

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 21 July 2020**

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:16 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.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (LICENCE DISQUALIFICATION) BILL***Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**FIRST HOME AND HOUSING CONSTRUCTION GRANTS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT
BILL***Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Torrens University Australia, Report—2019
Super SA Triple S Insurance Review as at 30 June 2019
Casino Duty Agreement between The Treasurer of South Australia and SkyCity Adelaide
Pty Ltd—Variation Agreement dated 23 June 2020

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Fee Notices under Acts—
Education and Children's Services Act 2019 (No. 2)
Legal Practitioners Act 1981
Regulations under Acts—
Coroners Act 2003—General
Labour Hire Licensing Act 2017—Miscellaneous
Land Acquisition Act 1969—Miscellaneous
Summary Offences Act 1953—Custody Notification Service

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

By-laws under Acts—
Corporations—City of Marion—No. 8—Shopping Trolley Amenity
Regulations under Acts—
Electricity Act 1996—General—Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme—Public Health
Emergency
Gas Act 1997—Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme—Public Health Emergency
Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016—
Accredited Professionals—Mutual Liability Scheme
Fees, Charges and Contributions
General—Mutual Liability Scheme

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

Fee Notices under Acts—
Landscape South Australia Act 2019

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

Regulations under Acts—
South Australian Public Health Act 2011—Notifiable and Controllable Notifiable
Conditions

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:19): I bring up the report of the committee on its review of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011, Part 1.

Report received and ordered to be published.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:20): I bring up the report of the committee on its inquiry into the recycling industry.

Report received.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WAGE THEFT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:20): I bring up the interim report of the committee.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Members

MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

The PRESIDENT (14:26): Members, pursuant to the resolution of the council on 1 July 2020, I lay on the table country members' accommodation allowance claim forms for Legislative Council members from 20 March 2010 to 30 June 2020. With the concurrence of the council, I table the forms with certain redactions protecting the privacy and safety of former members of the council and one current member of the council who did not previously advise of their consent during the debate.

Question Time

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding disability services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: On Sunday 19 July, *The Advertiser* reported comments from the chair of the government's disability task force. The chair was talking about Integrity Care having dozens of unscreened workers and called for its immediate closure. The article quoted the Hon. Kelly Vincent as saying:

Every day it remains open, the government is showing other agencies they can get away with this.

She further went on to say:

If this isn't what it takes to get deregistered, then what the hell does it take?

The Labor opposition called on the government many weeks ago to shut down Integrity Care. My questions to the minister are:

1. When was the minister first advised that Integrity Care may have had dozens of unscreened workers providing care to vulnerable South Australians?
2. What exactly did the minister do, and when, after being advised that Integrity Care may have dozens of unscreened workers?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his question. Once again, the Labor Party comes in here and demonstrates that they have very little concern for the proper processes that have been established for a very long time in terms of investigations. They also continue in the media to demonstrate that they don't actually understand how the systems work, how the systems operated when they were in government and how they continue to operate and which part of the government is responsible for various aspects.

It is very clearly the responsibility of the Quality and Safeguards Commission to regulate disability services providers, as has been the case since South Australia reached full transition. The responsibility of the Department of Human Services is to provide screenings to organisations or individuals who apply for them. The penalties that are associated with organisations that are not getting their staff screened rests with the NDIS (Practice Standards—Worker Screening) Rules 2018 made under the National Disability Insurance Scheme Act 2013.

There are a number of investigations taking place at the moment. I have been asked about these matters before and it would be inappropriate for me to provide details in the public domain, as much as people have an interest in this matter. I can completely understand that. The state government has been fully cooperating with all the investigations, whether they be the Quality and Safeguards Commission or its own inquiry.

We have had hearings this morning from the retired Federal Court judge Alan Robertson and a number of those hearings that have taken place since yesterday and again today have been held in private for the very specific reason that matters relating to these things need to be provided to the investigative processes so that the appropriate course can take place, rather than prejudice any of the particular outcomes. There is also a SAPOL inquiry in place.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: has the minister sought any advice from her department about how often it occurs that there might be people who haven't gone through a screening working with the vulnerable people in her area?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:30): I think the Leader of the Opposition again betrays the lack of understanding of the Labor Party of how these systems work. The Quality and Safeguards Commission, through its legislative remit, has responsibility to regulate whether organisations are having their workers appropriately screened. The screening applications come to the Department of Human Services screening unit and the screening unit is responsible for doing the police checks and the ongoing monitoring through the Child Abuse Report Line and the other data bases on a continuous basis, if that's for working with children checks or disability services checks.

Matters relating to employment records are not matters that are kept by the Department of Human Services screening unit. That is something that is regulated by the Commonwealth government through the NDIS Act.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary: to be clear, is the minister informing the chamber that the Minister for Human Services has absolutely no responsibility whatsoever if a person isn't screened and is working with people living with a disability?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:32): Mr President, the member does love to try to insert words in my mouth. Once again he has tried that little trick.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Listen to the answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I can repeat for the benefit of the honourable member that the requirement for organisations that are providing services funded under the NDIS sits with the NDIS (Practice Standards—Worker Screening) Rules 2018 made under the National Disability Insurance Scheme Act 2013. The matter in relation to whether organisations have their workers appropriately screened or not is a legislative requirement that is very precisely located in the NDIS Act and is the responsibility of the Quality and Safeguards Commission.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Final supplementary: for the sake of clarity, is it the minister's contention that the state of South Australia has no responsibility to ensure that people are properly screened if they're working with people living with a disability?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:33): Mr President, that's a different question. If the DHS screening unit receives an application, either on an individual basis or from an organisation, DHS undertakes the worker screening check and ensures that it is monitored on a continuous basis. Particularly with working with children checks now, with the individualised identification number, both organisations and individuals who have a relevant right to notification about those particular screenings can register themselves to receive information about whether a person's screening has been revoked. Those matters are undertaken by the screening unit.

The Labor Party, with its commentary in the public domain, through the media and through its line of questioning in question time, continues to portray that it doesn't understand how the NDIS works and how screening works. It is pretty straightforward.

The PRESIDENT: Just before the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks her question, it was remiss of me not to welcome back the Hon. Mr Darley, looking sprightly. I hope you have stayed well during your absence, the Hon. Mr Darley. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding disability services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Today, the government's own Disability Advocate and the co-chair of its disability task force appeared at the federal inquiry into the Ann Marie Smith case. In relation to the expansion of the Adult Safeguarding Unit to cover people under 65, Dr David Caudrey said, 'One of the recommendations is that that expansion happens sooner rather than later.' There is legislation in the other place to remove the transitional provisions section of the relevant act that would allow this to happen. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister believe this should occur as a matter of urgency before the parliamentary winter recess?
2. What is the minister doing to ensure that vulnerable adults with disability are protected while she fails to act on the recommendations of her own task force?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:36): I would be delighted to send the honourable member the transcript of the press conference that took place here in Parliament House with the Hon. Kelly Vincent and David Caudrey. I think it was the day after we received the interim task force report.

It was widely reported, I think, that the state government had already started activating all the recommendations of the task force. Of course a number of them relate to the federal jurisdiction, so those have been provided to the federal minister the Hon. Stuart Robert, to the Quality and Safeguards Commission, and to the National Disability Insurance Agency. There are also matters that will be on the agenda for the Disability Reform Council meeting, which takes place this Friday.

At the time my comments were that all the recommendations were being activated. I had conversations with my colleague the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, as the Adult Safeguarding Unit is part of his portfolio responsibilities, and we have been working towards those assiduously.

As a government we have acted quickly because we have been quite distressed, as many South Australians have been, about matters that have arisen from the tragic death of Ann Marie Smith, and have undertaken to ensure that all those matters are implemented as quickly as possible.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:37): A supplementary question: when will the Adult Safeguarding Unit be expanded?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:37): As soon as practicable.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:38): A further supplementary: why doesn't the minister treat it with more urgency, and will the minister accept responsibility for any more deaths or injuries on her watch while she is failing to act and get this changed?

The PRESIDENT: Minister for Human Services, I'm not sure that is a supplementary question.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:38): I am tempted to answer, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: It can be your call.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I find the imputations of the deputy leader repugnant, and I think the role the Labor Party has played during this whole very sorry and sad time is reprehensible—and I'm not the only one. The tone of that question is so basically political.

The Labor Party thinks everything is all about them. They would like to be the heroes in every situation, they have the answer to everything, but we saw what happened on their watch. We saw the record of ministers who did not take responsibility for things, who dodged and weaved, who blamed their chief of staff, who blamed others. Yet, having taken very rapid action, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition comes in here with a question like that. The Labor Party are going to try to pretend that these pieces of legislation they have come up with—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —which is extending something that was a Liberal Party promise during the election arising out of the horrendous episode of Oakden—that their legislation is some quick fix, as no doubt we will have to deal with the commentary tomorrow—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —their commentary tomorrow on similar issues.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, continue please.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: And beyond a couple of pieces of legislation, they've made no submission as far as I am aware to the task force.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

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

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Dawkins, you're not helping.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: They insulted the work of the task force. I am not aware of any submission they've made to the task force. I am not aware of any new ideas.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You're the minister and you've done nothing

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: No new ideas.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Two years. You sat on your hands for two years.

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Has the Labor Party considered any other issue in relation to safeguarding?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What have you done? 'As soon as practical.' That's all you've had for the last six months.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: All they want to do is play politics and insult people, but I am quite confident that South Australians understand these things better than they do.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding disability services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: On 4 June this year, the minister was asked a question with the following explanation:

When asked about disability careworker screenings in one particular media interview, the minister said all of the following, in this order: 'I can't comment on those sorts of details', 'I can't comment', 'I don't have that information', 'That's a rather inappropriate question', 'I'm not going to talk about screening' and 'I'm not going to respond to this line of questioning'.

The minister was then asked how many applications had been received from Integrity Care following the death of Ann Marie Smith. The minister's answer did not reveal how many applications had been received and, instead, referred to ongoing investigations, including the federal inquiry by Alan Robertson SC. This week, when Alan Robertson SC came to Adelaide to undertake his inquiry, it was reported that, and I quote:

Mr Robertson said 'neither Integrity Care SA Ltd...nor her carer Ms Maione have agreed to assist my review'.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Given that that the minister won't answer questions about Integrity Care and Integrity Care won't cooperate with the independent federal inquiry, how can the public have confidence that the truth will be revealed?

2. Has the reporting of the dozens of screening applications from Integrity Care prejudiced any investigations?

3. If not, why has the minister been hiding such critical information from the chair of her own task force?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:42): There are a lot of issues to unpack there. If I can respond to the last one first, in relation to the task force chair—I can just repeat, and I do get a bit tired of repeating myself but I feel that I have to because of the line of questioning—the task force is not looking into the details relating to the tragic death of Ann Marie Smith or the elements which necessarily include the disability services provider that was 'caring' for her at the time.

Those comments that I made at the time I stand by and if one is to question confidence in the system in terms of the investigations, I think that is really a very unfortunate slur on the good work of the South Australian police force who have been working with my department. My department has also been working with the Quality and Safeguards Commission. I think the Labor Party knows that in relation to these matters, because they are under investigation, I am not able to provide specific details on them and that continues to be my position.

LYMPHOEDEMA COMPRESSION GARMENT SUBSIDY

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:44): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on support for South Australians living with lymphoedema?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for this question. Lymphoedema is a chronic condition. Early intervention, good management and access to garments are important elements of support for people living with lymphoedema.

Acknowledging this, I'm pleased to say that the Marshall Liberal government, together with the commonwealth government, has now launched a compression garment subsidy scheme for South Australians. This is the first time such a scheme has been offered to South Australians and is a clear demonstration of this government's commitment to providing better health services. The compression garment subsidy will provide two sets of garments every six months, as clinically advised. These garments will be either custom made or ready-to-wear.

Importantly, the scheme has been developed through the work of Wellbeing SA, together with clinicians and community representatives and those with lived experience. This is vital in ensuring it responds to the needs of consumers and follows the medical advice of our front-line clinicians. The need for this scheme has been recognised by members of this place. In particular, I acknowledge the advocacy of members of the parliament, particularly the Hon. Connie Bonaros, who last May facilitated a round table on this issue that I attended.

This morning, I have written to all members to advise them of the garment subsidy scheme, providing further detail on the operation of the scheme, including its phased introduction. As my letter outlines, the compression garment subsidy will be funded through a \$2 million investment by the commonwealth government, supplemented by \$2.5 million from the Marshall Liberal government. This scheme is just one of the ways in which this government is investing in community health and wellbeing through the provision of services previously left unfunded.

In closing, I particularly recognise the leadership and tireless advocacy of Monique Bareham from the Lymphoedema Support Group of South Australia. Sadly, another staunch consumer advocate is no longer with us and I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the sad passing of Mrs Pam Moulden. It's people like Monique and Ms Moulden for whom this scheme is really dedicated. The legacy of their advocacy work will live on through the scheme.

LYMPHOEDEMA COMPRESSION GARMENT SUBSIDY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:46): Supplementary to the minister: will the minister look into whether or not the garments can be made in South Australia or in Australia generally? If that work has already been done, can he please provide that to the council?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:46): I am certainly happy to take that question on notice and bring back an answer for the honourable member. On the issue of the garments, it was interesting to talk to some consumers at the launch. Having the garments provided frees up the resources of people with lymphoedema to acquire other services.

So the provision of the garments is not only a very useful support for them in their condition, but considering that many of them have needs that go beyond garments the scheme hopefully will provide them with a few more resources to address other needs that they have with their condition. I certainly acknowledge the honourable member's point: we should always be looking at opportunities as we expand health services to expand opportunities for South Australian industry.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: There is growing concern among clinicians about the future of the Women's and Children's Hospital, both the current site and the proposed new site opposite the new RAH. I understand the government has already confirmed its allocation of a \$550 million down payment on the build but the full cost remains a matter of speculation, with increasing concern it could hit \$1.8 billion, more than five times the cost of the new Calvary Adelaide Hospital, for about the same number of beds.

My question to the minister is: in the current COVID-19 environment and, importantly, the post COVID-19 environment when the state government will battle to get the budget back to the black, can you give an emphatic, categorical, ironclad guarantee that the new Women's and Children's Hospital will go ahead?

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Set in stone.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Set in stone? In that same environment, do you believe the government and indeed the taxpayers can afford the anticipated \$1.8 billion price tag? Can the minister provide further details of allocations announced—I think it was last week—in relation to funding for backfilling of FTEs to allow for front-line clinicians to contribute meaningfully to the structure and functional design of any hospital that is proposed?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): I think there are three aspects to that, and I will try to not lose any of them. In relation to Calvary, obviously this government strives to get the best value for money possible that we can in capital builds, but I think it would only be intellectually honest to say that Calvary Adelaide—the blue building on Angas Street, I think—is a quality asset but not the same asset that we are anticipating with the new Women's and Children's Hospital.

The new Women's and Children's Hospital is effectively—I am not sure whether it is a tertiary or a quaternary hospital; in other words, a highly complex hospital providing a range of services to both women and children. The Calvary facility is certainly a quality facility, but it's not surprising that its price tag is lower than what's anticipated for the new Women's and Children's Hospital.

In terms of the commitment to the new Women's and Children's Hospital build, actions speak louder than words. We are going on at full bore. In that regard, the honourable member asked me to give more details about the consultation process. To inform planning for the new Women's and Children's Hospital, a robust consultation process is being established that will involve seven advisory groups, 80 project user groups and working groups. It's being developed—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It's interesting the interjections you get, isn't it? The Labor Party is challenging me. They are saying 'action' as though consultation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —doesn't mean action.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: And this is why we had the problem with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: They didn't think it was worth consulting with the people who had to use the facilities.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Well, I'm afraid the people who need to use the facilities—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —are the most important people to talk to.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! Order! Let the minister continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Let the clinicians note that the Labor Party that wants to be the alternative government does not believe they are worth talking to. They do not believe that their opinions are of any relevance. They weren't with the old Royal Adelaide Hospital move—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: They're not relevant to the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: They wouldn't give—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. Bonaros: I missed the answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, you will be heard in silence. You will give the Hon. Ms Bonaros her answer so she can hear it and so that I can hear it. Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will listen in silence, please.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you, Mr President. I do thank the honourable member for her consistent interest in the Women's and Children's Hospital and for asking me specifically about consultation, because at least this side of the chamber is committed to consultation.

We are establishing seven advisory groups and 80 project user groups, and working groups are being developed. Clinicians, staff and consumers will be members of these groups so that they can provide input into the project. Health planners and architects have recently commenced as part of the planning process and will be strongly engaged with the consultation groups as they are established. On 3 July—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hanson!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —the Women's and Children's Hospital chief executive officer formally launched the new Women's and Children's Hospital consultation, and there is an expressions of interest—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —for people to be involved that is underway as we speak.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, can you just hang on for a sec. The Hon. Mr Wortley, you are not helping. The Hon. Ms Bonaros, you have a supplementary question.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:53): Can the minister confirm for the record whether there was a budgetary figure that was announced in relation to the consultation by clinician specialists?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for reminding me of that aspect of her question. We have committed \$600,000 to help backfill medical staff during this first consultation phase. I do want to stress that this is going to be a multistage process, and this backfilling is in relation to the first stage only. In that context, I will quote a comment on the radio, I think by the chief executive of the Women's and Children's Hospital, in which she said:

I have personally been involved in five new builds and redevelopments in my career so far, both in Australia and in the United Kingdom. In all of those, doctors have been engaged in the planning process in the same way as we are intending with our 100 project user groups and clinical advisory groups. However, because we take clinical engagement so seriously, we are funding some medical time and I think that it is important to note there is no precedent worldwide that we have found, but we are putting some money into it because we do take it so seriously.

I take it from the honourable chief executive officer's comments that this is not standard practice in Australia, so I think a \$600,000 investment to backfill staff, plus a strong commitment to engagement in what I would call a network of advisory groups, demonstrates the commitment of the network to solid consultation with clinicians.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:55): Further supplementary: can the minister also guarantee the new hospital that is proposed will have adequate space to accommodate all the current and proposed specialty services at the current Women's and Children's Hospital?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): The planning process is going on as we speak and of course there will be debate as to what we need going forward, particularly in terms of quantity. I know that there are discussions going on with other hospitals about what we need to be doing to develop women's and children's health services across the state. For example, the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network has what the health system tends to call a lower self-sufficiency ratio. In other words, a lower level of their services are delivered within their network.

This government was elected on a commitment, in contrast to Labor's centralising Transforming Health, of delivering care closer to home, so there may well be realignment of services to make sure that services are delivered where the customers are, not where the hospital is.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

LAND TAX

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:58): My question is to the Treasurer regarding land tax. What is the definition of 'principal place of residence' for the purposes of land tax exemptions, the administration of which the Treasurer is responsible for, and what are the categories of exemptions from land tax for properties that are otherwise assessable?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:58): I refer the honourable member to the RevenueSA website and the land tax legislation. It is evident to anyone.

LAND TAX

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:58): Supplementary: what has the Treasurer done to satisfy himself that you, sir, have not breached a law for which the Treasurer is responsible?

The PRESIDENT: It is hardly a supplementary question.

JOBKEEPER PAYMENT

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:59): My question is also to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer indicate how many businesses in South Australia have been benefitting from the JobKeeper and what is the importance to South Australia of today's statements on extending the scheme?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:59): The announcements today by the commonwealth government, the Prime Minister and the Treasurer I am sure are very warmly received by all Australians, but in particular all South Australians. There has been a significant level of concern amongst the business community, particularly amongst small and medium-sized businesses, in South Australia as to what would be the federal government's intentions in relation to JobKeeper in particular post September, bearing in mind that we are only three months through the original six months projected for the operation of the scheme.

The state government has been active publicly and privately, advocating for a continuation of JobKeeper, and we therefore warmly welcome the announcement by the commonwealth government today of the extension for a period of six months in relation to JobKeeper, albeit in a tailored fashion, post the end of September.

The answer to the honourable member's question is that it is difficult to provide precise numbers of the number of South Australian businesses and organisations that have benefited from JobKeeper. The commonwealth government and the ATO don't provide precise breakdowns to each of the states and territories. However, our state Treasury has estimated, on the basis of the publicly available national information and the other publicly available information, that in their estimation approximately 50,000 South Australian businesses have benefited from the implementation of JobKeeper in South Australia. It might be marginally higher than that, but nevertheless that is the conservative estimate from state Treasury in relation to the number of businesses that might have benefited.

The announcement of the commonwealth government will mean that post September there are stricter eligibility requirements. Certainly, the review—not that I have read all of the review, but I have read summaries and excerpts of the findings of the review—has highlighted areas where the operation of the scheme might be improved in the future.

Whereas the first six months of the scheme operated on a comparison of one month this year compared to one month in previous years to establish an entitlement for a six-month period, my initial advice is that the entitlement to continue beyond September will be over a longer period of time—not just one month compared to one month in a previous year, but on a quarter by quarter basis. I think in aggregate it will require that in two consecutive quarters the decline in turnover is greater than 30 per cent, as opposed to a single month comparison under the initial eligibility criteria.

There will also be tailored operation of JobKeeper for those closer to full-time employment at a high level of payment and those who might have been working and earning for less than 20 hours a week at a lower level. I think all members will have been informed by, in particular, cafe owners and some hotel operators of some people who might have only been working for a modest number of hours per week and not earning a significant sum of money who were then receiving \$1,500 under JobKeeper, significantly more than they had been for some period of time whilst working pre-COVID. The tailored arrangement is intended to, at least in part, as I understand it, canvass for those sorts of examples as well.

I am sure all businesses—small, medium and large—in South Australia will welcome the initiative from the federal government. Certainly, the state government welcomes the initiative. In addition to the enormous success of HomeBuilder, it would appear that in South Australia the JobKeeper extension will also be very warmly received by business.

ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Treasurer on the topic of a SafeWork SA investigation into the Crows camp.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The 2018 Adelaide Crows pre-season camp to the Gold Coast has drawn significant concern from a number of sources, including of course the South Australian Premier, Steven Marshall, who earlier this month stated to the media that he found some of the reported training exercises 'disturbing', and that it may warrant further investigation from a body such as SafeWork SA. It is a concern echoed by the AFL Players Association chief executive, who was quoted as saying:

I'm not sure what more can be done on the issue. If they had their time again there might have been some things that everyone would have done differently, including the players, but I think it will be an issue that keeps on keeping on because there seems to be some things that haven't been said about it.

Despite concluding that the camp had not been a breach of industry rules, the AFL's integrity unit did determine that the Crows did not do enough due diligence in identifying what was going to take place on that camp, and it recommended further investment in the club's integrity area. My questions are:

1. Does SafeWork SA have jurisdiction to investigate the 2018 Adelaide Crows pre-season camp? If so, is there such an investigation underway?
2. Has SafeWork SA reached out to the AFL Players Association regarding this matter, and is the Treasurer concerned that the disturbing training exercises should in fact breach AFL industry standards?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:06): As members would be aware, SafeWork SA in terms of its regulatory role is completely independent of government and me as minister and therefore I am limited in terms, so I am advised, of what I can say. There have been media inquiries in relation to this particular issue, and the advice I have received from SafeWork SA is as follows:

No notifications or complaints against the Adelaide Football Club in relation to their pre-season camp in 2018 have been received by SafeWork SA. SafeWork SA is looking into the matter, and no further information can be shared at this stage. SafeWork SA does not have jurisdiction over Queensland businesses. However, where South Australian businesses operate interstate we [SafeWork SA] may have jurisdiction over activities relating to safe systems of work.

SAFEWORK SA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): Supplementary: does SafeWork SA have jurisdiction for the psychological harm inflicted on South Australian workers?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:07): I have just indicated the nature of the advice I have received from SafeWork SA in relation to this issue.

SAFEWORK SA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:07): Supplementally: what leadership and action will the Marshall government take to ensure that all workers, regardless of whether or not they play for a football team, or in any other workplace in this state, are free of psychological harm?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:07): We will be relying on the independent assessments of the regulatory authority, SafeWork SA, to ensure that the requirements of work health and safety legislation for all employees in South Australia are properly implemented.

ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:07): Supplementary: does SafeWork SA have actual jurisdiction for the Adelaide Crows, PCBU, rather than Collective Mind, as SafeWork SA was referred to as the Queensland organisation? Clearly, the PCBU in this case is the South Australian Adelaide Crows. Will the minister clarify whether or not SafeWork SA has jurisdiction over that PCBU?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I have nothing further to add to the advice I have received from SafeWork SA in relation to the issue that the honourable member is interested in.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:08): My questions are to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding COVID-19 testing clinics:

1. Why is there currently a wait of up to five, even six, hours at our metropolitan COVID-19 testing clinics?

2. Why is the Premier claiming that there are 60 sites for people to attend without a referral when the government's own website says that there are only 48 sites, of which only 10 are walk-ins with no appointments required?

3. Why are there only two drive-through clinics in the metropolitan area?

4. Why is GP referral required to these clinics?

5. Will the minister consider adding additional drive-through clinics in the metropolitan area and remove the GP referral requirement, allowing more people to get tested quickly and conveniently?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:09): It is quite an extraordinary question and it's yet another example of the Labor Party wanting to be the driving force behind the public health response to COVID-19. One example why GP's referrals—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —are needed—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —is because SA Pathology and the public health team actually want people to have a GP who can follow up their test. We don't expect people to understand and be able to unpack their pathology test. We want to make sure that people have continuity of care. It was SA Pathology's clinical judgement that the best thing to do was to have GP referrals to metropolitan drive-through clinics.

In relation to the need for more mobile clinics, my understanding is that SA Health is currently in the process of putting on the road a fleet of 10 mobile testing clinics. My understanding was that the first assignment for the first of those mobile testing clinics was to Port Adelaide—metropolitan. I'm not going to say to the public health team and the SA Pathology team, who have been so innovative and so successful in the response to coronavirus, 'Wait! Stop! The Labor Party wants you to do it differently.' No, I'm going to continue to trust the expertise of the public health team that has delivered a world-class testing response. That was great—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: You didn't trust them six months ago.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to see assertive outreach surveillance going into—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —Port Adelaide—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Why is your Premier misleading the parliament?

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —going out to—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —the community—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —not expecting that everyone will come to them.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Why is your Premier misleading the parliament?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down for a sec, please.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Answer the question you were asked.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, please, let the minister answer the question.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: He's not answering the question, sir.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, I'm speaking and you don't! Enough! The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos has asked a series of questions. The minister is doing his best to address those questions and he will be heard in silence. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Another aspect of the cluster of questions that came at me like a cluster of European wasps—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —was the issue of why are people needing to wait at clinics. Well, one of the reasons is because we have had a tremendous response from the South Australian community to the request—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Five hours!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to get testing.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Five hours, Stephen.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, please continue.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Let me give you some illustrations of that reality. In the last five days—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Do you think five hours is reasonable?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In the last five days—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, the Hon. Mr Wortley, let's listen to the answer.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: We did, sir. We're not getting an answer.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, that wasn't an invitation to have a conversation.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, please continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos quite rightly asks why do we have line-ups at the clinics. The reason why we have line-ups at the clinics is because we've had a superb response from South Australians to the call, and the call from Nicola Spurrier in particular, to get tested. So out of the last seven days, five of those days have seen more than 2,000 tests—quite extraordinary. In fact, on 17 July, which I think was last Friday, we had 2,374 samples. Congratulations to the people of South Australia: that is a record for this pandemic.

This is very encouraging because we haven't had a case of community transmission in South Australia since March. There is a lot of concern amongst the public health team, as demonstrated by posters on bus shelters, that complacency could undermine people's willingness to go and get tested. So to have a record result last Friday is very encouraging because testing is important to make sure that we are identify a case—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: A record five hours, Stephen.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to make sure a case does not become—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: How can you be proud of five hours?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —a cluster and a cluster does not become an outbreak. We have seen what can happen. We've seen what's happened in Victoria. We are working night and day to make sure that does not happen in South Australia. We will continue to—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Make people wait five hours.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —build our clinical response to try to reduce the times. But one thing that I can assure the people of South Australia is the latest advice I have is that, in spite of that increase in demand, the turnaround in the test results is still about a day, which is exceptional.

We have reports from other jurisdictions where people are waiting a number of days to get test results. It's really important that SA Pathology continues to achieve what they are achieving, which is very good turnaround times, because as soon as we identify a case that case can be isolated and their close contacts isolated to ensure that we minimise the spread.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Supplementary arising from some part of that answer that was given: minister, do drive-through clinics or hospital clinics require a GP referral in South Australia? Is the minister aware if that follows the practice in other jurisdictions in Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15): Again, I am going to resist the temptation of taking public health coaching from the Labor Party. I can assure you that I am going to let the public health clinicians decide how these services are going to be delivered. Be that as it may—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Excuse me, I'm trying to answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down. Let me hear the point of order.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: A point of order: no advice was being given. It was a very simple question asked very respectfully.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, hang on. It's not a point of order. The minister will answer how he sees fit, and he will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The reality is—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, you couldn't wait five seconds. Listen in silence. Minister, please continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: A number of clinics operate in distinctive ways, depending on their circumstances. For example, a number of country clinics are run in GP clinics, where a referral is not required. Many of the clinics are actually linked to hospital services. Some sites do require a referral from a GP, but the majority of sites have now ceased that. SA Pathology sites, such as Tanunda, do require referrals. As I said, that is the practice of SA Pathology at its two drive-through sites in the metropolitan area. I will pass on the coaching tips from the Labor Party to Tom Dodd. I'm sure he will give them due consideration.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, unnecessary.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): Further supplementary arising from the original question: is the minister aware if drive-through clinics in other states require a GP referral?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:17): Considering what's happening in other states, I am not going to say, 'Why aren't we doing what your states do?'

INTERNATIONAL TRADE OFFICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:17): My question is for the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister please provide an update to the council on the Marshall Liberal government's international trade offices?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Don't even start. Finished? Minister.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for her question and ongoing interest in our overseas trade representation. As members would remember, the Marshall Liberal government committed to increasing our presence on the world stage, ahead of the last election. We committed \$12.8 million to opening a new international trade office network.

I am pleased to announce today that we have opened our newest office in Dubai, which will facilitate trade and investment opportunities across the Middle East and North Africa, as well as India. This office follows the opening of our Shanghai, Tokyo and Houston offices, the last of which was opened just as the COVID-19 travel restrictions came into place. Having representatives in-market that can provide South Australian businesses and exporters with on-the-ground information and assist with business connections is increasingly important, as international travel continues to be disrupted.

The MENA region (Middle East and North Africa) and India region offer exciting opportunities for South Australian companies to expand their export networks, with increasing demand for wheat, livestock, lentils, copper and wine. South Australia has strong ties with the MENA and India markets, with Qatar and Emirates flying here regularly up until COVID-19 disrupted the travel industry.

Leading this office will be the new regional director for MENA and India, Mr Sidharth Mehta, known as Sid to the team. Sid has more than 12 years' experience in international trade and investment, most recently working with the South African Consulate General Office. Sid will provide invaluable support between our exporters, potential buyers and distributors and his appointment highlights the South Australian government's commitment to growing opportunities in this region.

With both the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar and Expo 2021 in Dubai, having Sid on the ground in the years leading up to these large-scale events will ensure South Australia is well placed to capitalise on all investment opportunities. Foreign direct investment from the MENA region has provided nearly \$354 million in capital expenditure in South Australia since 2003, creating some 562 jobs, while in 2019 South Australian exports to the region were valued at some \$367 million.

I would like to take this opportunity to formally welcome Sid to the team, and look forward to updating the chamber on the activity of the Dubai office in the months to come.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question regarding COVID-19 testing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: A constituent who attended the Lyell McEwin Hospital contacted me last week concerned about open gaps at the COVID-19 testing area that has been set up. A flimsy wall was erected to separate the unit from the general part of the hospital; however, there is no screening in the gap between the top of the wall and a wooden frame extending across it connecting it to the ceiling. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why does the gap exist when there is concern from patients and others outside the unit that if someone did present with COVID-19 the virus could become airborne and travel through the gaps? Does the minister have some kind of advice that the COVID-19 virus may be distance-challenged and unable to travel beyond certain heights?

2. Is SA Health undertaking follow-up studies on all patients being treated in our hospitals for COVID-19 to record whether they are suffering from any lingering after-effects of COVID-19 or whether it has returned?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for his questions. There were two questions and I will deal with the first question first. It raises two issues; first, whether the Lyell McEwin Hospital is following appropriate infection control procedures in terms of the COVID-19 clinic. I am confident that they will be, but I will certainly seek an explanation from the hospital to check that.

Secondly, in terms of community concern, it may well be that even if it is not an infection control issue it may provide reassurance to people to have a different form of screening. I will certainly raise those issues with the Lyell McEwin.

I must admit I don't think I have visited the COVID-19 clinic at the Lyell McEwin Hospital itself, but I have been in the Lyell McEwin Hospital—last week, I think—and I certainly had no concerns about infection control. I was greeted by the concierge and asked relevant questions, and appropriate public health measures were taken. Some people might think it was encouraging that even the minister has to comply with public health regulations, but I think it was more the fact that they probably didn't know who I was.

Be that as it may, in relation to the second question the honourable member raises a very good point. Even in the relatively early stages of the pandemic there was concern about what I call the lingering effects of COVID-19. My recollection is that they might have been about cardiac, in particular, but there was a quite specific after-effect beginning to be identified. What is emerging now is that a significant number of people who have had COVID-19 seem to develop something that resembles a chronic condition.

In terms of the SA Health response to COVID-19, I have been involved in discussions with both the public health team and broader members of the team about keeping track of this cohort of

patients. Thankfully, it is a manageable number; thankfully, we have had only 444 confirmed cases in South Australia.

Tragically, of those, four have died, and a number of those were overseas acquired. For example, our most recent case was never active in South Australia. Both the PCR testing and the serology suggest that the person had the disease when they were overseas, and so therefore we don't have, if you like, a large cohort.

Nonetheless, SA Health does have on its radar to be alert to the needs beyond, and considering that we now have so many cases around the world, there is so much work being done in, to be frank, so many different domains, I think we will have a very strong body of evidence that emerges as to the after-effects of COVID-19.

I think it might have been the Victorian Premier I heard discussing this issue, and he was highlighting it in particular to warn young people not to take this disease lightly. It may well be that you might be young enough and fit enough to overcome COVID-19, and that is the case for a lot of younger people who contract the disease, but we do not know what we don't know.

Young people need to appreciate that they need to protect not only themselves but their families, their communities and their states from this condition because we just don't know what the impact could be. One of the really disturbing elements of the second wave in Victoria is that it is affecting younger people than the first wave did.

One of the other concerns is that it is becoming positive with less obvious symptoms. My understanding—and I think I picked this up from the media so please don't regard this as a public health alert—was that with one of the cases in New South Wales, the only symptom that the person had was a headache.

Very few people would go to get tested for COVID-19 because they had a headache so we need to be alert to the evolving nature of this disease in terms of its onset and the spread of the disease, but we also need to be alert to what we don't know, and we don't know the long-term effects. It is really important that we take every measure to avoid contracting the disease and from spreading it.

Parliamentary Committees

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:27): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Tuesday 1 December 2020.

Motion carried.

Bills

STATE PROCUREMENT REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 July 2020.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:28): I rise to speak on the State Procurement Repeal Bill 2020. This bill seeks to repeal the State Procurement Act 2004 and the State Procurement Regulations made in 2005. It also dissolves the State Procurement Board and its associated policies and guidelines.

In late 2018, the government tasked the South Australian Productivity Commission with undertaking an inquiry into public sector procurement. In parallel, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee conducted an inquiry into state procurement. According to the Liberal government, it seeks to replace the State Procurement Board and associated policies with a new central procurement branch within the Department of Treasury and Finance.

However, the issue is that this bill merely rescinds the State Procurement Act. It does not replace it formally with a framework which is designed to achieve the recommendations of the

Productivity Commission report or the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. The absence of a future framework and policies from the government is concerning. There can be no comfort for the parliament, if this bill is passed, that there is a robust framework that will replace it.

In only two years, there have been several instances of procurement mismanagement: the uncontested appointment of KordaMentha in the health sector; the delayed and confused management of the schools capital works program; the cancellation of the Port rail spur project, despite a signed contract to deliver it; substantial delays in major projects; the attempted privatisation of Pathology SA; the mishandling of the Darlington road project; the privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre; the privatisation of the tram network; the privatisation of road maintenance; the privatisation of facilities management; and the privatisation of field services in DPTI.

Labor wants to support all efforts to increase South Australian content in government procurement contracts. Now more than ever in South Australia we must ensure that local content is given first opportunity in government contracts; however, instead of coming to the parliament with legislative reform of how we can ensure we increase South Australian content in procurement contracts, this government wants to abolish all parliamentary control over government procurement. We are merely meant to trust the Treasurer with government procurement without any oversight. This is a government and a Treasurer addicted to privatisation and outsourcing, as the long list I read before shows.

So we turn to what it is that is being abolished. The State Procurement Board is comprised of four public sector members and four private sector members. It was established under the State Procurement Act 2004 to be a separate oversight body of procurement practices and compliance across government. According to its 2017-18 annual report, the board's purposes included providing comprehensive policies and guidelines to support effective procurement operations across government. These policies were designed to provide a balance between process rigour and efficiency in accordance with the objective of ensuring value for money, the fair treatment of all bidders, and probity and transparency.

The board also provides a range of capability development initiatives to help improve the procurement and contract management capability of the South Australian government workforce. Its objective was for the board to play a proactive role in ensuring the procurement activities of public authorities are directed towards obtaining value in the expenditure of government funds on goods and services, providing for ethical and fair treatment of participants and ensuring probity, accountability and transparency in procurement operations.

The primary functions of the board are to facilitate strategic procurement by public authorities by setting the strategic direction of procurement practices across government to develop, issue and keep under review policies, principles and guidelines relating to the procurement operations of public authorities; to develop, issue and keep under review standards for procurement by public authorities using electronic procurement processes; to investigate and keep under review levels of compliance with the board's policy framework; to issue policies, principles, guidelines, standards and directions; and to assist in the development and delivery of training and development courses.

In 2018-19, these purposes, objectives and strategies were changed to mirror the government's 'more jobs, better services, lower cost' mantra. Unsurprisingly, in all three areas we have seen failure to achieve. Even before the current COVID-19 pandemic, jobs growth was in freefall, services across government were being cut, closed or privatised, and under this Treasurer we have seen costs increase by \$750 million over four years. The increase in state government taxes, fees and charges across the board have washed away any relief claimed from ESL and water charges.

Just as poorly, the government has also stalled on a major number of infrastructure projects, including the north-south final corridor being installed, the new Women's and Children's Hospital and The QEH stage 3 development. GlobeLink, the child of the Minister for Trade and Investment, has been abandoned. The tram extensions have been stalled. The O-Bahn extension park-and-ride has been stalled. The South Road duplication, the Seaford to Aldinga stretch has been stalled. The Aboriginal arts and culture gallery on Lot Fourteen has been stalled. The major inner city sporting and entertainment facility has been completely abandoned.

This is a shame because the board also collaborates with the Office of the Industry Advocate to ensure all policy requirements of the South Australian Industry Participation Policy relevant to the scope of the act are incorporated into the board's policy framework. This includes focusing on employment for residents of South Australia, investment and capital expenditure that builds capacity in the South Australian economy, and the use of businesses and supply chains that employ South Australian residents and invest in the state.

It is clear that there are many projects that need to be started and need to be completed and under the policies of the former Labor government almost certainly would be and provide a huge benefit to the state. For example, the Torrens to Torrens project was one of the first government projects procured with stringent local labour hours targets and requirements for apprentices and trainees to make up a proportion of worker numbers. The Convention Centre stage 2 development prioritised using local steel and steel manufacturers, as well as local workers.

The Northern Connector project expanded on this to also include local materials, including the cement used in the concrete road surface, achieving over 90 per cent of all labour hours being local and 20 per cent of workers being a combination of apprentices and trainees, long-term unemployed workers and Aboriginal workers. The Darlington project saw a traffic management company owned and operated by South Australians given the contract for the traffic management, delivering many jobs for Aboriginal South Australians.

The State Procurement Board's strategic focus is aimed at delivering a system of public procurement that will:

- ensure support for the government's policy objectives and deliver value for money;
- ensure procurement activities are seen by all stakeholders as fair, equitable and professionally managed;
- provide government with an independent party to oversee procurement activities to identify and disseminate opportunities for improved procurement practices; and
- establish a culture that allows good ideas to be considered and implemented.

If the act is being repealed and the board being abolished, you would think the government would be presenting, for the benefit of the parliament, an alternative structure to ensure that parliamentary strictures and oversight would apply to the billions of dollars spent each year, but there is none.

The Treasurer vaguely says, 'Trust me.' He wants a senior executive in Treasury reporting to him to conduct all oversight functions of government. We had a chief procurement officer in government who left for a position in the private sector at the end of 2018. That position remains unfilled. This, more than anything else, is a good indication that the government is not serious about an independent officer keeping the Public Service accountable for its procurement practices.

The Productivity Commission's focus in their reviews of government procurement was value for money. There were also issues raised about compliance with procurement policies, cost to business of tendering and complying with government requirements and transparency and accountability.

The opposition does not for a second dispute the need for constant improvement and reform in these areas. I spoke earlier about the \$40 million-plus contract that was handed out to interstate corporate liquidators to work with SA Health, and now the Treasurer says, 'Trust me.' I also spoke about the contractual agreement the government had to deliver the Port rail spur extension, and now the government says, 'Trust me.' A new project, the tram stop at Halifax Street, was handed to the same company without due process, and the government says, 'Don't worry. Procurement isn't your concern anymore. Trust me.'

The opposition would be pleased to support procurement reform, and we would be pleased to support a bill that establishes a new framework for procurement, but that is not what we have here. We have a repeal bill with a vague inkling of a promise of putting an administrative stricture in place that is just not good enough. The Treasurer has not, in any fashion whatsoever, set out how his government plans to ensure that all the objectives and strategic focus currently undertaken by the

State Procurement Board to ensure government gets value for money and supports local South Australian procurement will be dealt with.

It is disappointing that, only two years into the first term of this government, the Treasurer shows such disrespect for parliament. Every single member in the opposition, and I am sure many on the crossbench in this place, cares about government procurement and ensuring that we put South Australians at the forefront. However, this government is now telling parliament not to concern itself with \$11 billion a year in government procurement and to trust the Treasurer to do it.

We on this side recognise that there are recommendations made by the SA Productivity Commission and the Statutory Authorities Review Committee that have merit. However, the removal of any parliamentary oversight into government procurement, without anything taking its place, is quite frankly ludicrous. The Treasurer could easily have come into this place with a new vision and a new procurement policy—a new procurement policy in South Australia with some parliamentary oversight maintained. However, he has merely come to this place with a request to scrap parliamentary oversight, to scrap this board and to scrap the legislation with vague promises of, 'Trust me.' I indicate that the opposition will be opposing this bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:39): I thank (sort of), in form, the Leader of the Opposition for what must be the most monumental backflip I have ever seen, given the accusations of the Australian Labor Party directed towards the government in relation to backflips. The bill that is before us is the implementation of recommendations signed off and agreed to by members of the Australian Labor Party, members of the crossbench and members of the government after what was a quite lengthy parliamentary inquiry through the Statutory Authorities Review Committee.

That was not an inquiry that I was a member of, although I was previously a member of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, but its first recommendation was:

The Committee recommends that the State Procurement Board be abolished, along with all associated Guidelines, Policies and legislation.

You cannot have a more comprehensive recommendation than that, and that was signed off by the Hon. Mr Maher's own party colleagues in this chamber. It was a representation of the Labor Party's view in relation to the State Procurement Board. Mr President, you and other current government members and members of the crossbench were members of that committee of inquiry for a long period of time and that was the recommendation from the committee, agreed to by the members of the Labor Party.

All this bill is seeking to do is to implement the recommendations made by a cross-party, unanimous view, parliamentary committee. It also implements the recommendations of the independent Productivity Commission, and I can understand how members of the Labor Party may or may not on occasions agree or disagree with the views being expressed by the independent Productivity Commission; that is their prerogative.

However, in a short space of time to actually recommend to the government to take a particular course of action and, when the government does exactly that, to then say, 'Well, we think this is unconscionable and an attempt by the government to take over procurement policy,' when its own members and its party actually signed off and recommended it, is an extraordinary position for the Leader of the Opposition in this chamber to take.

The Leader of the Opposition says that this is just a blatant grab for power by myself as Treasurer. Recommendation 2 of the committee states:

The Committee recommends—

this was in lieu of obviously the State Procurement Board—

that an Office of the Chief Procurement Officer be established—

that is an office established within government, within one of the departments, and it is intended to be within the Department of Treasury and Finance—

which:

- strengthens the current across-Government Chief Procurement Officer role;

- consolidates the current administrative staff servicing the State Procurement Board;
- provides a stronger link to, and consultation with, the Industry Advocate;
- ensures a consistent approach to procurement operations of public authorities; and
- provides assistance with, and support to, managing across-Government panels.

The government's response, which was outlined to the committee was:

The government supports the establishment an enhanced central procurement group within DTF, however intends to move away from using the Chief Procurement Officer terminology. The Department of Treasury and Finance Procurement Branch will be led by a highly experienced senior executive who will report to the Treasurer via the Chief Executive. The Executive Director, Procurement role will have clear objectives and deliverables, with an initial focus on driving implementation of an improved procurement framework across the public sector.

The key functions of the DTF Procurement Branch will include:

- Setting the strategic direction for procurement across government;
- Developing and maintaining a framework for the procurement operations of agencies, including policies and guidelines;
- Providing advice to the Treasurer and Chief Executive on any matters relevant to the procurement operations of agencies;
- Investigating and reviewing the procurement performance of agencies and their compliance with policies and guidelines;
- Supporting the development and delivery of training and professional development activities for public sector procurement practitioners;
- Providing procurement advice and support to agencies with limited internal procurement capability;
- Engaging with industry, in conjunction with the Office of the Industry Advocate, to reduce the complexity and costs to business of tendering for government work and maximising the opportunity for local business participation; and
- Undertaking data analytics to measure and benchmark agency procurement performance and identify opportunities for additional value to be obtained.

Recommendation 3 of this tripartisan committee, supported by members of the Labor Party, states:

The Committee recommends for the across-Government Chief Procurement Officer—

that is the chief bureaucrat for procurement—

to report directly to the Treasurer, to advise and support the South Australian procurement function and improving oversight of, and connection with, public authority Chief Procurement Officers to ensure a consistent and compliant approach to State Government procurement, and confirm a stronger link to, and consultation with, the Industry Advocate.

The recommendation of this tripartisan committee was that the new chief bureaucrat, or senior bureaucrat, on procurement would report directly to the Treasurer. Now the Leader of the Opposition in this chamber is disagreeing with his own members' recommendation by saying this is an outrageous grab for power by the Treasurer of the state in seeking to have the procurement function reporting directly to the position of the Treasurer. In recommendation 4, the committee recommended:

...a simplification of existing procurement policies, by establishing a procurement framework/strategy (such as the Queensland model) that aligns with the Government's Growth Agenda and with the South Australian Industry Participation Policy. In determining a new model, the Committee recommends the Treasurer explore a solution that ensures the Government's procurement policies are best reflected and focuses on local procurement strategies for the public service to follow when spending public monies.

In many of the remaining recommendations of this committee, signed off and supported by the Labor Party, there are a number of references to the role and responsibility of the Treasurer in the new procurement arrangements. I will not go through all of them. Recommendation 10 recommends the Treasurer undertake certain functions. Recommendation 12 recommends the Treasurer consider including a reference to the South Australian Industry Participation Policy and procedural guidelines in the relevant Treasurer's Instruction, and so on.

I think there were some 17 recommendations from the committee, many of which are recommending that the Treasurer undertake various functions in this new oversight process for procurement in government. They are all subservient to the principal recommendation from the committee, supported by members of the Labor Party and members of this particular chamber from the Leader of the Opposition's own party, which recommends—and again I repeat—that the State Procurement Board be abolished, along with all associated guidelines, policies and legislation.

It cannot be any clearer than that, so to have a situation now where the Leader of the Opposition, in an extraordinary fashion, says this is just a blatant grab for power by the Treasurer of the state and completely opposed to everything the Australian Labor Party is supporting, is nonsense and is clearly significantly disconnected from the views of his own members of the committee.

Again, the inference that in no way has the government been clear in terms of what the alternative procurement framework is going to be is untrue. The committee was provided with, and this parliament was provided with, the government's comprehensive response to the 17 recommendations of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee on this particular issue. The parliament is also aware of what I think is a 24 or 25-page document, the South Australian government's response to the South Australian Productivity Commission inquiry into government procurement, stage 2.

The government's detailed and considered response to how procurement was to be managed under the proposed new arrangements in the absence of a procurement board is publicly available to everybody, including the Leader of the Opposition and anyone else who has been actively engaged or involved in procurement in South Australia.

The only logical extension of the Labor Party's position now is that, should they successfully have the numbers in this particular chamber, the State Procurement Board will not be abolished, contrary to the views of their own members, the committee and the many people in industry who have lobbied furiously members of not only the Statutory Authorities Review Committee but members of the Liberal Party, the Labor Party and the crossbench, and who have been extraordinarily critical of the performance of the State Procurement Board under the operations mainly of the former Labor government for 16 years. People in industry and procurement were evidently sick and tired of the way the operations of the State Procurement Board had been carried out for many years under the existing arrangements.

So there are two major inquiries, supported by all and sundry, including the Labor Party. They recommend a consistent course of action, that is, to abolish the State Procurement Board, and now, at the potential end of the process, the Leader of the Opposition gets up and says, 'Well, no, we think you should keep the State Procurement Board, and we are going to vote to defeat this particular bill.' Should that be the view of the chamber, it will be an extraordinary waste of a lot of taxpayers' money.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition, if that is the end result, that we will calculate the extraordinary amount of taxpayers' money that has gone into implementing the recommendations of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, the new arrangements in relation to procurement, the employment of senior staff, the countless thousands of hours of work that bureaucrats and others have entered into in the prospect of implementing what had been a unanimous view of a parliamentary committee of inquiry, and the Productivity Commission as well, in terms of how the existing procurement functions had not worked to the advantage of business and industry in South Australia. They needed to be improved and there was an agreement in relation to how that process could be improved, along the lines of the recommendations of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee and the Productivity Commission.

I make clear that the considerable sum of taxpayers' money that might have been wasted in this whole process—if the Australian Labor Party, having had its own members vote for this particular proposal, upon the change of leadership or something had decided to change its position and had indicated that, then we would understand that, again, a key participant in this whole process, being the Labor Party, had withdrawn its support for the proposals its own members had entered into, but there has been no indication of that up until this extraordinary contribution from the Leader of the Opposition in this particular chamber this evening.

Without going through all the detail, I understand that representatives of the Labor Party were asked—in terms of the briefings, that is, the current legislative functions of the State Procurement Board—what the new control functions and the new procurement framework would be. I seek leave to table a copy of a note that, as I understand it, was given to members of the Labor Party, and possibly the crossbenchers—I am not sure. I am happy to make this available. Given the board was going to be abolished, it demonstrates how the current legislative functions of the procurement board under the new procurement framework—the equivalent control functions—will be maintained.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: With that, I would urge members of the crossbench to support this reform, particularly some members who participated in the committee inquiry and have been passionate advocates for the abolition of the State Procurement Board for a period of time. I would urge those members either during the committee stage or in the final vote for this particular bill, the third reading, to support what up until now has been agreed by everyone as an appropriate course to improve procurement policy in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:57): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:58): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to introduce a bill forthwith.

The PRESIDENT: There being an absolute majority present, I will accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:58): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I rise to introduce the COVID-19 Emergency Response (Further Measures) (No. 2) Amendment Bill 2020. The bill continues the Marshall Liberal government's approach of constantly strengthening the legislative framework underpinning the COVID-19 response. The bill focuses on building on the strong contribution that pharmacists, general practitioners and other health professionals have made to the pandemic response thus far and supporting their contribution to the ongoing response.

The amendments only operate for the COVID-19 emergency period and will expire in the same way as other provisions of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, that being either when the emergency is no longer declared or six months after the act commenced, being 9 October 2020. The bill provides an opportunity to strengthen the protection of front-line workers in pharmacies and general practices, as well as strengthen our approach to pharmacy services.

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

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

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

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

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

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

COVID-19 pandemic preparedness and continuity planning for community pharmacies has highlighted the risk to continuity of services should there be an outbreak of COVID-19 in rural and remote areas of the state. The amendment bill will support continuity of service through this emergency period.

The Pharmacy Regulation Authority of South Australia, supported by the Chief Pharmacist, will ensure the establishment of a strict regulatory regime for the provision of telepharmacy to ensure high standards in the operation of any pharmacy utilising telepharmacy. These changes also give the Pharmacy Regulation Authority SA the power to limit the kinds of communication that may be utilised in the provision of telepharmacy. Telepharmacy by remote attendance of a pharmacist is also aligned with the commonwealth government's move to provide medication review services through telehealth systems to ensure vulnerable patients can receive pharmacist-delivered support while remaining isolated from COVID-19.

Community pharmacists play an important role in our community. They provide critical access to medicines, and the services they provide lead to improved patient compliance, reduced inappropriate medication use, fewer preventable adverse drug effects and interactions, reduced hospitalisations and GP visitation, and a better quality of life for the community. Enabling continued access to these services through the COVID-19 pandemic is essential.

I would like to acknowledge the opposition's suggestions on this bill, which have led to enhancements to it. I commend this bill to the council.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

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

These clauses are formal.

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

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

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

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

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

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.T. Ngo.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (CONFIDENTIALITY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 June 2020.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:06): I rise to speak on this bill and indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. This legislation facilitates the introduction of a real-time prescription monitoring system for drugs of dependence to combat the potential misuse of these drugs. The implementation of real-time prescription monitoring is an important tool for clinicians to have information at hand at the time of prescribing. This in turn prevents overprescribing of dangerous substances and helps identify drug dependence treatment needs that might otherwise go unnoticed.

This was an election commitment of the government that they said was urgent; however, it is one they did not act on urgently, taking two years and three months to get to the point of legislation into parliament. We have seen Victoria and Queensland implement their monitoring systems well before us now and, given the existing delays, it is highly questionable whether the government will meet its commitment to have this system up and running across all pharmacies and GPs before the next election. However, it is good to see that the selection of a provider has finally occurred, with Fred IT winning the tender to provide the monitoring system.

SA Health has indicated to the opposition that its system would be rolled out in a voluntary form in March 2021 with stakeholders beginning trials ideally in October and November this year, and with the use of that system to be mandatory potentially one or more years after that. I would welcome the minister placing on record the predicted rollout, when the minister expects the mandatory enforcement of this across the system.

We will be closely monitoring those time lines and seeking strong justification for any extensions needed. We understand SA Health is willing to consider allowing some extensions on the rollout, depending on stakeholder readiness, as a result of COVID-19 disruptions. Where there are any delays occurring, we will be consulting with stakeholders to ensure that delay is indeed at the request of the stakeholders and not merely as a result of funding or administrative delays on the part of SA Health.

A response we have heard from several stakeholders has been that while they are supportive of the legislation, they have warned that everything depends upon the system rollout process. This includes ensuring that the appropriate provision of technology and training happens prior to the system going live, and especially before it becomes mandatory.

Another important point raised by multiple stakeholders is that, while a real-time prescription monitoring system is a great step forward, improving mental health and drug treatment services for the treatment of drug dependency is also a crucial step. While it will be a great improvement for individuals with serious drug dependence to be identified and refused prescriptions, we need to understand what else is being done to support that individual: who is taking steps to ensure that they are not spiralling and potentially ending up in an emergency department? These are all very important concerns we seek the government to address.

One particularly detailed submission came from the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists (SA Branch), they stated:

RANZCP SA supports the introduction of an RTPM system, as pharmaceutical drugs are the most frequent contributing drugs to overdose deaths each year.

As a number of the medicines to be monitored by the system are prescribed by psychiatrists, our members are cautiously optimistic about its advantages as a clinical tool.

However we would also like to take this opportunity to raise a number of matters surrounding the execution of a RTPM system which will need consideration as part of future legislative or regulatory changes, and in particular as part of its implementation. The rollout and detail of the new system are where issues may potentially arise.

The College of Psychiatrists is concerned about protections for patient privacy and scrutiny over the access of patient information. They say that while the issue has clearly been identified they have concerns about the implementation and list several concerns and suggestions to alleviate those concerns. Specifically, they advise:

Feedback from our Victorian counterparts has been that identifying patients based on their name as an identifier is not sufficient, due to the potential for errors.

Our view is that best practice would be to use Medicare numbers to identify patients.

We acknowledge this would need integration and cooperation from the Commonwealth Department of Health in order to achieve and is therefore not the easiest method—however also note that should a national prescription monitoring system be implemented, doing so now would allow for much easier integration in future.

Steps will need to be taken to ensure transparency between prescribers and consumers regarding the use of the RTPM system.

...In principle, an RTPM system should not be accessed in circumstances other than when the prescriber is making a prescription for their patient.

Where circumstances require access to the system to make a prescription without the patient in the room, we would suggest there be a mechanism by which the patient can be notified their record has been accessed.

The college is also concerned about accessibility of the new system for clinicians, and seeks the introduction of clinical guidelines to help inform decisions made about the prescription of medication in the event an alert pops up. Specifically, they list several areas they believe need to be fully explored before the system is rolled out, including, and I quote:

Clinical guidelines for actions prescribers should take when a RTPM notification identifies an issue with an individual's prescription history. In many cases, it is not as simple as deciding to continue or stop a patient's medication.

While we absolutely agree that the final decision should be based on the clinical decision of the health practitioner, the provision of a certain measure of advice and guidance is not inappropriate.

Guidelines as to how primary and secondary care, as well as pharmacists and other prescribers, should communicate regarding notifications about individuals in the RTPM system...where health professionals should direct an individual identified as having a substance misuse issue for assistance.

Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) services are often very stretched, and it is likely the RTPM system will lead to identification of additional individuals who require assistance. It may be necessary to consider increased resources for these services in order to meet an anticipated growth in demand.

While many of these concerns might be alleviated through answers during the committee stage, it is important to note that some simple consultation with that college much earlier in the piece could have

gone a long way. It is vital that there is effective consultation between the government and key stakeholders as the rollout of the system commences, particularly regarding the move to make the system mandatory, as we have heard from doctors that this will be of great difficulty if the system is not user-friendly, efficient, and works for busy general practitioners.

The bill itself is light on detail and grants significant regulatory powers. This is something my colleague in another place has pursued with diligence throughout briefings and, of course, the Legislative Council is regularly not minded to leave too much up to regulation but quite rightly as policymakers we prefer to have the essential elements of the scheme in legislation that we pass as a chamber. It must be said that no-one was as big an opponent of too much regulatory use of powers than the health minister when he was in opposition.

During the briefing on this bill to the shadow health minister, the member for Kaurna, the government claimed that parliamentary counsel had advised the changes were best placed in regulation rather than within the bill, but I know that at the briefing our colleagues were also told the regulations were three to four weeks from being finalised.

I am informed the opposition received a copy of the regulations at 2.47pm on the Monday before a sitting day, giving the opposition approximately half a day to scrutinise the regulations before debate on this bill was due to commence. As a practice, this is wholly unsatisfactory. These regulations are important and, in the absence of legislation, the regulations are essential to understand.

Thankfully, debate on this legislation was delayed, in recognition of this fact. Furthermore, these draft regulations were labelled as embargoed, with the minister offering this explanation on their distribution:

The draft regulations are embargoed as I need to undertake formal consultation before they are progressed to Cabinet.

This begs the question: if the government had not even brought the substance of the reforms to stakeholders or to cabinet, why back then were they asking Legislative Council members to force this bill through as quickly as possible when how it would actually work was not even known to their own cabinet or to stakeholders? In summary, the minister was asking the Legislative Council to pass the bill. However, the government did not even want to consult on the detail contained in the regulations before council members voted on the bill.

While the opposition does support the bill and does support the implementation of real-time prescription monitoring, we remain gravely concerned about the process that this minister has overseen and the lack of detail regarding the practical rollout of the system. Having tried to force the legislation through before regulations were able to be consulted on or even before regulations had gone through the minister's own cabinet process, the regulations still provide little clarity.

During the committee stage we will have questions for the minister on why he has brought the legislation to parliament with so little detail behind it with such a sense of urgency, despite the two years of prior delay. As I said, the Labor opposition is supportive of the system and the legislative change; however, there is much more explanation that needs to be provided to this council to convince us and to give us comfort that the government is on the right track.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:16): I rise on behalf of the Greens to welcome this legislation and the fulfillment of this government's election commitment, on top of a national commitment that will allow real-time monitoring of the prescription or supply of drugs of dependence. The key focus of this legislation is harm prevention and that is a welcome one indeed.

The Controlled Substances (Confidentiality and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2020 is a recognition that prescription drug abuse is a rising problem in our nation and pharmaceutical drugs have been significant contributors to overdose deaths. Prescription drug abuse is a worldwide problem of increasing concern to governments and the United Nations. Research data indicates that prescription drug abuse is increasing in Australia.

The 2013 National Drug Strategy Household Survey found that 4.8 per cent of Australian adults used pharmaceuticals for non-medical purposes in the past year. That is an increase from 3.8 per cent in 2004. The number of people in needle and syringe programs who reported that the

drug they last injected was a prescription opioid increased from 7 per cent in 2000 to 23 per cent in 2015.

The importance of a real-time prescription monitoring system is highlighted and indeed echoed in an article published in the *Australian Family Physician*, a magazine of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners. In an article titled 'Prescription drug abuse-A timely update' the authors noted that:

Regulatory changes in pharmaceutical medications can have an impact on patterns of drug prescribing and subsequent misuse. Implementation of real-time monitoring programs may assist doctors in making more appropriate prescribing decisions.

This is the very same article that highlights the statistics that I have just quoted. I am pleased to see that South Australia, along with the rest of the country, is moving to address this issue.

I believe the passage of this bill would make us the third jurisdiction in the country to have a system that is compatible with the national database. Victoria's system is almost implemented and Queensland is a month or so ahead of us. Currently, the ACT has a limited version of such a system in place and Tasmania has a system that allows for almost real-time monitoring but is not yet linked to the national database. This bill is largely administrative, with enabling amendments that will see us implement ScriptCheck in South Australia as well as allowing the system to connect to the national database and collect information in real time.

In an overdue leap into the 21st century, this bill also allows for doctors to make applications for authority to prescribe drugs of dependence via the ScriptCheck system, rather than having to mail in a physical form request, as is the current practice. This will allow for better information being available around what drugs are being prescribed by whom, for whom and at what frequency, and it also allows doctors and patients more timely access to those prescribed drugs.

The changes to penalties under the act are appreciated, as the amendments ensure they are more proportional. This bill allows for expiations on larger offences to support the system that will be in place. This is quite useful as, for example, the only way currently to address someone not submitting their data is to take them to court.

This bill will enable warnings and the possibility of a fine without the offence being recorded, as opposed to taking an individual to court in what should be more an administrative approach. I particularly appreciated the added clarity that doctors and pharmacists can only access information in the database for the purposes of treating a patient and that health practitioners can only share information with others providing treatment and SA Health as the government regulator.

It was deeply concerning to learn in our briefing about some of the behaviour of SAPOL officers who have engaged in demanding information from health practitioners under certain pretences and then have gone after the individuals to whom the information related for something entirely other than their health needs. So it is very welcome to see an assurance for health practitioners that they will not be required to share information relating to the prescription of drugs of dependence with SAPOL.

I have a question for the minister, and I would like it to perhaps be taken on notice because I did not give prior notice of this question. In the past five years—or three years, depending on what is the easiest data to collate—how many times has SAPOL attempted to put pressure on our health professionals with regard to information about the prescription of drugs of dependence?

This bill is timely and we look forward to its swift passage and implementation. It is indeed good to see our systems being brought into the 21st century, albeit 20 years into the 21st century, and also good to see the harm minimisation approach to tackle the very serious issues of dependency on prescription pharmaceuticals.

As a subscriber to the SANDAS (SA Network of Drug and Alcohol Services) email list—which I have been for well over a decade, well before I was a member of this place, in my previous roles, particularly as policy officer for the Mental Health Coalition—I must note that this bill has been well consulted and that currently there is an email out that is specifically consulting those practitioners who are directly affected with regard to the regulations.

I find it extraordinary that the Labor opposition would come in here as if we normally look at the regulations that are associated with an act before we pass a bill to create that act. It is extraordinary to gild the lily a little there as if somehow that is common practice. I note that, if the opposition were so minded, there is a whole website devoted to information on this process.

Indeed, the website is very cognisant that some of our health practitioners have had a little thing called COVID-19 to deal with just lately and have had a lot else on their plate but are currently being asked for their specific input on how they will be affected and whether or not they need exemptions from the operation of this act. With those few words, I commend the bill to the council.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:23): I also rise to speak in support of the Controlled Substances (Confidentiality and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. As we know, the bill makes a number of commonsense amendments to the Controlled Substances Act that flow on from the impending rollout of the real-time monitoring system. A national strategy has progressed since 2017 to address the growing prevalence of the non-medical use of certain pharmaceuticals, particularly those that pose the greatest risk of misuse or dependence.

South Australia will be the third state to integrate into the national register. Victoria is already up and running and Queensland will likely pip us to the post by a month or so. I understand that the South Australian and Queensland systems will go a step further, not just in terms of monitoring schedule 8 medicines but also schedule 4 medicines, which when coprescribed can also be harmful.

When used properly, these medications are of course meant to provide relief, but inappropriate use can have all sorts of detrimental and harmful effects on individuals, their families and the community. They can be highly addictive and help in terms of escaping from the stresses of life and reality, and we know that their use is on the rise.

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report into the 'Non-medical use of pharmaceuticals: trends, harms and treatment', 2006-07 to 2015-16, has made some disturbing findings. During the study of that period, it found that prescription medications were responsible for more deaths than illegal drugs. In 2016, there were 1,808 drug-induced deaths in Australia: 663 of those deaths were caused by the misuse of benzodiazepines, traditionally prescribed to treat sleeping disorders and stress; 550 of those deaths were attributed to opioid analgesics, painkillers such as oxycodone, morphine and codeine, traditionally prescribed for pain management and heroin addiction; and over the decade there was a 127 per cent increase in the misuse of benzodiazepines and, even greater, a 168 per cent increase in prescription opioids.

In fact, misuse was at higher levels than for any other illegal drugs except cannabis. So we know this is a huge problem. I think it would surprise many in the community that real-time access to data is not currently available to assist decision-making for medical practitioners and pharmacists alike. I suppose in a sense they are working in the dark at the moment, and they have been up until now.

The bill provides for the implementation of a system that is intended to help combat the phenomenon of doctor shopping, where patients visit multiple medical practitioners seeking prescriptions they intend to either misuse themselves or sell on the black market. At present, there can be a significant delay in information being captured in the system.

It is important to note the importance of this, particularly in relation to the black market and the sale of those prescription medications illegally to minors, because we know that minors, if they cannot get their hands on anything else, are very likely to get their hands on Xanax or whatever else they can get their hands on, depending on whether they are seeking an upper or a downer, and it is extremely accessible to them. In my view, that is something we need to address as best we can. This measure certainly goes some way towards doing that.

We know that the lag in terms of the current system can sometimes be a month and sometimes more, as pharmacists currently manually download the previous month's prescriptions from their database. We know that locums and emergency departments still regularly handwrite prescriptions, which are manually recorded by pharmacists at the dispensary, adding to the length of delay in some instances.

With the implementation of the new scheme, prescriptions will be immediately captured at the time they are dispensed and avoid those lag times. So this does make perfect sense in terms of capturing real-time data. The national rollout of the real-time system will prevent doctor shopping over borders too, and I am told it is not uncommon for patients to play both sides of the South Australian and Victorian border in terms of accessing these medications.

The substituted confidentiality clause in the bill addresses any potential inappropriate use of data stored in the system. I share the concerns that have been raised by the Hon. Tammy Franks. I know that was one of the issues canvassed at our meeting in relation to SAPOL accessing data. I am pleased the government has made it clear that this information is not to be accessed by SAPOL for their investigations generally. That is not the intention, but SAPOL have used some questionable methods in the past in terms of trying to gain access to the records of access to medication by individuals, which was flagged with us at the briefing. As I understand it, that is the reason for these particular provisions in the bill.

The bill makes it crystal clear that information cannot be shared over the counter or by phone to an unauthorised party. I understand that a comprehensive training and education program will ensure the dos and don'ts are understood by users. Of course, information sharing can still be sought through the appropriate FOI channels for use in the same wide variety of legal matters. It will not be real-time sharing, which itself has the potential for inadvertent misuse. A pharmacist will be able to confidentially refuse an over-the-counter police request for information, for example, and that is, I believe, at the heart of the comments the Hon. Tammy Franks was just making and the concerns that were also raised by us at the briefing.

As I said before, I think many would assume real-time prescription monitoring was already in place. Those exploiting the system presumably know that it is not. We support any legislative measures targeting the illegal use of drugs in South Australia and acknowledge that this is a serious public health issue. We recognise only too well that illegal drugs are not the only drugs that can ruin lives and that the inappropriate use of such prescription medicines can create just as much havoc, whether through addiction, accidental overdose or suicide.

I will end by reflecting on a very tragic inquest that I was involved in some years ago, where a young lady who suffered from a terrible gambling addiction accessed over-the-counter drugs at the supermarket, but accessed them in enough quantities to effectively end her own life. It was a tragic set of circumstances. I know that this bill is not intended to deal with those particular circumstances, but it did highlight to me very clearly at the time just how dangerous medication, whether legal or illegal, can be when it is misused and just how careful we have to be in terms of how readily available these medications are.

I, for one, think it makes perfect sense. After experiencing the harrowing effects of that inquest with that family I think there are good grounds for further regulation of these sorts of products, which certainly do not fall within the classes that this bill addresses but are normal sorts of over-the-counter painkillers that we would access in the supermarket or over the counter at the chemist. I think there are very good grounds for some of those medications, which we often think of as rather harmless, to be further regulated, because I know, as a result of that inquest, that taking a couple of boxes of Nurofen will end in your death, whether you like it or not. With those words, I acknowledge again the importance of this bill, commend the minister for his work in this area and indicate our support for the bill.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:32): I thank the Hon. Kyam Maher, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Connie Bonaros for their contributions. I thank the honourable members for putting matters on the record that they would like to have addressed. In particular, both the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Connie Bonaros sought information that is not within my portfolio, so I intend to approach the relevant minister and seek his advice. In that context, I propose that we consider the second reading and I will see what information I can provide at clause 1.

Bill read a second time.

WAITE TRUST (VESTING OF LAND) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 July 2020.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:35): I rise to speak on the Waite Trust (Vesting of Land) Bill 2020. The bill, as we know, will allow land that is subject to the terms of the Peter Waite Trust to be vested by the Minister for Education and the Commissioner of Highways so that the planned upgrade to the Cross and Fullarton roads intersection can be undertaken. The land, we are told, is required to widen the south-western side of the intersection road to benefit the 55,000 vehicles that pass through each day, plus the additional vehicles it will presumably attract. I suspect that we may have some more cynical views about the purpose of this bill expressed in another member's contribution shortly—I only suspect.

Safer pedestrian crossings are also being constructed, according to DPTI. Peter Waite remains one of South Australia's most generous public benefactors, and upon his death in 1922 Waite gifted the land in question for the establishment of an agricultural high school. Urrbrae Agricultural High School remains the only specialist agricultural school in South Australia, with flourishing horticultural and livestock programs, in addition to traditional course work. Of course, we are delighted that the minister backed away from a previous very unpopular decision in relation to this particular school.

In terms of this bill, there are over 7,000 square metres that the Commissioner for Highways would like access to, to be taken from the school campus, including four dual-purpose tennis and netball court sites. School sporting facilities are vital in any education environment. I was briefed on this bill and it is my understanding that the government has the opposition's support for this bill, so it will get through in one form or another. I did ask for confirmation that any of the existing facilities that are to be taken from the school, given that this bill is likely to pass this parliament, will be replaced. The feedback provided to me at that briefing was that, obviously, there will be less space and we will try to return whatever space is left available as best as possible to the previous use, including the car park, which obviously will be smaller.

I have asked whether there have been specific discussions with the school about the use of those tennis and netball courts, and what will be done to reinstate those potentially on other parts of the school grounds. There was no answer provided to me. I did indicate that that is an answer I would like to have a response to during the course of this debate. I expect the Minister for Education would have had those discussions with the school in question and that he could provide a response as to whether there is any intention to ensure that the school does not lose on facilities that it currently has access to, namely, the tennis and netball courts.

There were also questions in relation to other surrounding facilities that the school may lose access to and about what feedback generally has come from the discussions with the Minister for Education and with Urrbrae in relation to their losing 7,000-odd square metres from what I think is a total of about 440,000 square metres, and whether requests have been made to reinstate those areas in other parts of the school, but particularly at whose cost as well, because I do not think it is appropriate that these should come out of the school's budget, given that it has no choice as to whether or not it loses this 7,000 square metres, which happens to be where these courts are situated.

So I would be extremely grateful if the government could confirm what discussions have taken place, what it intends to do to reinstate those particular provisions for this school and whether it is intended that this will come out of the school's budget or whether the Commissioner of Highways will be footing the bill for the reinstatement of those provisions. With those words, I indicate our support for the second reading of this bill.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:40): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. The Waite Trust (Vesting of Land) Bill alters the operation of a trust. As has been briefly alluded to, Mr Waite vested this land for educational purposes. He gave one portion of the land to the University of Adelaide and another portion of the land to the state government to

encourage and incentivise agricultural practice. It is fair to say, I think, that it has been a huge success; however, there is now a need to upgrade an intersection.

There has been speculation that the reason for the fast tracking of this upgrade to the intersection is because the local MP, who of course used to be a Liberal, probably will not be the candidate for the Liberal Party at the next election so they are going to need something to talk about for their new candidate, the new candidate that they are going to run in opposition to their former member who is no longer a Liberal. This intersection has been fast-tracked and, as I said, speculation is that it is mainly so that the government has something to talk about in the seat of Waite.

However, to the minister's credit, the original iteration of this bill indicated only that any land that was left over after the purposes for which this land use is being changed may be revested to the minister in accordance with the scheme prescribed by the regulations. I just want to put on the record that in the other place this was addressed. What it meant was that in that iteration it would have been entirely up to the discretion of the minister or the commissioner to revest the land for the purposes that Peter Waite had set out.

However, I am glad to say that an amendment was moved and accepted and, therefore, the version of the bill that we have coming to us in this place says instead that that must be revested. This is a positive change, and I do want to just place on the record the opposition's support of that as indeed it was the honourable member for West Torrens who indicated that that would have been moved as an amendment by the opposition if it was not adopted by the government.

Initial concern of the opposition was that that was not in the bill; it was simply a promise. Indeed, it may have been a promise which could have been relied on. Given the government's history on promises, the opposition have been concerned: roadworks like GlobeLink, the 24-hour airport in Murray Bridge, the new sweeping freight line, the new highway going around the Adelaide Hills straight down to the port of Adelaide, coming up the Northern Expressway and the Port River Expressway to bypass all that freight, as promised before the election. Oh, wait a minute! Those promises were not kept. Those promises did not eventuate. There has been backflip after backflip. That was a concern that the opposition had, but I am glad to say we can now rest assured because the version that came up to us said that that land must be revested for its original intention.

In 1913 Peter Waite wrote to the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. A.H. Peake, and the Chancellor of the university, the Rt Hon. Sir Samuel Way, informing them that subject to his own and his wife's life interests he intended presenting the Urrbrae property of 54 hectares to the university. The eastern half was to be used for scientific studies related to agriculture, and the western half, which is the part under discussion in this bill, as a public park. He also intended handing over 45 hectares adjoining Urrbrae to the government of South Australia for the purpose of establishing an agricultural high school.

This statement of intent was subject to the South Australian parliament making the gifts free of succession duty. So I am very glad that he did not get taxed for offering this land to the state. In explaining his gift, Peter Waite wrote:

I have been much influenced by the wonderful work our agriculturalists and pastoralists have accomplished...in face of the very great odds they have had to meet. With...little scientific training they have placed our wheat, wool and fruits in the highest estimation of the world; our sheep have been brought to such perfection that they're sought after not only by all the sister States but by South Africa.

Then he talks about many successors of the state in those fields. I think it is fair to say that, given his contribution to one of the largest industries in South Australia, we should continue to train the next generation of farmers and agriculturalists in this state on which we rely for our economic prosperity. We do not think that Peter Waite would begrudge a piece of this land being used for a road.

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: Ask him.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Well ask him, indeed. The designs are not yet complete. It will be available to the public in due course. We are willing to accept that on this occasion there is the opportunity to do something for the common good, even if that does end up being for the good of the Liberal Party as well, which is an unfortunate by-product, but the common good to build this road and therefore the opposition indicates it will be supporting the bill.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:45): The previous speaker has suggested there may have been some political motives in relation to this particular road project. I would refer the member and all members to the piece that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* in February of this year with the heading: 'Infrastructure fund analysis reveals 40 per cent of South Australian grants went to Nicolle Flint's marginal seat of Boothby.'

The article goes on to say that the vast bulk of these road projects nationwide went to Coalition seats or marginal Labor seats that the Coalition hoped to win. The article states:

In South Australia, the two Liberal-held urban seats received 58 per cent of the \$361 million allocated to the state. And more than 40 per cent—\$153.5 million—funded four projects in the marginal seat of Boothby, held by Nicolle Flint.

This \$61 million colossal waste of federal and state taxpayers' money was a pork-barrel before the last federal election. The road widening project is unnecessary. It is dangerous for heritage and for the environment. The Greens do not support the project and, as a result, we certainly will not be supporting the bill.

Interestingly, Labor appears to have simply squibbed it because their reaction to the pork-barrel story from earlier this year was to get on their high horse and say how outrageous it all was. It was a waste of taxpayers' money that the government was using 'for its own political purposes'. So they were not too happy with how this pork-barrel was rolled out last year for the federal election. Now they seem to think they have had a major win because they managed to get the government to agree that if there is any high school land that they do not actually require, they will give it back.

What I find even more remarkable is that you cannot find any plans for this project; you cannot find the design work. There is no publicly available document that tells you exactly what land they are going to take from this intersection to widen it. I was on the DPTI website less than an hour ago and the best you can get is a generic intersection map, the one they use for all intersections—it just shows three lanes of traffic in each direction and turning circles and right-hand turn lanes—the same map they always use with the annotation, 'Please note this image is an artist's impression for illustrative purposes only, and not a final design.'

In fact, when you read their website there is no final design. They talk about a design process; they talk about, 'We better have a think about heritage.' There is a state heritage item in the way, but they do not say anything on the website about what they are going to do with that. My understanding is that they are going to do like they did with Captain Cook's cottage in Yorkshire, they are going to pick it up and move it. Probably not move it to Yorkshire, but certainly move it away from the intersection, because they are determined to get their three lanes in each direction.

According to the DPTI website, there is a list of eight or nine dot points that are key considerations in the planning and design development, but there is no final design. That begs the question: if there is no final design, how do we know they need this land? How do we know they need to undo this trust that was for the people of South Australia and for the specified purposes laid out by Peter Waite? How do we know how much of this land they need? How do we know they need any of it?

My understanding is that the legalities around this are complex. The Peter Waite Trust land crosses both sides of Fullarton Road. It includes the arboretum, but it also includes the high school. My understanding, from what DPTI says, is that they reckon they can take arboretum land just using compulsory acquisition powers but they need an act of parliament to take the school land.

That might be right or it might not be; but what gives me some comfort is the number of heritage experts, including retired lawyers, who live in this area who will, I think, delight in challenging some aspects of this project, particularly as they start eating into the university land and the arboretum land and start trying to knock down the state heritage-listed gatekeeper's cottage, which is the prominent feature on the corner of Cross Road and Fullarton Road.

What you have to love about DPTI—let us be honest here—is that they sort of exist to build roads, it is what they do. So I do not expect anything more, when given the opportunity to expand a road or build a new one or make a road wider, than that they will, of course, take it. It is what they do. However, as the Hon. David Ridgway knows—he is a regular through this intersection, as am I—you only have to go 1.5 kilometres south from this intersection and it becomes a single lane road. It

stays a single lane road for 5.9 kilometres, it stays a single lane all the way up to the Blackwood shopping strip, and then it becomes two lanes again.

This is one of those classic examples of where the plan is to make it easy to get through the intersection, but you have bottlenecks; there is certainly a big bottleneck on one side, and it narrows down to two lanes on the other side of the intersection in all directions anyway. This is \$61 million of taxpayers' money to maybe help people get through the lights one change faster.

My experience—and I do use this intersection a lot—is that it is not particularly congested even in peak periods. The definition of congestion in Adelaide is whether it takes you more than one go to get through the lights. If you say that to someone from Sydney or Melbourne they will laugh at you and say, 'You don't know what congestion is.' This is not a congested intersection.

There is also no indication I can see that safety is necessarily improved by adding multiple extra lanes in each direction. As members would know, this was the site of a horrific accident that killed two people earlier this year, an awful, awful accident. There was no indication from the circumstances of that accident that it was anything to do with the layout of the intersection or how the road was constructed. There were other behavioural issues involved that would have been the same regardless of how the intersection was designed.

So when we get into committee the first question I will be asking the minister is, 'Show us the plans that convince the Legislative Council that you need to take high school land, and exactly how much land do you think you will need to take?' Honestly, I am not satisfied with a generic picture on the DPTI website that has just a bog standard four-way intersection and a disclaimer, 'Don't rely on this. For illustrative purposes only.'

When we get into committee I will also be asking exactly what the government's intention is in relation to the state and local heritage-listed gatekeeper's cottage. This is an important item of state heritage. I was in front of the cottage back in January with the protesters, and they had a very nice banner—probably 30 metres long, one of the longer banners I have seen—basically pleading with the government not to take away their heritage and not to take away the large number of significant trees that abut this intersection as well.

With a complete absence of any detailed plans, with no information whatsoever about what particular high school land is required, this government has the nerve to come to the Legislative Council and say, 'Give us as much of the high school as we need and we promise to give back the bits we don't use.' What an appalling way to manage infrastructure projects in South Australia. With those brief words, the Greens are not at all happy with this bill and we will be voting against it.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (16:54): I thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Clare Scriven and the Hon. Mark Parnell for their contributions on this important bill. I note that the Hon. Connie Bonaros posed a couple of questions in her contribution, and that a number of questions were also posed during a briefing with her party on the bill. I will answer them now in my summing-up and maybe that will speed up the committee stage of the bill.

The first question is: what discussions have been had with the Urrbrae Agricultural High School? I am advised that in November 2019, a meeting was held with Joslyn Fox, the principal, and David Price, the deputy principal, to discuss the intersection upgrade. They were advised that a road widening is likely, but the extent was not known at that point in time, and the school provided valuable input.

In March 2020, the school was telephoned and advised that there were further investigations and a preferred concept design would be undertaken over the coming months. In April 2020, an email was sent to the school principal, Ms Joslyn Fox, advising that DPTI was still progressing with investigations at the intersection and advised that a vegetation survey would be undertaken in late April 2020. The vegetation survey was undertaken over several days in late April 2020.

Contact was made again with the school in June 2020 with the intention of setting up a further meeting; however, a meeting date and time has not yet been set. In summary, the school's input has

been sought and the school has been kept advised of the progress. As the project design is fleshed out further, consultation with the school will continue.

The second question is: what is the likely impact on the school? I am advised that whilst the design has not yet been finalised there is likely to be an impact on the school which DPTI will attempt to keep to a minimum. In particular, it is currently expected that there will be an impact on the sporting courts due to the proposed widening of Cross Road to the south. The extent of the widening impact is not fully determined nor have the rectification of the impacts been incorporated into the design. The process, when it occurs, will be undertaken in consultation with the school.

The next question is: what land will be acquired from the school? While the design is still in the early stages, DPTI estimates that approximately 7,200 square metres of land will be acquired along the Fullarton Road and Cross Road boundary and the total land area within the certificate of title is approximately 440,600 square metres.

The final question I have been provided with is: given the design is not finalised, why does the government need this bill to pass now? Uncertainty in relation to whether the Waite Trust land can be acquired will impact on the project planning and there will be a real risk of the project being delayed.

Some portion of the Waite Trust land will be required for the project to proceed and the government will attempt to keep the amount of land required to be taken from the trust to a minimum. As we have heard earlier, any leftover land from the project will be returned to the Waite Trust. They are some of the answers I have been provided with.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I will talk slowly so the minister's advisers can assume their position. I will reiterate what I asked before. The minister partly answered it when he responded to the Hon. Connie Bonaros's question about the impact on the school, but just to make sure that I clearly understand what the minister is saying, he seems to be saying that they know they need some of the school land, but they do not know exactly how much they need.

He is pretty sure they are going to need some of the land on the south side of Cross Road. That is where the current tennis and basketball courts are but, again, they do not know how much. Are they likely to need any of the western side of Fullarton Road, because that is currently the school car park and it is also where they have their monthly market where you can buy honey and other produce the students have prepared.

I will get the minister to answer that in relation to those, but I guess the more fundamental question is that it seems to be a case of chicken and egg. The minister seemed to say that, unless we know we have parliament's ability to take some of the school land, we are not in a position to advance our planning any further.

The second question is: have I understood correctly that they want parliament's permission to take as much of the high school land as is required and that, unless they have that permission upfront, they are unable to progress the planning for the intersection upgrade?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Certainly, in relation to the western side of Fullarton Road, which is the car park market's space, I am advised that, yes, the preferred design is to take a portion of that and, of course, on the southern side of the Cross Road area that the honourable member referred to for the tennis courts and some of the other facilities that are there.

You are right when you assume that because parliament has not given the government any certainty yet that they can access the land, the design has been, if you like, partially done assuming that the land might be available. Until this bill passes the parliament, there is no certainty that we can access the land to do it.

I accept that the honourable member thinks it may be a little bit of a chicken and egg scenario, but why would we get DPTI to do all of the final design work if the parliament then says, 'We are not going to give you the land to do it'? It is not so much like, 'Trust us and we will do a good job.' I think that it would be a complete waste of DPTI resources to go through all the design work and all the activities if, in the end, the parliament chose not to support the bill.

I am pleased for the sake of the residents of that area that we will get this intersection. It appears that the opposition is supporting the government. I know that the honourable member likes to have everything cut and dried so he knows exactly what is proposed. In this circumstance, my understanding is that the preferred design would take a slice off the western side of Fullarton Road and a portion on the southern side of Cross Road, but until that land is available they cannot finalise the design.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I thank the minister for his answer. Can we speculate for a minute? If this bill did not pass, for example, is the intersection project still viable taking residential land from the north side of Cross Road or taking the arboretum land? It seems to be that the two alternatives to taking high school land would be to take more of the arboretum land or to take the residential land on the north side of Cross Road. Is that the case?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am advised that there are, of course, always other options. There is more than one way to skin a cat. You can design the intersection differently. I am advised that it would be much more expensive to take residential land. I am reasonably familiar with the properties, as I drive past them regularly. They are quite valuable properties, so certainly that would have some impact on the cost, and there is also the issue of heritage. It would be a much more complicated project, given that, if you look at the nature of the intersection, clearly the preferred option and the most economical option is to take some land away from the school.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: How many significant or regulated trees are in the zone on the high school land that are likely to be required for the project?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I do not have the actual number of significant or regulated trees. We do not have that advice today. There are over 100 trees, shrubs, plants and bushes that will be impacted by the proposal. They have been identified in the vegetation study, but as far as regulated or significant trees we do not have that information here for you today.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: If the vegetation study has been completed, can that be made, firstly, publicly available and, secondly, available to the parliament?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I do not know, but I will certainly ask the minister if we can have that. I do not know whether it can be made available, but I undertake to at least pose that question to him.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Is the minister able to provide any more certainty about the fate of that part of the Waite land that includes the state heritage-listed gatehouse—or coach-house, as it is sometimes called—cottage? Am I correct that the current plan is to pick it up and move it somewhere?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am advised that shifting it is an option that is being investigated at the moment. The advice that I have been given is that it appears to be possible to shift it. As to its new location or the distance it may be moved, I don't have that information with me here today, but it is possible to move that cottage away from the intersection. My advice is that there has not been final work done on a final resting place for that cottage.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Are there any economic benefits to this intersection upgrade?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It is a major intersection, and the Hon. Mark Parnell and I, as I said, go through it regularly.

The Hon. F. Pangallo: So do I.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes, of course, so do you. I do forget that sometimes. It can be a number of cycles of lights to get through that intersection on some mornings. Any efficiency that makes those intersections, and all of them across the state, flow more quickly gives an economic

benefit—time is money. Cross Road is a major route into the city. A reasonable amount of freight comes along that road, unfortunately. We do see a fair bit of it go along Portrush Road, as the north-south connector. When finally that road is completed we will probably see more freight come down Cross Road. Anything that makes those intersections move more quickly will certainly deliver an economic benefit to the state.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: That leads me to my next question. Are there plans to reroute heavy transport up and down Cross Road from Portrush Road in the long term?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: That is not something I have any information on. As we know, Portrush Road has seen a significant amount heavy vehicles along it. Surely, if a road becomes more free-flowing it is better. Time is money. Whether it is passengers, light industrial or even bigger vehicles, they will use it simply because it is more efficient to do so, but there is no plan that I am aware of. I am not advised that there is any actual plan to change the traffic flows from Portrush Road down Cross Road.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I go back to my question about the economic benefits of this intersection. We have come to accept that it is a bit of pork-barrelling that happened. At the same time that they announced the Portrush Road-Magill Road intersection—again, there is heavy traffic that goes along Portrush Road—the Minister for Transport claimed in parliament and elsewhere that the economic benefits to South Australia would be somewhere in excess of \$600 million. We have actually asked for the modelling—

The Hon. M.C. Parnell: Rubbish. There is no modelling.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: No, there is not any, I gather—thank you to the Hon. Mark Parnell. The minister was very forthcoming in throwing up a figure of \$600 million of economic benefits. Surely there must be similar types of estimates for the economic benefits of transforming this intersection.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I have just asked my adviser here, and we do not have any information around the economic benefits here with us today.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I make the observation, and it follows on from the Hon. Mr Pangallo's questions, that it is very, very rare for a proper cost-benefit analysis to be undertaken in relation to DPTI road projects because it rarely stacks up. They can pluck some numbers out of the air and pretend that that is what the benefit is. This is \$61 million, \$30.5 million of which comes from state coffers and the other half comes from federal coffers.

In parliament over recent weeks, we have been talking about residents of South Australia— asylum seekers, people on bridging visas—who are getting food parcels from churches and charities, and here we are throwing over \$30 million of South Australian taxpayers' money at an unnecessary project. My question, though, relates to an answer the minister gave earlier when he was asked about consultation with the school. What consultation has there been with the National Trust of South Australia in relation to heritage impacts?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I have just been advised that we are not aware of any actual consultation with the National Trust, but clearly groups such as the one that you were demonstrating with in January, community groups and those that are interested—I am sure there is a Friends of the—

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Friends of the Waite.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes, Friends of the Waite. I probably should put on the record that my uncle was an employee of Waite and there are some bull oaks growing in the arboretum taken from seeds from the property that I grew up on, so I have some relatively small and tenuous connection to it, but I do enjoy the arboretum. Nonetheless, all those groups are actually being consulted, even though the National Trust specifically has not been. I am advised that DPTI is talking to all of the community groups.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I am not going to ask any further questions, but I just want to put on the record that I see where the numbers lie in this chamber. I still think that this is a misguided project that wastes taxpayers' money and has not been justified on any cost-benefit analysis. Key

stakeholders have been tolerated but not consulted. So when we do get to the third reading of the bill, the Greens will again be voting against it.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I have one final question in relation to this, and that is: last year we passed legislation which allowed for a compensation payment of \$50,000 to be made to those households that did have their properties acquired. As it turns out, those changes have not been implemented in time for the Portrush Road residents that we mentioned today. I would like to know whether the government intends for those measures to be in place before any further properties are acquired as a result of this road upgrade and whether those payments will be made available to any home owners who lose their properties as a result?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am advised that those provisions now do apply and that any properties that are acquired on this particular project will receive that payment. Others have talked about pork barrelling. The hardworking member for Boothby, who was working particularly hard in advocating for her community, has some wonderful road projects. It is a bit disappointing that there are members in here being critical of the hard work she has done to advocate on behalf of her constituents to get those projects funded.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 6) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (17:14): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FAIR TRADING (FUEL PRICING INFORMATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 July 2020.)

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:15): I rise to speak on the government's Fair Trading (Fuel Pricing Information) Amendment Bill 2020. I would like to thank the members of the Legislative Council who in the last sitting week of parliament voted to pass my private member's Fuel Watch Bill. My bill, which will soon be debated in the House of Assembly, provides for a 24-hour fuel price guarantee and mirrors the scheme that has operated successfully to bring fuel prices down and deliver price certainty to consumers in Western Australia for over 20 years.

Price-sensitive Perth consumers use FuelWatch to time their purchases to avoid price jumps and to seek out the lowest price station at a point in time. This model has delivered the lowest average fuel prices in Australia. My bill will break up the monopoly that fuel retailers have in South Australia now and give consumers the information, power and authority they need to get cheaper prices.

Under my bill, petrol retailers in a FuelWatch area are required to make a decision about what their fuel pricing is every 24 hours, with prices then locked in for 24 hours, dramatically changing the market and giving the consumer critical information well in advance. This is called the reverse auction principle and is argued to create downward pressure on pricing, as we have seen in Western Australia. It limits collusion to push prices up and incentivises more downward pressure.

My bill is all about delivering benefits to consumers, who in South Australia are not only weary of unpredictable price fluctuations, inexplicable price hikes and the constant chase for the cheapest fuel but are weary of waiting for over two years for the government to deliver upon a key election promise. Today, finally, because they could not continue to do nothing, or in response to the bill introduced by Frances Bedford in the lower house or my bill in the Legislative Council—who knows—the government has introduced its own alternative to my Fuel Watch Bill, the Fair Trading (Fuel Pricing Information) Amendment Bill.

In developing their bill, the government had two fuel watch schemes to choose from: my bill, which mirrors the proven, true, real-time Perth model, or the failed Queensland scheme, where fuel prices are the highest in the country. Guess which option they have chosen? You have guessed it: the failed Eastern States model that has delivered to Queenslanders some of the highest fuel prices in the country. I am in furious agreement with the government on the need for a fuel price watch scheme, but the actual model the government has chosen is the wrong model.

On the opposite side of the country, the average price of fuel is consistently cheaper in Perth than in Adelaide or Brisbane, so why would anyone choose the Queensland model? The South Australian Productivity Commission report released in March 2020 certainly did not recommend it. Indeed, it did not make recommendations at all. It left it to the parliament to decide. I have not been able to get a straight answer from the government about why they did choose it. In simple terms, this bill will deliver a fuel price monitoring scheme where only one group—the retailer—benefits.

The government's policy is therefore not to apply pressure to lower fuel prices but just to make known the cheapest price. Perhaps that is the reason they chose the Queensland model. I can only speculate as to their reasoning, as I have not been able to ascertain it from the government. By the government's very own admission, the scheme they have opted for may not work and could well lead to fuel price increases.

The Attorney-General has acknowledged that the Productivity Commission report suggested there was a real risk of there being a sustained increase in fuel prices under the Queensland model, as has been the experience in New South Wales, that is, the government bill would have the directly opposite effect to the commitment the government gave as an election promise.

The Attorney has already conceded that this model could put up prices, and if that happens she will, to quote her, 'have to think about whether we abandon that earlier, I suppose'. Come again! I am not comforted in the slightest by the Attorney-General's assurances in the House of Assembly that, if this scheme does not work during a two-year trial, then she would 'advocate to the government that they look at any other model that had a demonstrable success rate'. Is she serious? Are we going to have to go through this again?

I am sure South Australians will see straight through the get-out-of-election-promise card the Attorney-General has given herself. As Frances Bedford so eloquently put it in the lower house, the bill before us is a Clayton's bill, a fig leaf; it is the fuel price bill you have when you do not really want anything to change. Industry endorses it because it is passive and ineffectual, yet the Attorney-General has the temerity to dismiss ours as a stunt!

Unfortunately, I, too, must agree with the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis in the other place, who said that the government simply cannot accept that they are wrong. I met with the Attorney-General on Monday and it became apparent to me that she will press on with this bill regardless, with a system that is substandard and not as good as the crossbench have come up with.

As a journalist I worked on countless consumer stories and investigations. I would say that in the mid-1990s we at *Today Tonight* on the 7 network pioneered the tabloid supermarket consumer genre that has now become so prevalent in the media. We opened the eyes of consumers to what was really going on with the products they bought: pricing structures and the marketing tricks and secrets used to entice people to buy.

I recall that we were once mocked—I think it was in about 1996 or 1997—when I carried out laboratory testing on kitchen sponges, cloths and tea towels that we collected from households that revealed the presence of all types of bacterial nasties like salmonella and campylobacter. Manufacturers then put out warnings to customers to ensure proper use and hygiene care.

One topic we focused on consistently was petrol prices, a bane of consumers to this very day. I can spot a dud consumer idea when I see one, and the Attorney-General's bill is a dud in the making. I urge members to see through it and note that it will not deliver to consumers what I call the four Cs of consumerism: clarity, certainty, consistency and convenience. The member for Florey and I have backed up what we are saying with real data, real-time data that cannot be challenged for its accuracy.

We have shown to the government the prices collated over three months in Brisbane, Perth and Adelaide. Brisbane has consistently come out on top for having the highest average price of petrol than any other capital city in the country. Over the past 45 days, for instance, it has been 10¢ dearer than Perth and 7¢ dearer than Adelaide.

However, the Attorney-General thinks the Brisbane model, a flawed work that is still very much in progress, will deliver a better deal than the Perth model that we are supporting and which has been working very successfully in Western Australia for 20 years and which they do not need to touch because it works. It is backed by their motoring organisations.

That is why I am at a loss to explain why the RAA has thrown its lot with a government that seems to think they are the sage on this. Not every driver out there is a member of that organisation, although let me add that it is a fine organisation that serves its members, including me, very well. Interestingly, the RAA has not expressed an argument against the Perth model.

This is not about dictating the prices of petrol. We know big petrol can set any price they like. It is about giving consumers a fair go. The government's bill gives the state's petrol barons an armchair ride to still do what they want to do. There is no certainty or consistency with what they want to give us. As an example of this I kept a close eye on prices in the inner south and west from 4 July to 17 July, when the last cycle conveniently started and ended to coincide with the school holidays. It went from a low of \$1.06 jumping by 40¢ before gradually coming down again to eventually touch \$1.03 to \$1.06 on Saturday morning.

I thought I could go back later in the day to fill up, but guess what? Within a couple of hours it was back to \$1.47. This week it is hovering around \$1.41 at the big three—Caltex, On The Run and Shell—while Mobil X and Liberty remain quite low at around \$1.03, resulting in logjams of cars at locations like Cross Road, Anzac Highway and Henley Beach Road. Retailers, as I said, are free to charge as much as they want.

According to marketing experts like Barry Urquhart, who I have known and worked with for many years, consumers have found that with the discipline of having and knowing a set price it has a stabilising and determining influence on them. The consumers are advantaged. Is that not what we are trying to achieve here: empowering consumers? Price discounting does not change behaviour. It determines when they buy, not where they buy it. Price does not buy loyalty. Less than 20 per cent of consumers will drive to buy cheaper petrol. A 1¢ or 2¢ variance is not going to be a critical factor in their purchase.

Peace of mind purchasing is important; that is, where there is no stress or anxiety. In other words, you will go past one servo and notice the price, see another down the road at a slightly different price before you make a choice to buy. You will not necessarily go back to the one you have driven past on the driver side.

Barry says price is the fourth most important thing for consumers. Convenience is the single most important item. If it is accessible and you know it is there, that is where you go. He points out that the most successful retailers in the world—IKEA and Apple—do not have products constantly on sale. Walmart in the USA simply promises everyday lower prices.

In Western Australia, consumers can control when they buy fuel. They can budget for this grudge purchase knowing that the price will shift within at least a seven-day cycle. The average Australian household spends 13.8 per cent of its income on transport costs. Car loan repayments and fuel are the biggest expenses.

Do you want to buy fuel at a set price for the following 24 hours with notice being given the previous day, as my bill proposes, or with just 30 minutes' notice and where the price can fluctuate up and down like a yoyo several times in a day? I know which one I would prefer, and I am sure that if you put it to consumers they would agree and it would save them hundreds of dollars each year. Barry Urquhart says consumer buying habits are also strongly influenced by the release of weekly catalogues, with Sundays and Mondays now the most popular and targeted days for shoppers.

When you go into Woolies, Coles or Aldi you already know that their discounted specials will apply for an entire week advertised, not on the whim of an announcement at short notice. There is some comfort in knowing that if the price is going to be advertised at either 99¢ or \$1.49 the next

day, you have 24 hours to decide whether you are going to purchase it. The four Cs: clarity, certainty, consistency and convenience, that is what they want.

I would like to read out some of what *CHOICE* magazine had to say about petrol pricing in its May edition this year:

Motorists have a right to feel ripped off when it seems they're paying too much at the petrol pump—especially when they probably are.

That's truer than ever in the midst of the COVID-19 crisis, when instances of what looks a lot like price-gouging are not hard to come by.

And with oil cheaper on the international market than it's been in a long time, motorists understandably expect a corresponding drop in petrol prices.

For the most part, that's happened in recent weeks. But prices haven't dropped as fast—or as consistently—as they should have.

The international price of oil has fallen by about \$50 a barrel since the beginning of the year. The cost of petrol in Australia's five largest cities (Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth) fell by about 45 cents a litre over the same time period.

With price drops of this magnitude, who's complaining? If you look closer, it turns out we all should.

A report released by the ACCC on 22 April makes the case that Australians were still being overcharged at the bowser long after the fall in oil prices filtered through the local petrol industry—especially if they lived in Hobart, Canberra, Darwin or many regional areas around the country.

In many cases, the overcharging may have been subtle. Five cents a litre more, for instance, may not seem like a lot until you analyse the \$333 million in net profits Australian retailers made on petrol products in 2017-18 (the most recent period covered by the ACCC report).

It was a record high, but it works out to an average profit margin of just three cents a litre (Although that's almost double the average from 2008-09 to 2013-14 of 1.6 cents a litre).

So five cents a litre is a lot when you have the economies of scale that Woolworths, Coles, BP, Caltex, and 7-Eleven can bring to bear.

ACCC Chairman Rod Sims said, when the report was released:

'In the larger Australian capital cities, petrol retailers took too long to pass on the savings from the rapid drop in international...prices, and this did not reflect well on them...'

'Especially at this difficult time, retailers must not take advantage of the situation to increase their profits, but should pass on savings to motorists.'

Federal Treasury asked the ACCC to keep an eye on petrol prices in December last year. The April report was the agency's first under this revised direction. Along with making the case that petrol retailers have been overcharging customers during the COVID-19 crisis, the report shows that Australia's petrol retailers are making more money than ever.

Net profits across fuel, convenience store and non-fuel services were \$616 million in 2017-18. Total industry net profits (including wholesalers, refiners and other players) for petrol products were \$1.44 billion in 2017-18, or 4.2¢ a litre—the highest recorded by the ACCC. That is about double the profits for petrol products in 2013-14—\$723 million or 2¢ a litre. Some interesting statistics are:

- 37 per cent of petrol retailer profits came from convenience store and other non-fuel sales in 2017-18; and
- profits for 95 and 98 grade premium fuels were 5.8¢ and 5.9¢ a litre respectively, compared with 1.5¢ a litre for regular unleaded.

The national Australian Automobile Association endorses the use of modern technology like apps to get the message out there, saying that having access to more information not only leads to more competition and cheaper prices but also flushes out the rogue operators.

The AAA also suggests that petrol pricing transparency be taken a step further by having fuel dockets display the amount of excise tax the federal government collects for each litre of petrol and diesel sold, which currently stands at 42.3¢ a litre. This approach would follow the same

transparency principle as grocery dockets displaying the amount the federal government takes in GST—and I firmly wish there was legislation that forces petrol companies to do that on their dockets.

In an effort to avoid a deadlock, and in a spirit of compromise, I have filed a number of amendments that I will outline as we come to them. Broadly speaking, they amend the government's bill to make it consistent with my bill and with the successful WA FuelWatch model. This legislation does not deliver the fuel watch pricing system the South Australian public deserves, and I sincerely hope the government can get over their egos to support my amendments. With those words I conclude my remarks, and reiterate that I will not be supporting this bill without my amendments.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:36): I rise to speak in support of the government's fuel pricing information bill, and to outline why the Greens are supporting a FuelCheck model.

The RAA has called for the government's bill to be implemented in South Australia as a priority; indeed, they wrote to us last sitting week, and we could have debated this matter and finalised it on the sitting Thursday. On the sitting Wednesday, when we debated the private member's bill, there were guarantees given at the time that the very next day we would debate the government bill. However lo and behold, and despite a story of Aesop's fables and rabbits and hares and comparing the government to one or the other, it turned out there were a few sloths in this chamber as well who did not want to debate the bill the next day at all, contrary to what they had said the day before.

As I said, the RAA has called for us to act with urgency; we did not last sitting Thursday, but I hope we will this sitting week. The reason they have done so is because this means that motorists are closer to getting real-time information to help them deal with the cost of living pressures of fuel. The RAA's research shows that Adelaide has the greatest variation in petrol prices of any state capital, the key reason they have been calling for this reform.

Under the government model reported prices will be aggregated electronically by the commissioner and published for public use. Information will be available on a website on how to access this data. Furthermore, the data will be available for use for free to third-party users, which means that existing fuel price apps will be able to access it and use it, and consumers who already try to track fuel prices will not have to download new apps: existing apps such as Fuel Spy and MotorMouth will be able to use this information. This is one of the reasons the Greens are supporting this bill.

As the commission notes in its report, 'the experience of other jurisdictions with fuel price transparency schemes suggests the take-up by motorists of government websites and apps is slow.' Indeed, after about two years in New South Wales when they introduced a similar scheme, the uptake was only 13 per cent, and the commission noted that it could be a more effective option to use other media to advise lowest petrol prices. This is enabled effectively under the government proposal. Conversely, under the FuelWatch model previously debated in this council, third-party users would have to pay to access and use that data.

Throughout this debate, we have seen proponents of the Fuel Watch Bill talk about the report of the Productivity Commission and, in particular, making a criticism of the fact that it did not make official recommendations. However, from the outset in the report, it is quite clear that this was not its purpose. The report, however, does have findings (while it does not have recommendations) and they are very useful for this debate, and I suppose they are convenient for some to ignore as they favour the government's model.

One of the other underlying ideas in this debate is that by providing greater price transparency, we are encouraging more competition between fuel retailers, leading to a benefit and lower prices for consumers. However, as is found in the literature reviewed by the South Australian Productivity Commission, the work that is required to comply with the WA-style scheme has the potential to restrict fuel retailers' ability to compete.

It is important to note that the commission concluded that evidence is inconclusive that price transparency schemes have any lasting impact on average price in price cycles. Further, even if we were to introduce a WA-style FuelWatch scheme, as is the alternative presented to this bill, there is no evidence to suggest that South Australia's fuel prices would fall under a similar weekly cycle.

Proponents of the FuelWatch model in this place most recently have taken to pointing out that in the last 45 days, Brisbane had higher fuel prices on average than Perth, trying to suggest that this is indicative that the FuelWatch model is better for consumers. This is naïve at best and disingenuous at worst, given we all know that there are a range of factors affecting fuel pricing.

Further, as I have just noted and as stated by the commission, there is no conclusive evidence that any scheme relating to price transparency has an impact on average fuel prices. This is, of course, not the only misinformation that has been thrown around in this debate. I have to say how bizarre it is as a Green having to be heated and invested in a debate on anything to do with fuel.

I want to address as well one of the other claims made about the FuelCheck model, where members opposite and in the other place have stated that by requiring retailers to update their prices within 30 minutes of a change, consumers will only have a few minutes of certainty if any at all, and might see prices change three or four times in a day. This is, of course, ridiculous, and a slippery slope; a fallacy in logic and a weakness in argument that does not stand up to the reality faced by both retailers and consumers.

No retailer is going to sit there and watch the fuel prices all day trying to catch out consumers by constantly changing their prices frequently throughout that day. They do not do it now and there is no evidence or logical reason why they would do it under the FuelCheck model. It is worth remembering as well that this is a two-year trial: we will be able to see at the end of it whether or not it has been successful and, if not, it can be tweaked or changed.

At this point it is worth noting that this may not reduce the overall cost of petrol, but it will help motorists make informed choices and find the cheapest prices at any given time. Furthermore, a price freeze, if it can be accommodated, can be introduced after the trial if it becomes clear that one is needed or would be an improvement on the scheme. Industry stakeholders consider the approach taken in Queensland to reporting price changes reduced administrative costs to retailers without compromising the integrity of information.

Finally, I would like to draw the chamber's attention to the conclusion of the commission's report which states:

The Commission notes WA is the only jurisdiction that has a 24-hour price freeze regime, which has been in place for almost twenty years. The New South Wales, NT and Queensland—all variants of the New South Wales Fuel Check Scheme—are much more recent, having been introduced within the past five years. The Commission suggests there is merit in adopting a model based on Option 1, largely because this model is pro-competition compared with Option 2.

All these jurisdictions, when seeking to implement their own fuel price transparency scheme reviewed the existing options, including the WA model, and all since the implementation of that model have chosen to not implement the WA model in their state.

As has been repeated many times throughout this debate, the WA model is 20 years old. It predates the existence of apps and of technological capability for real-time reporting. It might have served WA well but consumers in South Australia deserve a scheme that is modern enough to suit our modern needs, and our current price-watching habits, and that is what the government model achieves.

I note, of course, that there has been a lot of talk about the four Cs by the Hon. Frank Pangallo of clarity, certainty, consistency and convenience for consumers. Well, there is a fifth C that Andrew Barr, the Chief Minister of the ACT has raised and that is 'capping' prices and that is what we could be doing in this chamber should you really want to give that price certainty to consumers. I commend the bill.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS) (ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 July 2020).

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:45): The challenge for our generation in relation to the climate emergency is to reduce our emissions in order to limit global warming to 1.5° Celsius above pre-industrial levels. This task will need to be tackled across all sectors of society and all parts of the economy. We need to reduce emissions in relation to energy, transport, industry and agriculture. The low-hanging fruit is the stationary energy sector; in other words, generating and using electricity and gas. Ultimately, we need to get rid of gas. Gas is a fossil fuel and its continued use is harming the planet.

Electricity, on the other hand, is here to stay. It can be generated without emissions through renewable generation options, such as wind, solar or hydro, and when used in combination with storage, such as batteries, solar thermal and pumped hydro, we can secure reliable, affordable and clean energy into the future. That is the supply side of the energy equation.

On the demand side, we have energy efficiency and energy productivity and we have government programs that encourage demand side responses and these programs are vital. For some years in South Australia, we have had the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme, which is to be replaced with a broader retail energy productivity scheme.

The bill before us is quite simple. Mechanically, the main thing it does is replace references to 'energy efficiency' with references to 'energy productivity'. Interestingly, that phrase is not defined in the bill. When we get into committee, I might explore that a bit further, but what is the difference between energy efficiency and energy productivity?

According to the Australian government's Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources website, being energy efficient means using less energy to achieve the same outcomes. Energy productivity is doing more using the same or less energy and that includes energy efficiency along with other ways to reduce energy costs. So it seems that all we are really doing in this bill is expanding the range of options that are available to us to deal with what the Chief Scientist, Professor Alan Finkel, described as a wicked trilemma: we want energy to be affordable, we want it to be secure so it is there when we need it and we want it generated in a way that does not harm the planet.

Whilst it is simplicity itself, I think that this bill probably does have some work to do. We know that dealing with the demand side of energy, rather than just the supply side, can deliver great outcomes for the community. In fact, the organisation ClimateWorks did a study three years ago and they basically calculated that dealing with the demand side could be the equivalent of taking two Hazelwood power stations out of action; in other words, dealing with the demand side had that corresponding decrease in the need for energy supply. So I think that demand management is absolutely critical in our challenge to decarbonise our economy and reduce climate change. It is a simple bill and, with those few words, the Greens will be supporting it.

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

SINGLE-USE AND OTHER PLASTIC PRODUCTS (WASTE AVOIDANCE) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 July 2020.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:49): I rise to speak today on this bill and indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. Waste is one of the most visible effects of human occupation across the planet, and unfortunately, by many measures, Australia is one of the most wasteful countries in the developed world.

Every year, the average Australian family produces enough rubbish to fill a three-bedroom house, producing about 2.25 kilograms of waste each per day. Eighty-five per cent of soft plastics from bags and packaging end up in landfill, and eight million tonnes of plastics are dumped in the world's oceans each year. Minute traces of human-made chemicals and plastics used in other parts of the world are now being detected in the snow that falls over Antarctica.

South Australia, and in particular the Labor Party in South Australia, have always been leaders in waste management, becoming the first state in Australia to introduce a container deposit

scheme, way back in 1977 under the Don Dunstan government. The beverage container act was one of the first pieces of environmental legislation to focus on a polluter-pays principle. The Rann government was also the first in Australia to legislate a ban on lightweight plastic shopping bags in supermarkets in 2009.

Various iterations of waste management strategies have been in place in South Australia for decades, with the 2015-20 version managed by Green Industries meeting most of the targets before the deadline for those strategies. South Australia had the highest diversion rate of waste to recycling in Australia in 2017-18. Of all waste generated in South Australia, 83.6 per cent was diverted from landfill. This equates to just under 4½ million tonnes of material not going to waste. Eighty-six per cent of recovered waste was recycled right here in South Australia.

Since 2003, the recycling rate has improved by nearly 22 per cent, and the resource recovery has increased from approximately two million tonnes to just over 4.4 million tonnes a year. The diversion and recovery rate means that 1¼ million tonnes of greenhouse gases are not being released, which is the same as planting two million trees or taking 316,000 cars off the road each year.

The waste management, resource recovery and recycling sectors provide employment for just under 5,000 South Australians. The market value of recovered resources in 2017-18 was \$356 million. Just before the most recent state election, the then Labor government announced a 30-year plan for the future of waste and resource recovery in South Australia, estimating that almost 5,000 extra jobs in waste and recycling could emerge in the future and targeting further reductions.

The opposition is broadly supportive of the proposed legislation. However, I indicate that we will be moving amendments of our own as well as supporting some of the others moved by the Hon. Mark Parnell, which will strengthen the bill and ensure that the effectiveness, or otherwise, of its implementation is known. This is not the end of the process but the beginning.

Consultation with industry, retail and disability groups was undertaken and showed broad support for the bill, with some issues raised in relation to the availability of alternatives, the workability of exemptions and the enforcement of the clauses. I look forward to the committee stage of this bill to investigate some of these concerns and to seek the government's support in strengthening this legislation through a number of the amendments.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:53): I rise to support the bill and note that it has been two years since the Greens introduced, in this very place, a bill to ban single-use plastics. It is wonderful to see a significant moment in this parliament where a government introduces such a bill. After a lengthy consultation process, it has been hugely encouraging to see the government moving on a bill such as this. Green ideas into power is why the Greens are here.

It is by now a well-known fact that mind-boggling amounts of plastic rubbish make their way into the environment, leading to horrible pollution and the harming of wildlife and damaging everyone's health. Despite ever-improving awareness and campaigning, our ability to recycle or properly dispose of plastics remains poor. Globally, one-third of all plastic produced becomes plastic waste, which makes its way into our environment.

During the debate on this bill in the other place, and indeed here in this chamber, we have heard members extol the virtues of this modern material. Of course, no-one is trying to deny the value and usefulness of plastic as a material, nor its pervasiveness in our lives. Indeed, plastic and certainly single-use plastics have greatly improved hygiene standards, but we have created a material that is almost too good: it is cheap, versatile and lasts a long time.

As we have grown increasingly reliant on single-use plastics and in particular their convenience, we have seen the growing negative risks and impacts of our rampant consumption of these products. The WWF summed it up in their 2019 report, entitled *Solving Plastic Pollution Through Accountability*, where they stated:

Plastic is not inherently bad; it is a man-made invention that has generated significant benefits for society. Unfortunately, the way industries and governments have managed plastic, and the way society has converted it into a disposable and single-use convenience, has transformed this innovation into a planetary environmental disaster.

Since the year 2000, we have used more plastic than all of the years before. While the issue of plastic pollution has only been around for a few decades, 75 per cent of all plastic ever produced has already become waste. The average person uses 53 kilos of plastic a year, leading us to collectively create a total of more than 300 million tonnes of plastic waste.

The production of plastic is increasingly cheap, versatile and reliable, supporting the development of disposable plastic products and practically ensuring that disposability is our global business model. Almost half of all plastic produced becomes waste in less than three years. Plastic packaging clogs up city sewer systems and chokes birds and marine life as it breaks down, looking like bits of food as it makes its way through waterways and into our wildlife, which starve while filling their bellies with deceptive plastic scraps.

As these products break down they leach toxic chemicals and, in the process of breaking down, which takes years and years and years, plastic products are worn into smaller and smaller particles. Microplastics are now making their way into the food we eat, the water we drink and the air we breathe, which will no doubt have serious health implications. The full effects of microplastics on the natural world and society are still unknown. Many knowledge gaps on the impacts of plastic pollution still exist, including the economic impact of land-based pollution and the effects of microplastic ingestion on humans and other animal species.

Carbon dioxide emissions are growing each year from increased production and incineration of waste plastic, and plastic production consumes 4 per cent of total oil and gas demand annually. In 2016, the most recent year for which that data is available, the production of plastic resulted in approximately two billion metric tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions. We are now seeing research predicting that there will be more plastic in the ocean than fish by the year 2025, five years from now; that is horrifying.

About 40 per cent of plastics that we consume today are single use: items such as cutlery, plates, food containers and electronics packaging. While the legislation before us today only tackles a fraction of the various single-use plastic products that become waste at best and serious pollutants at worst, it is not hard to imagine the environmental benefits of seriously reducing our consumption of these products.

In their report on plastics, the WWF estimated that on a global level, if we were to phase out single-use plastics, we would lower plastic waste generation to 188 million metric tonnes, a 57 per cent reduction from the business as usual scenario we have now. We are far from the first jurisdiction seeking to do this. In fact, around 112 countries, states and cities around the world have already imposed bans on various single-use plastic goods, and the list of these restrictions continues to grow.

The East African Legislative Assembly has passed a bill to ban the manufacture, sale, import and use of certain plastic bags across its six member states, with a combined population of approximately 186 million people. In October 2018, the European Union parliament approved a ban on a number of single-use plastic items by the year 2021, along with the requirement to reduce plastic in food packaging by 25 per cent by 2025 and cut plastic content in cigarette filters 80 per cent by the year 2030.

The European Commission is phasing out plastic cotton buds, cutlery, plates, straws and drink stirrers in all of its member states, and single-use plastic bottles with detachable lids are also being banned. I note that we in this chamber, due to the COVID restrictions, currently use plastic bottles each and every day that we sit. Today, I have chosen not to do that, not just because we are debating this bill but certainly this bill is a timely reminder that we can and must do better.

This bill is a welcome and necessary first step itself, particularly with the amendments moved by my colleague the Hon. Mark Parnell, but we cannot just pass this legislation and think that we have done enough. In getting to this legislation, it seems that some products and issues have already been put in the too-hard basket for the time being. Even if we are satisfied with the types of single-use plastics that we are banning in this place today, there is still a lot more that we can and must do.

There need to be incentives for producers to create and use products that are not single-use. The cost, both the environmental cost and the economic cost, is not borne equally by those

responsible for plastic pollution. While plastic is cheap to produce, UN estimates tell us that ocean plastic pollution alone costs US\$8 billion each year as it impacts fisheries, tourism and maritime operators. Falling production costs have resulted in the accelerated production of virgin plastics and a continued low uptake of recycled materials. Plastic can be more expensive to recycle than it is worth because the true cost of production is not reflected in its price. Manufacturers need to be responsible for the cost of cleaning up the products that they design for us to throw away.

While we need to have better recycling practices and greater uptake in the use of recycled materials, it is not a silver bullet and it does come with limitations. If we continue to deal with and use plastics in the same way, many factors will make it hard to recycle plastic, from its physical characteristics to insufficient market demand for many types of recycled plastics. Then there are issues of contamination and products made of different types of materials that are difficult to separate. Takeaway coffee cups are the perfect example of this, as my honourable colleague, Mark Parnell, is fond of reminding me.

In particular, in that case, if they are recycled, they can only at most be recycled about 10 times before their fibres become too short to be reprocessed. Plastic converters and manufacturers of products made out of virgin plastic have limited responsibility for the downstream impacts of their actions, causing a prevalence of single-use plastic business models. Plastic products often have a complex blend of additional materials that reduce the cost of production. However, this also reduces the recycling potential of these mixed material products by introducing impurities and contaminants and increasing the sorting and cleaning costs.

We also see manufacturers who fail to design resource-efficient products that enable effective end-of-life plastic waste management. Due to choices made in the design and manufacturing processes, those creating the products experience significant benefits from a cheaper product but subsequently increase the cost of plastic waste management for those downstream in the product's life cycle. As the WWF states in that same report, 'Measures should be put in place to ensure the global price of plastic reflects its full life cycle cost to nature and society.'

This is not a far-fetched idea. I think it is the logical step from here. This is already happening in Europe, where there are some places where if companies do not design or enable products to be re-used or recycled they are penalised. A European Commission statement has outlined a shift in responsibility from consumers and onto producers for the entire lifespan of their products, from their production right through to the disposal.

As that quote states, producers will help cover the cost of waste management and clean-up as well as awareness-raising measures for food containers, packets and wrappers, drinks containers and cups, tobacco products with filters, wet wipes, balloons and lightweight plastic bags. The industry will also be given incentives to develop less polluting alternatives for these products. We need to look at the life cycle of products and move towards closed-loop systems. Otherwise, the future of our waste is looking grim. If we do not change our consumption, our plastic consumption is predicted to double by 2030, with dire environmental consequences.

The Greens welcome this bill. We look forward to its speedy passage, hopefully with the Greens' amendment of my honourable colleague included, but we cannot wash our hands of this issue once that is done. We need to move towards better accountability for those responsible for the negative consequences of the products that they produce.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (18:04): I rise today to support the proposed bill, in relation to single-use plastic products, with amendments. The legislation aims to prohibit single-use plastic drinking straws, cutlery and drink stirrers in relation to sale, supply and distribution. This bill is one of many, being part of a staged approach, to eliminating single-use plastics. Twelve months later we will look at banning polystyrene cups, bowls, plates and clam-shell containers.

Incorporated in the bill is a six-month transition period, enabling businesses to explore and institute alternate products, replacing single-use plastics for sale, supply and distribution. In addition, the amendments put forward by the Hon. Mark Parnell include provisions for reporting and review some three years after the commencement of the act, as occurred when legislation was introduced banning plastic bags some years ago.

The intention of the bill is to focus upon recycling and waste resource management that diverts waste away from landfill and focuses on the development of green industries. The result of these initiatives will be reduced waste and pollution in our oceans, rivers, beaches and parks, which in turn will reduce the detrimental effects on our marine wildlife.

For many years South Australia has led the campaign on waste reduction, environmental protection and conservation. This began in the 1970s, with a littering campaign and the institution of signs, as well as penalties for littering, moving from a focus on personal responsibility to developing a scheme for recycling with the container deposit legislation in the 1980s, and more recently a ban on single-use plastic bag legislation, prevalent in the supermarket industry, which focused on waste avoidance.

I am proud to say that these initiatives were all introduced by state Labor governments and supported by the Greens through the years. Single-use plastics require attention and action. As the evidence indicates, they are playing their role in accelerating climate change by contributing to greenhouse emissions from the production process through to the way these products are managed as a waste product. Single-use plastics are, in essence, throwaway products, on which communities have become dependent because they are cheap and convenient. It has meant that, as a by-product, we are creating waste at an alarming rate.

The current pandemic highlights the instances where single-use plastics are essential, especially in the area of health. Without single-use surgical masks, gloves and gowns our healthcare workers would be placed at greater risk. Although several studies have released promising results on reducing the waste of hospital materials, there is little evidence to suggest that another product can be used in place of single-use plastics at this point in time.

According to the experts, we produce 300 million tonnes of plastic each year worldwide, half of which is for single-use items. There is no doubt that recycling, rather than throwing away plastic products, would play an important role in reducing the carbon footprint of plastic products. Alarming, 91 per cent of all plastic is not recycled. Instead, single-use plastics in particular find their way into landfill or polluting the environment. Plastic product pollution does not decompose; rather, it simply breaks down into smaller and smaller pieces known as microplastics, and end up in the water to be eaten by wildlife and ingested by humans.

Single-use plastic products are visible on our streets and in our parks, but also in our rivers and in the ocean. There is a direct correlation between plastic litter on our streets, which is washed away by rain and ends up in our storm drains, into rivers and streams, causing further pollution. Our marine animals bear the brunt of this influx of litter and garbage polluting their environment. Whales, sea birds, turtles and fish have all been found with stomachs full of plastic rubbish.

Scientists estimate that there will be more plastic in our oceans by weight in comparison to fish by the year 2050. It is for these reasons that we must address the pollution and the detrimental environmental effects of single-use plastics. It will at least go some way to preventing millions of tonnes of plastic from entering our waste stream each year and represents a first step in working towards a cleaner and safer environment for both humans and animals that share the land, waterways and oceans of our planet.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:09): I rise to speak in support of the government's Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) Bill 2020. As a South Australian, I am very pleased with the success of our container deposit scheme, introduced by the visionary Dunstan Labor government in 1977. Can I say for the record that my son is also a great fan of that scheme because it means that every time we go to the depot he gets a little extra pocket money for his toys.

The PRESIDENT: You have outsourced pocket money.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I have. We always try to guess how much we are going to get prior to the visit, and I am always way off, but that is another story. For 35 years we were the only state to have a container deposit scheme. I am sure that, like me, you have often marvelled at how many plastic bottles and cans live on the roadside verges once you cross the border into Victoria because the difference is quite remarkable. That jurisdiction has been very slow off the mark, only recently announcing that they, too, will be introducing a container deposit legislation scheme.

We were also one of the first states to ban the use of plastic shopping bags. For the record, I think it is worth noting that a plastic bag has a working life of approximately 15 minutes on average. We had all become so accustomed to using them up until they were banned here. I think there is something to be said about the replacement of those bags with the 15¢ plastic reusable bag and the 20¢ paper bags in terms of whether one problem has really substituted itself for another and provided some forms of extra revenue.

Studies have shown that a paper bag needs to be used three times to counter the negative impacts it has on the environment, so it would be interesting to see a scientific evaluation of that ban and, specifically, the replacement of those plastic bags with reusable bags and paper bags. Do we actually re-use or recycle the reusable plastic and paper bags or do they also end up in landfill and the marine environment?

It is nevertheless encouraging to see more cutting-edge legislation introduced to reduce plastic waste in South Australia even further. This will no doubt have a significant impact not just on our state but nationally and globally. Although studies have found all single-use items, including those made of bamboo, wood, cardboard and paper, are harmful to the environment, dealing with single-use plastics, polystyrene foam and oxo-degradable plastics is an excellent first step.

I think it is worth highlighting some facts here. Packaging is the largest end-use market segment, accounting for over 40 per cent of total plastic usage. Over the last 10 years we have produced more plastics than during the whole of the last century. Overall, better developed countries produce more plastic but are also the ones with the infrastructure in place to recycle best. It is then up to the population to recycle effectively; however, globally, only 14 per cent of all plastics worldwide is properly recycled. The other 86 per cent ends up in landfill.

The EU, Australia and some parts of Africa, specifically Rwanda and South Africa, have implemented effective bans on plastic bags. Banning these bags has only ever been proven to be effective when there is a cheap alternative freely available to consumers, particularly in poorer nations. The EU is set to eliminate all single-use plastics across Europe by 2021. Whether that is going to change as a result of COVID remains to be seen.

In terms of industries, packaging is the dominant sector in the use of plastics, globally accounting for 42 per cent or 146 million tonnes. This figure is followed by plastics used in construction, with 65 million tonnes. Since packaging is responsible for almost half of global plastic waste, it is worth noting also the breakdown: we have 141 million tonnes in packaging, 42 million tonnes in textiles, 38 million tonnes in other sectors, 37 million tonnes in consumer and institutional products, 17 million tonnes in transportation, 13 million tonnes in electricals, 13 million tonnes in building and construction and one million tonnes in industrial machinery. They are staggering figures.

While plastic bags are the most popular, single-use plastics are quickly becoming the next target. Just in terms of Australian stats, in 2017-18 a total of 3.4 million tonnes of plastic were consumed in Australia and a total of 320,000 tonnes of plastic were recycled, which is an increase of 10 per cent from the previous year. The national plastics recycling rate was just 9.4 per cent. Of the 320,000 tonnes of plastic collected for reprocessing, 145,700 tonnes were exported for reprocessing.

COVID has increased our use of single-use items made of plastic and other materials. I reflect on the fact that I went for a coffee the other day with someone. Between two people we were given two cups of coffee in paper cups, two cups of water in paper cups, two sets of cutlery wrapped in plastic, when we did not need two sets of full cutlery, and two plates, which were barely dirtied by the food that was put on them. You cannot help but reflect on the waste when you are sitting there and you see this pile of cardboard and plastic that has been placed in front of you as a result of the measures that have been put in place as a result of COVID.

I reflect on the multiplier effect in terms of the number of patrons who would have walked through the doors of that same shop during that day and multiply that by the number of shops across Adelaide, and then all our jurisdictions, and it is a mind-blowing amount of takeaway containers, plastics and whatnot that we are using.

Many times, previously single wrapped or not wrapped at all are now double wrapped and reusable cups are now not permitted to be refilled. Of course, there will be some medical and health

reasons why very limited use of these items will need to continue. We accept that. I just make the point for the record that now more than ever I think we are all becoming aware of our over-reliance on these products.

At least we can deal with the single-use plastics to begin with because it is these that have the greatest direct environmental impact and present particular threats to marine life. I am pleased to see that the list of prohibited plastic products in the bill extends not only to plastic straws, cutlery and stirrers but also to the polystyrene cups, bowls, plates and containers. I note that further items can be added to the list by regulation.

I want to highlight the contribution of the Hon. Mark Parnell, who had a very similar bill to this introduced some two years ago. I think it is only appropriate and fitting that we acknowledge the Hon. Mark Parnell's work in this area. When he introduced this bill the initiatives had begun to gain traction overseas and were based largely on the EU initiatives, which did go a lot further than is being proposed even today. Whilst the bill lists what the honourable member refers to as 'the low-hanging fruit', the EU list of products is a lot more exhaustive, and for good reason.

If we look at some of our EU countries—and I think it is worth looking at them—Italy consumes about 2.1 million tonnes of plastic each year; Spain, about 3.84 million; and Greece uses one million coffee cups a day—per day. They are a coffee culture. These are some of the places that will be taking the drastic measures that have been outlined by the Hon. Mark Parnell and the Hon. Tammy Franks. France, Germany and Spain, I think, are amongst some of the worst offenders, despite Greece using one million cups per day.

As I said, I note that further items can be added to the list by regulation. I look forward to the expansion of this list to include a lot of the unnecessary packaging that we find in a lot of our fresh food, primarily in supermarkets. I do not know if it annoys anyone as much as it annoys me, but I am sure it annoys all of us to see bananas wrapped in plastic on a styrofoam tray. It really beggars belief.

I look forward to including the huge number of single-use coffee cups and drink containers, cotton bud sticks, flossing sticks, sticks attached to balloons and so many other items that we really can live without. Oxo-degradable plastic will now also be banned and cannot be manufactured, which is a great step.

It is good news that local manufacturers who may be impacted by this legislation have indicated that they support it, and many of our leading local manufacturers—like Detmold, for example—have demonstrated their ability to adapt and offer a diverse range of product lines so that they are not solely reliant on selling products that will be prohibited by this legislation.

As I said, globally over 300 million tonnes of plastic is produced each year; disturbingly, this trend is increasing not decreasing. Those of us who have travelled to Bali or the Solomon Islands or Fiji would, I am sure, be aware of the huge quantities of plastics, rubber and wooden waste that washes up on those beaches. The Mediterranean tourism season also sees a huge influx of wasteful products being used in those countries, and of course they all end up in our oceans.

Unfortunately, scientists have discovered that plastic bags in the marine environment take on some of the characteristics of food, thus making them an attractive but fatal source of food for marine life, and we have heard other members speak about the same thing. If you have seen the results of containers falling off ships and their contents washing ashore along the east coast you would have observed that a great many of these items were single-use plastics.

Clearly, there is a need for a wide range of global solutions to be implemented by all jurisdictions to deal with plastic waste, to decrease its manufacture and use and prevent it from entering landfill and marine environments. Of course part of the solution is preventing the discharge of plastics into the ocean, but the most proactive solution is to do as this bill intends at the beginning of the plastic lifecycle; that is, to ban certain single-use plastic items and to continue to ban more plastic items over time.

I am just as guilty as the next person in terms of my over-reliance on plastics. I think at one point or another we have all become over-reliant on plastics because they are extremely convenient, but the reality is that that convenience has, for a long time, prevailed over environmental benefits. However, I think it is fair to say that some of us were ahead of our time.

We have now reached a tipping point, and it is critical that these measures take full advantage of that tipping point. To that end, I note there are a number of amendments filed aimed at strengthening this bill which we will consider favourably. In the interim I commend the government for introducing this bill to ban single-use plastics and other materials, and confirm our support for it. More importantly, I commend the ongoing work of the Hon. Mark Parnell for getting us here in the first place. With those words, I indicate our support for the bill.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (18:23): I would like to thank honourable members for their second reading contributions, particularly the Hon. Kyam Maher, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos and the Hon. Connie Bonaros. This bill further demonstrates our state's leadership in waste management and recycling, but I acknowledge that others have gone before.

Indeed, I do not think anyone has mentioned the Hon. Gail Gago and her plastic bag ban, which some of us at the time were sceptical about. When I was in my late 20s and early 30s and still house sitting with other people I used to embarrass my housemates by taking the calico bags in preference to those shopping bags, so there are certainly a number of us who have had concerns about plastics for a long time.

The government is aware that other states and territories are watching the progress of this legislation closely, with the intention of potentially following our lead. The government first raised the issue of addressing single-use plastic products with the community in early 2019 through the 'Turning the tide on single-use plastic products' discussion paper. The response is clear that South Australians want the government to take action on single-use plastic products.

A number of honourable members spoke very passionately about their concerns with these ongoing products and their impact on the environment. In response, the Minister for Environment and Water committed to developing this legislation, and I am pleased to support its progress through the house.

The government notes that there are members of this chamber as well as members of the community who want the bill to go further and address other types of single-use plastic products. We need to be mindful of impacts to organisations and businesses, particularly as they transition back into their new operating environments as coronavirus social distancing restrictions are eased.

The government considers that businesses will be able to transition to alternative products to those listed in the bill relatively easily. The delayed commencement of the prohibition on the expanded polystyrene food service items and oxo-degradable plastic products will also support the transition.

The legislation contains a framework to add other products to the list of prohibited plastic products via regulations, subject to the consultation process outlined in clause 6(2) of the bill. This will allow single-use and other plastic products to be considered for prohibition in consultation with key stakeholders and the community, prior to being added through the subordinate legislation process rather than via a new act of parliament.

As members are aware, parliamentary scrutiny of regulations is applied through the Legislative Review Committee, as well as motions of disallowance. I would like to reiterate the importance of the exemption that will allow for the continued sale, supply and distribution of single-use plastic drinking straws for people who require them due to disability or medical equipment.

The government is committed to inclusiveness and will be implementing a broad exemption via regulations to allow continued access to single-use plastic drinking straws on request without people having to provide any proof of their requirement. The government will be undertaking communications activities in the lead-up to and during implementation of the legislation to help businesses transition to alternative products.

The communications will also reiterate to businesses that it will not be an offence under the legislation to supply single-use plastic drinking straws to people who request them due to disability or medical requirement. Businesses will also be assisted in communicating this information to their customers.

The Single-Use Plastics Stakeholder Taskforce established by the government to assist and inform the development of this legislation, which comprises business, industry, retail, disability, local government and environmental group representatives, is also helping to inform these communications activities. I note the opposition and the Greens have placed some amendments on file, and I look forward to discussing the amendments further in committee. I understand the opposition has some particular questions that we will endeavour to provide answers to before the committee stage of the debate.

Bill read a second time.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (QUARANTINE FEES AND PENALTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 18:29 the council adjourned until Wednesday 22 July 2020 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***SMITH, MS A.M.**

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (3 June 2020).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised:

South Australian ministers were made aware of the death of Ann Marie Smith on Friday 15 May 2020.

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (4 June 2020).

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

The Minister for Education received the report on the review and the recommendations of the committee as to the retention, closure or amalgamation of the schools subject to the review.

The minister gave consideration to the report and the recommendations of the committee that conducted the review under the (now repealed) Education Act 1972.

The minister was aware that the report did not need to be tabled in parliament unless, of course, the minister made a decision contrary to the recommendations of a review committee. However, the minister was also aware that there was a high level of interest in the findings of the review and so determined that he would table the report to ensure all members have full access to the report, whether required to or not.

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (16 June 2020).

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

All review committee members were given the opportunity to access the full submissions. There were three full sets available at any point in time so there was no time pressure if a member desired a full set to read.

At no point was there a filtering process. There was a process to summarise each submission so that the names and contact details of the person or group who provided the submission were not provided to the members and their submission details were summarised for ease of reference.

SMITH, MS A.M.

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (17 June 2020).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Attorney-General has provided the following advice:

Although some cases, requiring further histological, neuropathological and/or other examinations, may take 12 to 16 months before a final report is prepared, less complex cases can be reported in shorter time frames. Cases involving matters of public interest are completed as soon as possible.

Preliminary findings into the cause of death are peer-reviewed and reported to the State Coroner on the day of the post-mortem. In cases involving suspicious circumstances or criminal offending, Forensic Science SA staff including the pathologist collaborate with SAPOL and the Coroner's office to assist with ongoing investigations.

The following recently introduced measures will all contribute to streamlining the post-mortem process and in doing so reduce the backlog in post-mortem reports and provide assistance to grieving families:

- The parliamentary amendment to the Coroner's Act of 2003 enabling the State Coroner to make a finding of 'undetermined natural causes',
- The installation of a CT scanner at Forensic Science SA enabling the pathologists to advise the State Coroner of the most appropriate examination to determine the medical cause of death, whether that is a full post-mortem, a partial post-mortem or a CT scan and external examination only.
- The temporary employment of staff to assist in supporting roles for the post-mortem process; mortuary technical support, administration and medical typing.

GOVERNMENT BAD DEBTS

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (30 June 2020).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been provided the following advice:

1.. The Department of Treasury and Finance is not aware of any government agencies changing their bad or doubtful debt write-off policies during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Whilst debt recovery arrangements were temporarily relaxed during the peak period of the pandemic, this did not include waiving any debts. Rather, the terms of recovery were extended.

It is likely that there will be some increase in bad or doubtful debt expenses as a result of COVID-19, however figures are unable to be provided at this time. Further information will become available as part of the finalisation of audited financial statements for 2019-20, which include updates to bad or doubtful debt provisions and expected credit losses. This information will be presented to parliament in October as per standard practice.

2. As at 30 June 2020, the total balance of ticket credits held by the state government for cancelled flights is approximately \$775,000. This includes those flights cancelled due to COVID-19 and other cancellations that have occurred as part of the normal course of business.

At this time, the government has not received notification from any airline that the credits held will not be honoured. On this basis, no money has been lost.

In respect of Virgin Australia, the value of the credits is approximately \$75,000. It is understood that these credits are still being honoured under the current voluntary administration arrangements, however it remains unknown whether this will continue to be the case following any subsequent business restructure.

Typically, ticket credits are valid for a period of 12 months, however due to COVID-19 airline policies are changing regularly and, in most cases, favourably for customers. For example, the state government's ticket credits with Qantas, which represent over half of the total amount, are currently valid to December 2022.