It is of the utmost importance that we implore Turkey to cease its Peace Spring operation and continue to endorse and encourage the development of democratic systems.

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

MATES IN CONSTRUCTION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (17:44): I move:

1. That this council notes that—

- (a) males in the building and construction industry are twice as likely to commit suicide than males in other jobs;
 - (b) males in the building and construction industry are six times more likely to die through suicide than in a workplace accident;
 - (c) between 2001 and 2015, there were 3,000 construction deaths by suicide, with 2,958 being males and 42 females;
 - (d) every two days in Australia, a construction worker takes their own life; and
 - (e) suicide kills more men than the total of workplace accidents and road accidents combined.
2. That this council acknowledges the valuable work done by MATES in Construction to—
 - (a) reduce suicide in the construction industry and promote health and wellbeing;
 - (b) raise awareness about suicide; and
 - (c) make it easier to access help that is practical, professional and appropriate.
 3. That this council notes that the Construction Industry Training Board recently cut the \$50,000 funding it previously provided to MATES in Construction and refused a funding request of \$150,000.
 4. That this council condemns the heartless and short-sighted decision to cut the funding and calls on the government to make an ongoing funding commitment of at least \$150,000 per annum to MATES in Construction for this life-saving initiative.

I move this motion with a great deal of sadness, given the callous nature of this cut. The purpose of this motion is to call on the Marshall Liberal government to immediately provide funding to MATES in Construction in South Australia, which recently had its funding cut by a ministerially appointed board.

As mentioned, males in the building and construction industry are twice as likely to commit suicide as males in other jobs. They are six times more likely to die through suicide than through a workplace accident, and this is in the construction industry, which we acknowledge has high rates of workplace accidents.

MATES in Construction's key objectives are to reduce suicide in the construction industry and promote health and wellbeing, raise awareness of suicide and make it easier to access help that is practical, professional and appropriate. The government-appointed Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) cut the funding it previously provided for MATES in Construction, which is a widely acclaimed suicide prevention program for construction workers.

As members in this place would recall, over the last 12 months, the Marshall Liberal government, led by minister Pisoni's actions, has demanded radical changes to the Construction Industry Training Board. Minister Pisoni removed the requirement to have unions, who represent workers in the construction industry and others, and stacked the board with his mates, including accountant Mr Nicholas Handley, who, up until recently, was in charge of fundraising for the member for Unley's local branch.

These so-called reforms were opposed by the opposition and the Greens but supported by SA-Best and the Hon. John Darley. I do not think for a moment that it was the intention of the SA-Best members or the Hon. Mr Darley that part of the result of that decision would be that funding to MATES in Construction would be cut, but this is what we get when we follow blind ideology. This is what we get when we follow, or allow a government to follow, blind hatred of unions. They removed the requirement for those whose core concern is the wellbeing of workers to be represented on this board, and this is the result.

Upon the formation of the new CITB, the board decided to cut all funding to MATES in Construction. They failed to explain why this funding had been cut. Presumably, they believed it was not their core business. If the consensus provisions that were removed from the CITB act had remained in place, this would not have happened. MATES in Construction's funds would not have been allowed to be removed if the consensus provisions were still in place. If the requirement for workers' representatives to be on the board had remained, this would not have occurred. If SA-Best or the Hon. Mr Darley had opposed these changes to the act, this cut to suicide prevention would not have occurred.

The funding enabled delivery of the Life Skills Toolbox program which supports young apprentices entering the industry. The cut has been made despite common knowledge that young men working in construction are three times more likely to die by suicide than other males of a similar age in other industries. The funding cut means that they will have to charge users for some of their programs. That will have real consequences that will hurt many young apprentices in the construction industry. No longer will young male apprentices be able to easily access this successful program, and that is an absolute disgrace.

Members in this place might be asking: when was this decision made and when was MATES in Construction made aware of this callous cut? Sadly, the answer is that they were advised of the cut to the suicide prevention program the day before World Suicide Prevention Day. This callous and reckless cut should be reversed immediately. I urge the government, and in particular the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, the Hon. John Dawkins, who told this place a few weeks ago that he himself was not made aware of the cut until it was released in the media, to advocate very strongly. We need to have advocates against this cut—

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

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: No. We need to have advocates who will advocate for suicide prevention regardless of the forum, regardless of party politics. I am sure that he has taken some actions. In fact, he said that he had, so I pay tribute to him for doing that. But what this means is that that is not going to help those apprentices who may not access this program because of the cuts.

Upon this cut being revealed, the minister who can reverse the decision of the Construction Industry Training Board, innovation and skills minister, David Pisoni, stated that this program is not 'core business' of the board despite the Construction Industry Training Fund Act stating that one of their roles is to promote increased occupational health and safety within the building and construction industry through training. What could be more fundamental to safety than reducing the industry's unacceptably high suicide rate? Where are the minister's priorities, where are the board's priorities, if that is not a central part of their role?

This is a program that builders support, group training organisations support and, of course, unions support. It seems the only people who do not support this funding are the minister and his hand-picked mates on the CITB. This outrage is something that both *The Advertiser* and regional papers such as *The Border Watch* and *The South Eastern Times* have covered extensively over the last few weeks, and I commend them for doing so. This cut will affect regional apprentices at least as much as those in the city.

I commend the secretary of the CEPU, Mr John Adley, who has been a vocal critic of these cuts, along with his union, and who has strongly represented workers who are worse off because of these cuts. He told me recently how many members of the CEPU had seen firsthand the tragedy of suicide in the construction industry and spoke of how MATES in Construction plays such a crucial role in reducing suicide. Other unions have also condemned the cut. I thank MATES in Construction for speaking out against this cut and for calling on the Marshall Liberal government to provide funding immediately.

This decision is short-sighted. This decision is callous. This decision is wrong. We call on the government to commit ongoing funding of at least \$150,000 per annum to MATES in Construction as one small way of stopping suicides in this state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. I. Pnevmatikos:

That this council—

1. Congratulates and welcomes His Eminence Archbishop Makarios of Australia on his inaugural visit to South Australia.
2. Congratulates all the parishioners and volunteers of the Greek communities of South Australia and the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of South Australia on all their endeavours and preparations to welcome His Eminence to our beautiful state.

3. Thanks His Eminence Archbishop Makarios for his efforts to meet and engage with as many South Australians as he could on his inaugural visit.
4. Thanks the organisers of all the functions and events that hosted His Eminence throughout South Australia, including:
 - (a) His Excellency the Governor of South Australia, the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC;
 - (b) the Hon. Chris Kourakis SC, Chief Justice of the South Australian Supreme Court;
 - (c) Inter-Communities Council of South Australia, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese;
 - (d) Saint George College;
 - (e) Saint Basil's Homes SA;
 - (f) Adelaide Airport Limited;
 - (g) the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of South Australia parishes and communities, led by His Grace Bishop Nikandros;
 - (h) the Greek Welfare Centre;
 - (i) the Premier the Hon. Steven Marshall MP and the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas MP;
 - (j) the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia MP, and the President of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan MLC;
 - (k) the parliamentary library and staff;
 - (l) the Parliamentary Friends of Greece and Cyprus;
 - (m) Mr Harry Patsouris, Mr Andrew Psaromatis, Ms Connie Kosti, Ms Angela Gondzioulis;
 - (n) the thousands of faithful who welcomed His Eminence to South Australia across Adelaide.
5. Encourages His Eminence to visit South Australia as often as possible and wishes him success in his mission here in Australia as the leader of the Orthodox Christian faithful of our nation.

(Continued from 11 September 2019.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:54): As I mentioned in my matter of interest earlier this year, the arrival of the new Greek Orthodox Archbishop of Australia, Archbishop Makarios, marked the beginning of a new area of Greek Orthodoxy in Australia, and never more so than in South Australia. Of course, His Eminence's election followed the sad passing of the much-loved Archbishop Stylianos Harkianakis, whose distinguished term with the Australian Greek Orthodox Church extended over four decades.

I was privileged to be among the delegation at Adelaide Airport to welcome His Eminence Archbishop Makarios during his first pastoral visit to Adelaide in August, along with a 700-strong crowd, including assistant bishops of the holy archdiocese, the clergy, the monastic fraternities, parishioners and representatives of state and political authorities, all of whom greeted him with yet another rockstar reception.

It was his first engagement of an exhausting, jam-packed, five-day schedule in which His Eminence, along with a number of us from this place, and others attended a number of community and official events, including doxology church services; a reception hosted by our Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le and Mrs Le; a dinner hosted by the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese Inter-Communities Council of SA; a dinner hosted by St Basil's Homes; and, of course, a luncheon right here in Parliament House, Mr President, hosted by yourself and the Speaker from another place, which was attended by all four members of state parliament of Greek background, as well as members of the Parliamentary Friends of Greece and Cyprus.

His Eminence did not disappoint. He got to as many churches, community facilities and events as time would permit. Wherever he went and wherever he spoke he was greeted with the same level of enthusiasm and sense of hope for a new era of Greek Orthodoxy in SA. For me, it was his address at the Inter-Communities Council of SA dinner that touched me the most. So overcome was he by the display of affection from the hundreds of volunteers who serve our churches and communities, many of whom were in attendance, that he was absolutely overcome with emotion in expressing his gratitude.

We all enjoyed the opportunity to speak to His Eminence about a number of issues that confront us not only in our personal lives but also in our professional capacities, many of which are the same issues that we as members of this place often find ourselves deliberating over, sometimes with a heavy heart. His visit was a momentous occasion and, can I say, a truly big deal for the South Australian Greek community. I say this genuinely, because for South Australia in particular the Archbishop's enthronement really does mark the beginning of what all Greeks living in Australia, whether they be Greek migrants or the children or grandchildren of Greek migrants, hope will be a coming together of our churches.

As other honourable members of this place and the wider South Australian Greek community would know by now, His Eminence has expressed a deep and genuine desire to end the schism that divides our churches here locally. This is an issue that is South Australia focused. It is a vexed issue that has plagued the South Australian Greek community for decades; in fact, always. But, more importantly, it is the elephant in the room that has, in the view of many, prevented Greek Orthodoxy from flourishing here in SA. I hope I speak for most South Australians of Greek background when I say that it is one of the issues that stands in the way of progress and one we will all be happy to see resolved once and for all.

On a much lighter note, I have to say that the icing on the cake for me was when His Eminence was presented with a gift on behalf of the members of the Parliamentary Friends of Greek and Cyprus, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis MP from another place and Andrea Michaels MP, also from another place, at the luncheon that you, Mr President, co-hosted here in Parliament House. A lot of thought went into that gift. I spoke to a couple of priests and to their wives and asked them what they thought of the idea of presenting His Eminence with an Akubra hat. In fact, I think we agreed it would have been extremely un-Australian of us not to ensure that His Eminence was the proud owner of an Akubra hat. We were all extremely heartened by his very genuine appreciation for receiving a very practical gift that he can utilise during his travels to our rural and remote regions.

On that note and on behalf of SA-Best, I would like to echo the sentiments of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos and thank her for bringing forward this motion. I also echo the sentiments of members of the other place and once again welcome Archbishop Makarios. I look forward to working with him on issues of great importance to the local Adelaide Greek community.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (18:00): It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak on behalf of the Marshall government to wholeheartedly support the private member's motion introduced by the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos. The South Australian community certainly put on a huge welcome for His Eminence Archbishop Makarios of Australia for his first historical pastoral visit to Adelaide on 31 August 2019.

Upon His Eminence's arrival at the airport, the media cited that the heartwarming cheers of 500 faithfuls resembled a rock star's welcome. Many high-ranking dignitaries, including the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Steven Marshall, were at the airport to personally welcome His Eminence. It was a great honour to join the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of South Australia to welcome His Eminence, who was formally elected as the Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia in June this year.

It is a great fortune and joy for the whole community to have such an influential leader with remarkable presence. He comes into the role with exceptional qualifications and great intellect. His wonderful nature and strong communication skills will have a positive impact on the whole community, as he projects strength and compassion in his role as the new Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church in Australia. I had the great honour to attend the welcome dinner in his honour on Monday 2 September 2019 with the Premier and many members of parliament, including the Hons Irene Pnevmatikos and Connie Bonaros from this chamber.

I wish to sincerely thank the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia and the Inter-Communities Council of South Australia for organising a fantastic welcome dinner, attended by distinguished community leaders and volunteers. The main highlights included the memorable presentation by His Eminence, gifts presentation and many memorable performances by local

groups and talented young people. It was an outstanding display of generosity and the strong community spirit of the South Australian Greek community.

I also want to thank His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le for hosting a prestigious welcome reception for His Eminence. I also attended that reception with many honourable members, including the Hon. Vincent Tarzia.

At this point, I would like to also place on the record a special thanks to the President of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, and Mr Speaker, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia, for hosting that welcoming lunch reception for His Eminence during his visit. His Eminence was kept very busy, as was already mentioned by other honourable members. He visited churches, community groups, associations and schools, and his time was well spent. He had a very engaging itinerary throughout his stay in Adelaide.

I would like to thank the honourable member for moving this motion. I wholeheartedly support the motion on behalf of the government. I also wish His Eminence many meaningful and fulfilling years of service in Australia. I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (18:04): I just want to thank my colleagues for their contribution to the discussion today and also their presence at the various events that occurred. Thank you.

Motion carried.

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (RESERVES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 July 2019.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (18:04): I rise to support the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Reserves) Amendment Bill. The Labor opposition supports this bill, because we favour transparency in our planning system, and we believe that developments in our national parks should be appropriately assessed. At the outset I wish to emphasise that we are not opposed to any and all developments in national parks. National parks should be visited, and they should be enjoyed. We value the contribution national parks can make to our tourist economy, and we value the associated job creation, but we also believe that any developments should respect our native flora and fauna and limit their encroachment on untouched, pristine wilderness.

All of South Australia's national parks have established management plans which include guidance on appropriate developments inside their boundaries. These plans have been developed in accordance with the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, which includes a public consultation process. However, at present these management plans are not required to form part of the development assessment processes for developments proposed inside national parks. They are not required under the Development Act 1993, and they will not be required under the new planning system underpinned by the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.

At present our planning system relies on the Minister for Planning placing a notice in the *Government Gazette* for national park management plans to form part of development assessment processes. This bill, appropriately, removes this arbitrary process by placing national park management plans within the Planning and Design Code.

Recent experience has shown the need for this reform. The development assessment process used to assess a development application inside Kangaroo Island's Flinders Chase National Park did not include consideration of the national park's management plan. As a result, the State Commission Assessment Panel provided planning consent for a development application for the construction of several tourist accommodation dwellings in locations not zoned for development in the Flinders Chase National Park management plan.

The approved tourist accommodation facilities at Sandy Creek and Sanderson Bay are located in isolated locations many kilometres from the existing Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail.

These developments will require new roads to be cleared through native vegetation so that vehicles can have access to the construction site and provide appropriate food and sanitation transport.

This was not what was originally envisaged. When the former state Labor government called for expressions of interest from private developers to construct eco-sensitive tourist accommodation facilities in the Flinders Chase National Park, and when it subsequently awarded the Australian Walking Company more than \$800,000 in a Future Jobs Fund grant, it did so under the understanding that the tourist accommodation facilities would be located alongside the existing wilderness trail. This would have been in keeping with the national park's management plan.

This is the issue at the heart of the public opposition to the proposed development. Opposition to the location of the tourist accommodation facilities has underpinned the objections of a coalition of local activists, including Eco-Action Kangaroo Island and the Friends of Parks association. It also underpins the objection of the shadow minister for environment and water in the other place, the member for Port Adelaide. Appropriate consideration of the Flinders Chase National Park management plan would likely have ensured that the development of tourist accommodation facilities would have been close to the existing wilderness trail and not have required the clearance of wilderness.

In supporting this bill, Labor also acknowledges that South Australia's national parks belong to all South Australians. That is why we are supporting provisions within this bill that will classify all development applications in national parks, with the exception of public amenity developments, as 'restricted developments' under the new planning system. This will ensure that all development applications will have to proceed through SCAP.

It means that the public will be notified, it means that all supporting documents to the development application will be published and it means that any member of the South Australian public will be permitted to make a representation to SCAP, in writing and in person, and have accompanying rights of appeal against a development application which has received planning consent. This will provide appropriate public scrutiny to developments proposed inside national parks.

Labor supports the bill because, although we support appropriate tourist developments inside our national parks, we do not want our pristine wilderness attractions to be spoiled in the process. I commend the bill to the council.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (18:09): I rise on behalf of the government to offer the government's response to the honourable member's bill. As we know, South Australia's national parks are a major attraction for the state's tourism sector. That sector employs some 38,900 people and currently generates \$7.6 billion for our state's economy, and it is a very important part of regional South Australia's economy.

Ecologically sensitive development in parks presents a significant opportunity to grow our nature-based tourism and drive significant tourist potential for our state. The previous government had very much a focus on nature-based tourism. Our government is committed to growing nature-based tourism here in South Australia and is actively seeking to grow this initiative and expand this into more areas to enhance the visitor economy.

The government is seeking to increase the contribution of nature-based tourism in South Australia to the South Australian economy to \$350 million and to create an extra 1,000 new jobs by 2020, including a focus on growing our regional economies. Incidentally, that is the 2020 plan endorsed by the previous government.

We are also encouraging private sector development in our parks to develop high-quality tourism experiences sensitive to the environment and capable of attracting high-value tourists. Nationally and internationally, development is undertaken in parks and reserves that builds people's connections to the environment and has minimal impact.

The government is also seeking to streamline the process and to provide greater investor certainty through the implementation of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. This bill will constrain the government's ability to support economic growth through ecologically sensitive development in national parks. Accordingly, the government opposes the bill.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (18:11): In summing up the debate, I would like to thank the Hon. Clare Scriven on behalf of the Labor Party for indicating their support for this bill. I thank the Hon. David Ridgway for his contribution. However, I am gobsmacked by his assertion that letting the public have a say over private developments in national parks constrains the ability to properly manage our environment, or that if you insist on national parks management plans being taken into account by decision-makers in relation to development that somehow constrains the ability to protect the environment, which is, after all, what our national parks are for.

I am very confident that we have the numbers on this bill tonight. I have spoken to colleagues on the crossbench, who I think, given the lateness of the hour, might not be making a direct contribution, but it is in the hands of the chamber and no doubt the President will decide this on the voices. I am very confident that we have the numbers to pass this bill, and I would urge the government, when it gets to the lower house, to take it more seriously than it has today. It is only procedural matters. It does not dictate what can and cannot happen in a national park. It mandates public consultation and it mandates consideration of the approved national park management plan. It is not too much to ask, and I hope that the government will reconsider when it gets to the lower house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (18:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

GAYLE'S LAW

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That the regulations made under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010 concerning remote area attendance made on 16 May 2019 and laid on the table of this council on 4 June 2019, be disallowed.

(Continued from 25 September 2019.)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (18:16): I would like to make a very brief contribution on this motion. Initially I was very sympathetic to the motion and was inclined to support the disallowance. I had had discussion with the family of the late Gayle Woodford, who indicated they supported the disallowance motion and urged me to do the same. They spoke of the dangers to remote workers and explained why the burden of making these decisions should not fall to the workers. I gave them an undertaking to support the disallowance motion.

However, earlier this week the Minister for Health wrote to me, advising me that, should the disallowance motion succeed, it would have several consequences, including some practitioners not being covered by the regulations, and the requirement for second responders to have working with children safety checks removed. The minister outlined that they would be working with stakeholders and the Woodford family on new regulations, and this would be undertaken within a month.

Upon receipt of this letter, I contacted the Woodford family, who indicated they were comfortable with what the minister was suggesting in his letter. As such, I will not be supporting the motion on the basis of the undertaking the minister has made and, most importantly, on the basis that the family of Ms Woodford is satisfied with this outcome.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (18:18): I rise on behalf of the government to indicate that we will not support this motion. Gayle's Law and the regulations that this motion seeks to disallow came into operation on 1 July this year. Together they provide better protection for health practitioners working in remote areas of this state. The current regulations were

developed in consultation with key stakeholders, including the Woodford family, and organisations that deliver front-line health services in remote parts of South Australia.

The regulations seek to strengthen and clarify the operation of the law. This includes providing a limited degree of flexibility on those rare occasions when every second matters and a second responder may not be immediately available. Such is the reality of sustaining and delivering health services in some of the most remote parts of this state.

As minister, I recognise the Woodford family's ongoing concerns with the current regulations. To that end, I have given the Woodford family a firm commitment to work with them and other stakeholders on a revised set of regulations, to be finalised and promulgated within one month. I want to make it abundantly clear that, if the motion before the council is successful, the government will not be reissuing the current regulations.

I fear that some members may be operating under the misconception that a potential prorogation would inhibit the capacity of the council to disallow regulations. I have sought the advice of the Clerk who has confirmed that any prorogation of the parliament will not interfere with the council's ability to disallow the revised regulations. Specifically, section 5B of the Subordinate Legislation Act says that sitting days need not fall within the same session of parliament. In other words, no matter when the revised regulations of Gayle's Law are promulgated, even if parliament is prorogued in the meantime this council will have the full 14 sitting days to give the notice of disallowance. Other members may be concerned in terms of the government's commitment to make fresh regulations.

I want to make this abundantly clear: I have given the Woodford family a firm commitment to finalise a new set of regulations within a month. I give the same undertaking to this council. The revised regulations will be promulgated before the end of this sitting year. If the current set of regulations are disallowed before the revised ones are ready to take their place, the statute itself will continue to operate but without the regulations they will be weakened and not strengthened during the intervening period. Gayle's Law will continue to operate but in a constrained and far less comprehensive way.

For that one-month period, Gayle's Law will not apply in the District Council of Coober Pedy or the Municipal Council of Roxby Downs. It will not apply to health practitioners employed by organisations that receive all their funding from the commonwealth. It will not apply to any nurse, midwife or medical professional registered to practise in South Australia who operates as a private provider in a remote area unless they receive funding from the government of South Australia.

For that one month period, second responders engaged under Gayle's Law will not have to hold a driver's licence nor will they have to hold a current working with children safety check. If the motion passes in the affirmative, I sincerely hope no harm comes to South Australians as a consequence of no regulations being in place, be they a health practitioner working in a remote area or someone seeking care from one of those practitioners. If any such harm should occur, the people of South Australia will be right to hold to account those members of this council who support the disallowance of the current regulations.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:21): The reasons for this disallowance have now been canvassed extensively in this place. The minister has, as I noted earlier today, in a letter dated two days ago recognised the need for a new set of regulations. I mentioned earlier that I was heartened by his comments in recent days that he has now accepted the current regulations are unacceptable. He has also indicated to me his intention to consult over a revised set of regulations in consultation with stakeholders and, of course, with the Woodford family, and I, for one, will hold him to that undertaking.

In fact, I urge him to take seriously—very seriously—the concerns that have been raised in this place and throughout the inquiry process, which we spoke of just a short time ago, and to come to a mutually agreeable outcome in line with the intent of Gayle's Law, taking into account the very valid concerns that have been raised by a number of stakeholders including the ANMF(SA), SASMOA and others. Whilst I am sure, in fact it is clear, that the minister would prefer that I not proceed with this motion, the reality is that, firstly, we do not want to inadvertently lose the opportunity to disallow what is a substandard set of regulations.

I appreciate the advice that the minister has just put on the record but I can confirm that we have also sought advice in relation to the same issue, and that advice appears to be entirely inconsistent. I note that the Hon. Tammy Franks has also highlighted earlier today the potential ramifications of a prorogation of parliament. Pressing ahead today is, with respect to the minister, something—

The Hon. S.G. Wade: No, it is disrespectful.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Well, it is not disrespectful.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a debate, the Hon. Ms Bonaros. Please do not respond to the interjections—

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Sorry, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: —and please keep on summing up the debate.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I think the minister has some nerve coming to this place with completely unacceptable regulations which completely undermine and water down the intent of Gayle's Law and then suggesting that we who vote in favour of this disallowance motion would somehow be responsible if something happened to one of those nurses. Something did happen to Gayle Woodford. She did a risk assessment and she is dead. That is the reality of the situation. She was raped and she was murdered, and she had undertaken a self-risk assessment. That is the reality of what we are dealing with.

So the minister does have some nerve to come in here and tell us that we will be responsible if something were to happen to another front-line officer until they get these regulations right. You have had ample opportunity to get these regulations right, and you have failed to do so. We went through an inquiry process which was an inquiry in name only; it was not a genuine inquiry process. We did not consider meaningful reforms to these regulations during that process. We had a minority report which reflected meaningful reforms, which you could have looked at, but you failed to do so.

So to come in here now and suggest to us that somehow we will be responsible if something were to happen to another front-line officer is, with respect, completely disrespectful not only to us but to Gayle Woodford's legacy. With those words, I say this to the minister: you owe it to your front-line service staff, you owe it to the Woodford family, to do better. I, for one, will not back down on this disallowance motion, and I will not accept a substandard set of regulations.

I would like to thank the Woodfords, in particular Keith Woodford and also Gayle's sister, Andrea Hannemann, for their continued support on this issue. I would also like to thank the members of the ANMF(SA), who are present here today, for their continued support on this issue. I will not be derailed by the comments that the minister has made today. I will say this in relation to the Woodfords. I know that we have all been speaking to the Woodfords, and I continue to speak to Keith in particular very regularly. I can assure honourable members that, as far as he is concerned, he is not satisfied with the regulations that are before us and any alternative regulations that have been discussed to date. His message to me in relation to this issue has been absolutely crystal clear. For that reason, I will be proceeding with the disallowance motion.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes 12
 Noes 9
 Majority 3

AYES

Bonaros, C. (teller)
 Hanson, J.E.
 Ngo, T.T.
 Pnevmatikos, I.

Bourke, E.S.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Pangallo, F.
 Scriven, C.M.

Franks, T.A.
 Maher, K.J.
 Parnell, M.C.
 Wortley, R.P.

NOES

Darley, J.A.

Lee, J.S.

Ridgway, D.W.

Dawkins, J.S.L.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Stephens, T.J.

Hood, D.G.E.

Lucas, R.I.

Wade, S.G. (teller)

Motion thus carried.

Sitting extended beyond 18:30 on motion of Hon. R.I. Lucas.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (SUSPENSION OF SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (18:34): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

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

At 18:37 the council adjourned until Thursday 17 October 2019 at 11:00.