

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 17 March 2021

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.B. Teague) took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (BUSHFIRES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 February 2021.)

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (10:32): I rise on behalf of the people of Stuart to speak on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Bushfires) Amendment Bill, brought to us previously by the member for Waite. Quite understandably, the member for Waite brought this proposal to our parliament largely in the wake of the Adelaide Hills bushfires, not only for that reason but largely because of it.

I certainly understand it. As a member of parliament who has had several bushfires in my electorate over the last 11 years I have been in this place, I share the anger—I think 'anger' is probably the right sort of word to use—that I understand the member for Waite has with regard to people who deliberately light fires and the harm and damage that come out of that. The intent with regard to bringing this bill forward is something that I certainly understand.

The key feature of the bill is to amend section 85B of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act by increasing the maximum penalty for the offence of causing a bushfire from 20 years up to life imprisonment. It also requires a court finding a defendant guilty of the offence to make an order under section 124 of the Sentencing Act 2017 that the defendant pay compensation for injury, loss or damage resulting from the offence. There are some exceptions. Very briefly, that is what the member's bill seeks to do. I share the sentiment behind wanting to bring it forward.

In our electorate of Stuart, we have had numerous bushfires. Some started by accident and some started by nature. Some people contend that they could have been small bushfires started by accident or by nature that, through negligence, were not contained properly and then developed into much bigger and much more damaging bushfires. I can think of at least one bushfire we have had that was started allegedly through negligence, by careless and probably recklessly careless management of fire. We even had another bushfire started in our electorate, an out of control bushfire, that was started by a deliberate burn.

Although I was not there, I am very reliably informed by people who were right there—as in metres away—that the person under the previous government in charge of that government-managed prescribed burn to try to prevent bushfires and bushfire damage down the track was told by others, 'Don't do it. The weather has changed. It's the wrong day. Do not go ahead with this prescribed burn today. It will be a disaster.' The decision was made by the person in charge to continue anyway and, yes, it turned out to be a disaster. It was more environmental and commercial with regard to property than it was with regard to loss of homes or life. Thankfully, there were no losses of homes or lives or anything.

Bushfires can start in many different ways and often it is very difficult afterwards to know exactly what the cause was, and I use these examples: purely nature, lightning strike, somebody not managing a government-sanctioned burn-off, or perhaps even starting it when they should not have done so, or a person whose legal burn-off of rubbish on their own property gets out of control. It is very hard and, yes, of course, I take the point very clearly that this private member's bill is trying to address the very serious crime of deliberately starting a fire and when that fire does very serious damage.

I have to say that we already have those sorts of protections in place. This bill would duplicate penalties that are already available in South Australia's Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. In South Australia, currently there is a maximum penalty of life imprisonment when a person causes property damage by fire or explosives or in cases where there has been a loss of life. SA's laws are already consistent with those in Western Australia and Queensland and significantly stricter than those in other jurisdictions, such as the ACT and Victoria. I fully understand the sentiment behind this bill, but I am not convinced that it provides more than we already have in place at the moment and/or provides anything additional we need to have.

With regard to bushfires, we have had situations where farm machinery, agricultural equipment, has started a bushfire and people have died. Those circumstances are taken extraordinarily seriously and there is absolutely no suggestion whatsoever by me that in the case that occurred in the last 11 years since I have been a member of parliament it was anything other than an accident. I know the member is not looking to include situations like that in this bill.

If a person who had the authority to start a prescribed government burn was advised not to by other very capable people on the scene at the time and that person with authority chose to proceed anyway, and if, as was thankfully not the case, a circumstance like that ended up with, at the extreme, loss of life or any of the other potential outcomes suggested to be covered here, would that person fall under this bill?

That would have to go to the court. Yes, the person had the authority and, yes, the person had no intention of deliberately harming people but, yes, the person did light the fire that did cause that and did so in opposition to or without heeding the advice of others who believed that was a very likely outcome. It is very hard to say. Courts could spend years dealing with those issues.

I will say again that I am not sure this bill protects our state or, most importantly, the people the member for Waite and no doubt all of us want to protect. Would this bill actually give them greater protection? On the other hand, would it also provide greater penalties to people who fall foul of this and have clearly deliberately and knowingly done the wrong thing that ends up with this kind of catastrophic outcome? I do not think so.

I am not a lawyer. I take advice from friends and colleagues who are more learned than me in this area—at the top of the list, of course, is the Attorney-General. I do not claim to be a lawyer, but I do claim to be pretty well across the fundamentals of what happens on the ground when there is a bushfire. I am not only talking about fighting the fire but I am talking about dealing with people and the impacts on them during the fire and in the days and weeks and months and years following bushfires.

It is absolutely, completely, 100 per cent disgraceful, disgusting or whatever the strongest polite word I can think of for somebody to deliberately light a fire. Of course, it is even worse if the consequences are as grave as those considered in this bill. I think we already have the right tools at our disposal to deal with those unacceptable circumstances.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (10:42): I rise to speak on the bill, which seeks to amend section 85B of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 by increasing the maximum penalty for causing a bushfire from 20 years' imprisonment to life imprisonment. It also requires a court to require a person found guilty of an offence under section 85B to pay compensation for injury, loss or damage under section 124 of the Sentencing Act 2017.

I make very clear that any act that causes a fire is a despicable act. We know all too well the destruction and the devastation that fires, particularly bushfires, can cause. I fully appreciate the motivations of the member for Waite in moving this bill. As the Attorney outlined, South Australia has strong laws that create offences for acts of arson and causing property damage by fire as well as offences for placing human life at risk.

Section 85 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act makes it an offence for a person to intentionally or recklessly damage property by fire or explosives without lawful excuse and the maximum penalty for such acts is life imprisonment. Section 85B creates a specific offence for causing a bushfire, and the maximum penalty is 20 years' imprisonment.

Where an intentionally or deliberately lit fire or bushfire poses a risk to human life, a person can be charged with endangering life under section 29 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which has a maximum penalty of 15 years' imprisonment or 18 if the offence is of an aggravated nature. Where an intentionally or deliberately lit fire or bushfire results in the loss of human life, a person can be charged with manslaughter or murder, both of which attract maximum penalties of life imprisonment.

We have committed to doing all we can to prevent acts of arson. Each fire danger season, South Australia Police target suspected arsonists through what is known as Operation Nomad. This season, Operation Nomad has continued. This season, SAPOL has been assisted by the State Emergency Service (SES) in monitoring more than 80 persons of interest and improving bushfire prevention.

I am very grateful to have the opportunity to speak on this bill, and I can say from the outset that I certainly appreciate where the member for Waite is coming from in moving the bill. All members in the place, and indeed all South Australians, are all too aware of the devastation that bushfires can cause. Sir, you saw in recent times in your own electorate the devastation that bushfires can bring.

Since my time as Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, I have had the privilege of visiting probably by now more than 50 CFS units across the state. I am constantly in awe of the hard work, the determination and the commitment these volunteers show out in our community. These brigades are located in communities all around the state, and many have been affected by bushfires in recent years.

As I said, these volunteers are in communities right across what is a very vast space in our state. Visiting those fire-affected communities, and speaking with those who risk their lives fighting bushfires, makes it absolutely unimaginable to me that a person would be prepared to cause such physical, but also emotional, pain and destruction.

Just recently, I visited the Paracombe CFS. The Paracombe CFS is currently in the member for Newland's electorate, but I think after the election it may be in the member for Schubert's electorate, unfortunately for the member for Newland. It is a lovely part of the world. I visited the Paracombe CFS, amongst other brigades, and I heard harrowing stories from long-term CFS volunteers about their experiences fighting bushfires.

One volunteer was a group officer during the Sampson Flat bushfires of recent times. That person spent an agonising amount of time not knowing whether a crew of his was actually safe during that catastrophe, as the fire consumed the area in which they were allocated. I certainly cannot imagine how traumatic it would have been for this particular group officer and the families of the crew members, who were constantly seeking updates about their loved ones. There are thousands of CFS volunteers with similar stories and experiences right across the state.

To deliberately cause a bushfire is to deliberately cause suffering and loss to South Australians. We know that South Australia already faces enough risk from bushfires that unfortunately ignite naturally due to things like lightning, for example. Having seen the destruction that bushfires cause, and having heard the stories of those who risk their lives fighting bushfires, I think there is no doubt that anyone who deliberately causes a bushfire is unsuitable to be a free member of our community. So I empathise with where the member for Waite is coming from with this bill and I share his commitment to ensuring that South Australian communities are as protected from bushfires as possible.

South Australia has strong laws that ensure people who cause bushfires and place lives at risk are appropriately dealt with. Section 85 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act makes it an offence for a person to intentionally or recklessly damage property by fire or explosives without lawful excuse. The maximum penalty for that is life imprisonment. Section 85B creates a specific offence of causing a bushfire. The maximum penalty is 20 years' imprisonment.

Where an intentionally or deliberately lit fire or bushfire poses a risk to human life, a person can be charged with endangering life under section 29 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act which has a maximum penalty of 15 years' imprisonment, or 18 years for an aggravated offence. Where an intentionally or deliberately lit fire or bushfire results in the loss of human life, a person can be charged with manslaughter or even murder, both of which attract maximum penalties of life imprisonment.

Importantly, our efforts to combat acts of arson and causing bushfires are not limited to just after the event. Every bushfire season, South Australia Police stands up Operation Nomad, which focuses on preventing deliberate, reckless and negligent acts that may cause bushfires. During Operation Nomad, SAPOL also monitors persons of interests who are known arsonists. This bushfire season, SAPOL has proactively monitored, and continues to monitor, over 80 persons of interest.

I also acknowledge that this bushfire season South Australia Police is also being assisted by about 40 SES volunteers. They have been providing very welcome support to South Australia Police through the COVID-19 pandemic. The Marshall Liberal government has zero tolerance for deliberate or reckless acts that cause bushfires. We have strong laws to ensure that those who seek to cause bushfires are brought to justice.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:52): I rise to speak to the Criminal Law Consolidation (Bushfires) Amendment Bill 2021. I certainly appreciate the sentiment the member for Waite has in bringing this bill to the house. As a CFS firefighter and landowner, as I have mentioned in this place many times, either fighting fires on the frontline or mopping up after many in operations—twice on Kangaroo Island and once at Sedan, just outside my electorate currently—I know that bushfires are a terrible thing.

I have been witness to the effects of Ash Wednesday in 1983 and have seen the effects of bushfires right across the state. The Cudlee Creek fire affected Harrogate in my electorate and it was fortunate that the town itself was saved. Sadly, much property was lost and there was a life lost very sadly. Also, there have been many fires down through the South-East recently around Keilira, Kingston and the big one at Lucindale.

There were a couple in my electorate about 15 months ago, the Carcuma fire out the back of Coonalpyn and, more recently, on 19 November last year during the pause, we had the Yumali-Netherton fire. As I have said in this place before, being someone who has fought a few fires, I have had a couple of burn-offs accidentally get away for a minute and I have had to deal with that. But that is what happens in farming.

We have managed to beat them as well, so you do learn what you need to do. I must say there was a time with the Yumali-Netherton fire when we had to make a decision whether to save a house or not and it was within seconds of pulling out. If I did not have hose reels on my fire unit, we would not have stayed because I had to put the safety of my crew first, which included both my young sons.

Certainly, in regard to the Cherry Gardens fire, which was the impetus for the member for Waite bringing forward this legislation, what a disgrace. It appears that either a former or serving CFS volunteer decided they would allegedly commit arson. My understanding is that on that afternoon the Cherry Gardens brigade were at their headquarters and able to deploy very, very quickly when this fire started. There appear to have been multiple ignition points, up to about 10 I believe. It was such a disgraceful action.

We have seen this disgraceful action across the state in previous times when serial fire lighters have flagrantly lit fires. We have seen it impact throughout the Adelaide Hills recently, as I said, at the Cherry Gardens fire. I have seen it impact the Rockley area, which over a period of a few years suffered close to five significant fires in the area between Harrogate, Callington and Murray Bridge, out the back there. They were significant fires with lots of land lost and some property, as in housing and buildings, lost.

When there are incidents closer to urban areas, especially where they get lit up, probably only because of population density there is more significant risk to life. This could have had a far worse outcome had it not been for the volunteers who were ready to go and those other volunteers and firefighters who turned up very, very quickly to combat this blaze. This could have had far worse effects.

We already know from previous studies what could happen with a major event. This was done several years ago in the Blackwood area; there could be up to 300 deaths. Some of these places, and I include Mount Barker in this conversation, have narrow streets, narrow roads. I believe there are certainly some places that are too dangerous, if it is really on, for a CFS crew to even attempt to go down. That is a real issue.

I just do not understand why anyone would think it is fun to light a fire on purpose. It is just such a disgraceful act because the risk is not just to buildings, property or farmland; the biggest risk is the loss of life and major injury.

Young Damien Heym helped fight the Yumali-Netherton fire, and he is now in a skin-tight suit for a couple of years because he got burnt badly trying to do his bit in the fire. It good to see him up and about, getting things done. His family, Sharon and his kids, and others are giving great support to get him on the way to mend. I personally know people who have been severely burnt. Sadly, we saw it on Kangaroo Island with the loss of Dick Lang and his son Clayton in that horrific incident. I do not know if I could think of anything worse than dying in a bushfire.

We must do all we can to prevent this happening. I understand the sentiment of the member for Waite, but I also understand, as described earlier by other members, that the legislation is in place, and perhaps it is up to the courts to impose the tough penalties that are required so that people know the implications of what could happen—especially to try to stop people repeating these actions.

It is disgraceful even in this day and age that not only does this happen but that we also have to have a watchlist of firefighters or potential firefighters. I do not know how big that list is, but it is significant enough for police to knock on doors—and I commend them for their work. It is significant enough for police to have vehicles stationed generally throughout the Hills in those areas that are more densely populated and further out than where I am at Coomandook, to look for the serial arsonists and check whether they are home. If they are not home, they have to check that they are not up to no good, so to speak.

I do not know what people think they have to prove doing this. It is just destruction on a grand scale. They would surely know that if you have a 40-plus degree day, especially, and a bit of wind about, there is a very high potential that someone could lose their life, let alone that major property damage could occur. On this side, we certainly believe the measures are already there in different legislation to get the right outcome.

In my closing few seconds I would like to commend all our firefighters, whether they be CFS, whether they be MFS, whether they be Aerotech and the other fly boys and girls who fight from the air, whether it be all the people associated with farm fire units, or whether it be the people who keep people on the ground fed and watered, including the Salvation Army. They put in a magnificent effort in keeping us all safe. The people who go out causing these acts of arson are the worst of the worst.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:02): I rise to speak to this bill, and thank the member for Waite for raising this very important conversation in this place so that we can review the penalties in place. I absolutely empathise with where he is coming from.

Following the devastation of the 2019-20 South Australian bushfire season, the Marshall Liberal state government commissioned an independent review to identify how South Australia's response to bushfires could be improved so that we can keep South Australian properties and families safe. The South Australian 2019-20 bushfire season had the worst conditions on record. The losses attributed to the fires included three human lives, 196 homes, 660 vehicles and 68,000 livestock, as well as \$200 million of agricultural production. About 280,000 hectares of land were burnt and several national parks were totally or partially burnt.

The successful efforts of all those involved in fighting the fires is acknowledged, including the efforts of our local volunteers in the One Tree Hill CFS, the Tea Tree Gully CFS, SAPOL, the State Emergency Service, the Metropolitan Fire Service, the Department for Environment and Water and ForestrySA, as well as the local farm firefighting units.

Community members were invited to have their say about bushfires in our review, and invited to say what we can fix and what we can provide support for so that South Australian families and businesses are kept safe in the future. The review adopted a simple three-pronged approach: what worked, what did not work and what we can fix before the next bushfire season. The independent review found that the response from our emergency services sector was remarkable; however, 68 findings and 15 recommendations were made as to how South Australia's emergency services capabilities could be improved.

Some actions I would like to highlight include funding of \$60,000 per annum indexed that was included in the 2020-21 state budget for the appointment of an independent chair. In line with the government's response to the independent review, this bill also proposes to enable the Minister

for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services to table reports from the State Bushfire Coordination Committee in state parliament.

Building on our \$48.5 million package released, the Marshall Liberal government has delivered a further \$49 million package to ensure that South Australia is as prepared as possible for our next bushfire emergency. The conditions that gripped the state in the 2019-20 bushfire season were some of the worst on record, and this government has responded with a \$97.5 million package to keep South Australians safe. We are investing nearly \$100 million so that our emergency services staff and volunteers have the resources and support they need to protect our lives and properties.

Importantly, we are boosting support to the CFS volunteers by employing nine additional regional staff, who will reduce the administrative burden on volunteers. We know that emergency services staff and volunteers experience some of the most extreme and distressing circumstances, so we are increasing mental health support by employing an additional professionally qualified counsellor. Key elements of our response also include:

- \$5 million for AVL technology, which has been successfully trialled this summer;
- \$7.2 million for new CFS appliances, including 25 new trucks for the 2020-21 bushfire season;
- \$2.7 million to retrofit 49 CFS vehicles with burnover protection;
- rollout of thermal imaging cameras to all 55 CFS groups;
- \$11.5 million for new MFS heavy appliances;
- \$4.7 million for nine additional regional FTEs, including the first permanent CFS staffing presence on Kangaroo Island;
- \$4 million to upgrade the state incident management facilities and continue Project Renew, upgrading the CFS stations so that CFS volunteers have modern and functional facilities;
- \$2.1 million for four extra FTEs to provide more support to the State Bushfire Coordination Committee;
- funding for an additional counsellor, as I have mentioned, to support the mental health and wellbeing of our amazing volunteers; and
- \$37 million for increased hazard protection, including prescribed burns on public and private land.

As the Chair of the Natural Resources Committee, I also have a keen interest in bushfire prevention, as do all the committee members. We recently requested an update on the independent review into the bushfire season 2019-20. Dominic Lane, Chief Executive, SAFECOM, kindly provided us an update on this review and abundant time to ask important questions about what is being supported and what is the next priority. What we heard was there have been numerous—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

Ms LUETHEN: —previous reviews and inquiries into bushfires in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The member for King will resume her seat. The member for West Torrens on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 128—

The SPEAKER: The member for King will resume her seat. The member for West Torrens has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 128: irrelevance to the matter before us. This bill regards penalties for arson. The member is talking at length about government initiatives to combat bushfires. The bill is not seeking in any way to resource that effort. It is simply talking about arson and penalties, and I would ask her to come back to the debate.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I am listening carefully to the contribution of the member for King. The debate in the context of considering two elements, one being a sentencing penalty provision and another on the subject matter of the provision for compensation to be provided, is squarely the subject of clause 3 of the bill that is under consideration. The member for King, in addressing matters that go to the context in which the subject matter is considered by government, in my opinion is squarely relevant to the bill. The member for King has the call.

Ms LUETHEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We very much recognise the importance of bushfire prevention penalties so that we can keep our South Australian families and properties safe. What we have heard is that there have been previous reviews and inquiries into bushfires in South Australia over many years; however, not all the recommendations accepted by the government in the past have been audited for implementation. An example of this was the inaction by the previous government to provide the automatic vehicle location systems to the CFS fleet. There is a commitment from our Marshall Liberal government to implement the critical previous review recommendations for bushfire management, prevention and protection of our community.

Recently, the One Tree Hill Soccer Club and the Tea Tree Gully City Soccer Club, two clubs I sponsor on behalf of the King community, ran their second annual CFS fundraiser in my electorate. Both teams played off all day. The Premier attended this fantastic second event to take part, to toss the coins, to start off this exciting day, as did the member for Newland. As it would happen, the Tea Tree Gully City Soccer Club won overall for the second year running—by only one goal, though. More important than that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: Only one goal over all the matches in the entire day, but more importantly than that, what happened—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens!

Ms LUETHEN: —was that through this wonderful, family-friendly day there were many important dollars raised for the CFS, and that money was split for the second year between the One Tree Hill CFS and the Tea Tree Gully CFS to support our volunteers. I commend both clubs and the community for coming out for that fun family day and, more importantly, for the funds that were raised.

That is what we are doing on this side: we are protecting our state. I thank the member for Waite for bringing this bill forward. Its intent is incredibly important. As advised earlier by my colleague the Minister for Energy and Mining, this bill unfortunately would duplicate some penalties that are already in place—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: —but I absolutely support the intent of the member for Waite—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens!

Ms LUETHEN: —and I thank him for bringing the bill to the parliament.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:12): I, too, rise to acknowledge the member for Waite for looking to increase penalties for what is considered to be an act of arson that in so many ways impacts so many lives and so many businesses. We know that not all fires are deliberately lit. A lot of fires are naturally lit by dry lightning, and roadside fires can start from machinery breakdowns or machinery issues. What that shows us is that we are always, in some way, shape or form, vulnerable to fires, fires that get out of control. We know that over many years fires come and fires go and we continue to experience the devastation they cause.

Some acts of arson have changed people's lives forever, and it can never be explained. Obviously, there are issues with people who are committing those acts, whether it is mental health, whether they are just pyromaniacs, or whether they have some level of vendetta or want community

payback in some way, shape or form. It really is a concern that these people continue to threaten some of these communities.

By and large, most of the communities that are threatened are regional communities and the fuel loads are there. Seasonal variances do add to the increased risk of fires; we saw that the 2019-20 bushfire season was a horror, and we know that there were high fuel loads after the drought. In many areas we saw some big fires. We know that the Yorketown fire burnt out a considerable amount of farmland, nearly 7,000 hectares, and the Cudlee Creek fires burnt out 23,000 hectares.

Kangaroo Island was the most devastating of all the fires. I do not want to categorise whose was the worst, as fires affect a lot of people and a lot of businesses. The Kangaroo Island fires burnt 211,000 hectares and 37,000 hectares were burnt in the Keilira fires. There were other fires, including Yumali, the Lucindale fires and the Duckpond fires. I have visited a lot of these fire sites. I was hosted at Keilira by the member for MacKillop. I saw how, under the conditions, fires came in and ripped through some of the prime farming country down there.

I also note that the Attorney-General's family farm was severely burnt by the Kangaroo Island fires. I, too, visited Kangaroo Island, but I went over there in a capacity to help. I went over there to help one of my very good friends whose property had been totally burnt. He lost his homes and his vehicles; he lost everything. He did not lose all his livestock but he lost the majority of it. Sadly, he was surrounded by some of the forests over there, and he was able to show me exactly how the forest acts as a wick to the fires.

While I was there I helped him. He and his family were struggling with putting down livestock, and I helped him destroy many hundreds of sheep and then put them into pits. We also tried to comfort some of the livestock that had their feet burnt badly. Some of the livestock were able to recover, which was a good outcome. Through the course of all these fires, people's lives were changed forever, sadly. Some of those communities have rebuilt; they are resilient.

If I look at Kangaroo Island, the majority of their fencing has been replaced, particularly on the north coast and the western side of the island. A lot of homes have been rebuilt, and a lot of old asbestos homes that were burnt have been taken away. Kangaroo Island will rebuild and Keilira will rebuild. Yorke Peninsula saw a lot of farm country burnt, but they will rebuild, as will the people of the Adelaide Hills, and we saw the devastation up at Cudlee Creek.

In my previous capacity as a minister, I was able to console some of those communities and also provide support. I think PIRSA and the livestock section within the department did an excellent job, with vets out there helping livestock owners deal with fire-damaged stock. The community got together to help, but also the government stood up and provided assistance to those who were fire affected, not only businesses but also some of the hobby farmers who lost everything they had. We have seen over 600 vehicles lost and many hundreds of homes destroyed, but the devastation of livestock on Kangaroo Island was significant. We know that Kangaroo Island is still in the rebuilding phase, as are the people at Keilira.

I must commend the support of the volunteers coming together. The CFS, the MFS and the SES were outstanding, but we cannot forget the volunteers and the farmers with their firefighting units. They were an integral part of fighting those fires. They were an integral part in giving feedback to the professionals within the CFS, the MFS and the SES, giving that vital information. But also there was the aerial service that was provided, and we know that Fligtech and other services did an outstanding job.

There were some issues along the way, particularly on Kangaroo Island where authorities would not allow them to use sea water in their equipment to fight the fires. I think that was a mistake. There were areas where the back-burning needed to start earlier. They were obviously issues they had to deal with.

I think we need to again thank the volunteers who travelled from interstate and overseas, to help out with their expertise and to put their lives on the line. They should be thanked no end. We thank Livestock SA for their support, their mopping up and helping those livestock owners with feed and freight. I want to thank some of the other primary producers, the farmers who donated large amounts of fodder and stock, farm equipment, expertise, equipment, bulldozers and tractors so that we can actually get the show back on the road. I think they all need to be commended.

I would also like to put out a big thankyou to BlazeAid, an organisation that travels the country giving their volunteer time as good Samaritans. They do not do it for money: they do it because they are community-minded people. To start off with they roll up the old burnt equipment and rebuild fencing so that people can get on with their farming practice, get stock back into the paddocks that were not burnt and get that economy back on the road.

I would also like to thank Twigg Forrester for the great work that he did. He attended a number of public meetings at Hahndorf with the wine industry dealing with smoke taint and dealing with vineyards that had been burnt and giving them an understanding that they can rebuild without having to pull everything out. He gave accommodation facilities and he put a huge amount of money on the table to help those communities rebuild and resurrect. They were great initiatives by those who were not impacted directly by fires and those who gave philanthropic donations to those communities who will be forever grateful.

I do acknowledge the member for Waite's motion, but I must say that there are significant penalties that the Attorney has already highlighted. I want to make sure that our communities stay safe, be fire ready, have a fire plan so that the damage is much less than it would be without a plan.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:23): I move:

That Private Members Business, Bills, take precedence over Private Members Business, Other Motions, until 1pm.

The SPEAKER: The motion pertains to sessional order 2(1)(a)(i). Members will be aware that the sessional order provides that, unless otherwise ordered, Private Members Bills be considered until 11.30am. I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for West Torrens wish to speak to the motion?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir.

The SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak to the motion? If not, I will put it at once: those of the opinion say aye, against say no. I think the noes have it.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23

Noes 21

Majority 2

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Duluk, S.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Ellis, F.J.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pisoni, D.G.

Chapman, V.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Power, C.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Sanderson, R.

NOES

Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

PAIRS

Piccolo, A.

Pederick, A.S.

Motion thus carried.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (BAROSSA RAIL CORRIDOR) BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 March 2021.)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:33): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22
Noes 22
Majority 0

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Duluk, S.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Chapman, V.A.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Piccolo, A.

Pederick, A.S.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 ayes and 22 noes, the Speaker exercises a casting vote in accordance with standing order 180. I exercise that vote with the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:41): I wish to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Barossa Rail Corridor) Amendment Bill of the Hon. Anthony Piccolo, member for Light. The whole proposal of this statutes amendment has some merit but, as the member for MacKillop and a member for the Limestone Coast, I can also see a lot of difficulties with such a proposal where the bill seeks to amend the Highways Act as well as the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.

We have a number of old railway lines down through the Limestone Coast, which is probably like the area we are talking about here, the Barossa rail corridor, where the rail used to run and obviously does not anymore. It is a difficult situation, and I am very much proactive regarding rail and freight and transport. I think there are many opportunities for these rail corridors to be utilised and accessed into the future, and there may not ever be another rail corridor again as our country laid down the rail in its development and infancy over 100 years ago, if not further back.

We have to be careful with the proposal to lock this land up and make it even more difficult with other infrastructure programs and projects, like highways and roads around these rail corridors, in the sense of locking away these corridors subject to bigger and more expensive developments for roads and highways when there may never be another train on these corridors.

The ironic thing about this proposed amendment by the member for Light is that Labor were in government prior to 2018 and they were not able to instigate any development on a tourist rail proposal or any type of rail proposal up into the Barossa, and suddenly it has come to light that they may wish to do so or perhaps they think the opportunity may be out there for some sort of proposal. It may be possible and it may not be.

This amendment proposed by the member for Light has some merit in that, yes, it could be more expensive if a rail proposal were put up, but I think that is even more reason that, if any rail proposal is put up through this corridor to the Barossa or any other old rail corridor around our state, it has to stack up and it has to be economical and viable.

Obviously, when rail is re-instigated on these old lines it is an expensive process. It impedes the travel that we are all accustomed to, and that is road transport. All the road crossings need electrification, you need crossings and red lights and so forth and then, obviously, you need good infrastructure around these proposals. This is what makes rail so hard. We have moved on. It is a form of transport that is quite difficult and expensive to maintain, and so it does need to stack up.

With the old rail corridors on the Limestone Coast, there are a couple of scenarios regarding all the rail corridors down from Mount Gambier and Bordertown and the old railways that used to go elsewhere from those destinations. Rail stacks up in the sense of freight, if the rail system is up and going and still working, hence we see a lot of rail freight between our state capital cities.

We are talking about a new rail corridor between Melbourne and Brisbane through the centre, up through Victoria and into New South Wales and Queensland, where there is a major freight route that can be accessed, but these smaller type routes that are being proposed here, like the Barossa and the Limestone Coast, do not seem to stack up, particularly for the transportation of tourists or people.

One reason is that it is a slow form of transport. If you see where passenger trains are used for any tyranny of distance around the world, you will go to some Third World countries and see that rail is still a major form of transport, but we are not a Third World country by any means or imagination. We will require rail transport to be of high speed if we are going to bring rail in over any sort of distance.

I have heard that there have been some studies on high-speed rail from our state city capitals. Depending on the efficiency of air travel, there may be a time in the future when we can emulate what happens in Europe with high-speed travel, because it is well supported, it does carry a great number of people, it can use electricity and it can be a green form of energy. There are many reasons why I think in the future, if any type of rail transport is used for moving people around, high-speed rail would be the option.

This proposal, and keeping the Barossa open for these sorts of things, is not on the radar. It would be a long stretch to make it economically viable. It is a bit ironic again, I think, that this rail system has been closed for a number of years. It has been proven that it would be very expensive

to upgrade, and the numbers of people who would want to use such a transport route would make it very difficult economically to do so viably.

Coming back down to my region, the Limestone Coast, what other alternatives are there for these rail corridors? We are talking about bike tracks down in our neck of the woods, turning these rail corridors into bike trails that are of significance. These are bike trails that can take you from town to town. They may be the next best use for these rail corridors. If you think about this Barossa rail corridor potentially being a bike track, for example, then the road network and the rail route that they are trying to protect can work in unison. They can work together. You do not actually need to protect this rail corridor as is being proposed by this amendment.

Coming down to my region, with these bike trails on the old rail corridors, there has been talk of bike trails that go from Goolwa across the barrages, down through the Coorong National Park and on to our rural towns on the Limestone Coast, and that is when we can actually start using these rail corridors in unison. There has been good evidence that there is a demand from tourists to access these bike trails, which could, as I already have highlighted, use these rail corridors. There is no doubt that a bike trail could potentially use the Barossa rail corridor up that way, if the numbers so desire and the moneys can be found to make it work.

I know that most of these rail corridors in my neck of the woods are still intact. But when a road has been upgraded and it has been made safer, it is there to carry a greater volume of traffic. We are talking about traffic, particularly heavy transport, where we are looking at trucks that are bigger than the B-double capacity. Roundabouts need to be made bigger, and this is my understanding of exactly what has gone on in the Barossa where a major traffic intersection has needed to be upgraded and has imposed itself on the Barossa rail corridor.

I can see no reason why we would stop these developments taking place for road transport because that is the form of transport today that is meeting our society's needs. Wrapping it up, putting it in mothballs, making it harder for our road transport network to get around and making these sorts of builds even more expensive for perhaps a hypothetical rail corridor, I think is too long a bow to draw. This is one of the reasons I cannot support this proposal.

In regard to rail, it would be good to see the rail network first of all maintained to what is being used around the state already because I think it does have a place for heavy transport and freight from other states around Australia. But, secondly, I think that there may be a really good purpose to address high-speed rail into the future that would work in parallel with our freight lines. They may need to be separate pieces of infrastructure. I think that is the only future development I can see at this stage as a proposal that would work for passengers on rail other than what is in place already.

I know we still have the *Overland* between Adelaide and Melbourne. There is probably rail that would take passengers all the way to Melbourne right up north of Brisbane, and they are still being used. I think the numbers that were on those trains 20 to 30 years ago were greater than today's because we obviously have buses now. We have airline tickets that are very competitive, or they were before COVID. This is why I think this rail corridor should not be proposed. It is not worthwhile mothballing and making it difficult for any sort of infrastructure in the future.

The SPEAKER: Member for Elder.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder has the call. The member for West Torrens—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So we are going straight to the government every time for the call, are we?

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will resume his seat and the member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: There is a precedence in this house.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned for a second time.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (11:52): I rise to add my voice to this debate in regard to the Statutes Amendment (Barossa Rail Corridor) Bill. I have wanted to talk on this debate for some time. We have had it before us for a number of Wednesdays. For me, it is quite important, particularly given that I have a number of train lines going through my own electorate. Ensuring public transport and particularly rail services are safe, affordable, reliable and accessible is something that I am really passionate about. I believe it is absolutely fundamental to our local communities. Fortunately, it is a priority of this Marshall Liberal government.

The new Flinders train line in my electorate of Elder is a 650-metre extension of the former Tonsley rail line. It includes an elevated single track over Sturt Road, Laffer's Triangle and Main South Road, linking Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University to the passenger rail network. The \$141 million Flinders Link Project was jointly funded by the Australian and South Australian governments.

The new line and new Tonsley and Flinders railway stations opened for passenger services from the first service on Tuesday 29 December 2020 and are now operating under an enhanced timetable developed after extensive consultation. When I was out doorknocking, even prior to being elected, the services along the Tonsley line were an issue that many people raised with me on the doorstep. To them, fundamental to the increased services was an opportunity for them to be consulted and engaged about what that service would look like. We did deliver an increased timetable after listening to the feedback from local residents who were not only interested in the service timetable but also keenly interested in being involved in the location of the new Tonsley station.

The Tonsley line previously only operated on weekdays, with a 20-minute peak frequency and 30 minutes at all other times until 7pm. One of the biggest things that people talked to me about was how frustrating it was for them to have a train line right next door to where they live and it was not operating in the evening or even on the weekends. People raised with me that, if there was a Showdown in the city, they could see the train line but there was no train running on it. As the local member, I fought really hard for increased services.

Since delivering the new line, the Marshall Liberal government has extended these services on the Flinders line until midnight on weeknights and provides a 20-minute peak frequency on weekdays and 30 minutes at all times. A new service is also running on the weekends for the first time from approximately 7am to just before midnight. This is a massive win for my local community. These additional services are greatly enhancing the public transport options for those living around the train line and also right across our state.

In addition to great services for the train line, features of the new line and station include better station access through shared use paths and activated pedestrian crossings; new station locations, providing increased access for more residents; and improved safety, security and customer satisfaction in terms of the amenities. I think safety is an issue that certainly we are all talking about and acutely aware of in a different way this week, particularly from a women's perspective.

Having that shared path and stations that are open and provide a sense of safety is really important. I noticed that at the Tonsley train station there is an emergency button should anyone feel unsafe. If they need to contact emergency services, they can do so quite easily. I think that is a very small but important detail and feature that I would like to see rolled out in a number of our future train stations.

As proof that the service is improving the public transport offering in the area, patronage data for the new line shows the investment is already attracting more South Australians to use public transport, with a 10.9 per cent increase compared to the old Tonsley line. That is fantastic news. It is a 10.9 per cent increase on the Tonsley weekday average at a time when patronage has been down across the Adelaide Metro network due to COVID-19. This is all part of getting on with the job and building what matters.

The South Road upgrade through my electorate is the largest road safety infrastructure project in the state's history. It will also help increase heavy vehicle productivity and will create around 4,000 jobs. Residents in my electorate are delighted at the news delivered in last year's state budget that we will deliver the final section of the north-south corridor. The Torrens to Darlington section is the final piece of South Australia's world-class, multibillion-dollar north-south corridor and the key to

unlocking Adelaide's traffic network while delivering important economic, employment and safety benefits to the state.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: What an abuse of parliamentary process. What an abuse. Talk to the bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs POWER: It will see a combination of tunnels and lowered and ground-level motorways as well as overpasses or underpasses at key intersections to successfully complete the free-flowing transport route. While those opposite seem to be calling out that this is not relevant and will not improve the lives of people in my electorate, I think that they would absolutely agree.

Ms Hildyard: We want to talk to intervention orders. It's pretty important for women. It's pretty important for women to talk about intervention orders.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Reynell!

Mr Brown: When are we getting the intervention orders? Is this more important?

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

Mrs POWER: Importantly, the Torrens to Darlington project will not only improve traffic flows, complementing the Flinders line, but also help to preserve heritage buildings and iconic places. This is really important work for my local residents. These are important government projects and infrastructure upgrades that aim to deliver improvements to road safety and heavy vehicle productivity as well as create jobs. Mr Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this debate to discuss public transport and rail corridors and to share with the house what it means for local residents in my area.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:59): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	23
Noes	21
Majority	2

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Duluk, S.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Ellis, F.J.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Chapman, V.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

PAIRS

Piccolo, A.

Pederick, A.S.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December 2020.)

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:05): I rise to speak on this very important and very sensitive matter. As we all know, this is a conscience vote on something that each of us will dig deeply into our own hearts and into our own communities to address. Voluntary assisted dying or voluntary euthanasia—there are different reasons that different people use different terms, and I am not too fussed about that to be perfectly honest, but I would like to put a few things on the record regarding this very important topic.

First, in the time I have been in this place I have had to deal with this before, as most members in the chamber have, and, regardless of the content of members' contributions in the second reading, including my own, and regardless of my personal views and my electorate's view, I have always voted affirmatively for the second reading because I deeply believe that it is not actually until we get into the committee stage of a bill of this nature that we really get right into the detail—and it is the detail that is incredibly important on this topic. Some people, of course, will have a view in favour or in opposition broadly on the principal, but I have to say that I think the details are extremely important.

If I go to this topic broadly, understanding that this is a different bill, members will know that last time this topic was lost by one vote. There was actually a tie of the house; it was not between any political affiliations—there were Liberal and Labor members on both sides of the chamber—but it was actually tied at 23 all, and the former Speaker had the deciding vote.

I am on the record as having voted, at the third reading, against the bill last time around. I am also on the record for my reasons why, and last time those reasons overwhelmingly, although not exclusively, were based on the fact that amongst the necessary steps a person would have to take to become eligible to access voluntary euthanasia was the fact that two doctors would have to agree that a person suffered from a terminal illness, was most likely to die within six months and was suffering unacceptable levels of pain.

From my perspective, I have no concern with that necessarily in and of itself—and that is not a comment on the whole topic, just a comment on that one condition. However, what I was uncomfortable with was that it could be any two doctors and that any doctor or doctors could give that type of assessment an unlimited number of times for an unlimited number of patients. I am not suggesting for a second that any doctor would provide an inappropriate assessment, or one that that doctor did not feel was 100 per cent accurate, but different doctors would have different opinions, so I will come to the first part of that.

With respect to any two doctors, I have a view that if it was appropriate to go down a path like that then it really should not be just any two doctors, and I asked this in committee last time. Does this mean that that patient could go to two doctors and the two doctors say, 'No, I don't think that you, as the patient, meet the threshold,' and then the patient could go to another doctor and get told no, and another doctor and get told no, on and on until that patient found two doctors who both said yes and then that would satisfy this condition? I am not comfortable with that.

The other factor is the number of times that any doctor could do this. Again, I have great respect for doctors, but there will be some doctors who might quite fairly determine that the answer was, yes, that the person did satisfy those conditions of terminal illness, unbearable pain and expected to die within six months, but there would also be other doctors who might see it differently.

The fact that a patient would have the opportunity essentially to seek out a doctor who had that opinion I was certainly not comfortable with. I am not suggesting that doctors are going to sell

their soul and just say whatever the patient wants them to say, but of course so many of these cases, you would expect, would be marginal. Who is to know that someone is likely to die in six months? Well, is that five months or is that seven months? That would actually make a difference to the way in which the bill was written.

Another criterion is unacceptable levels of pain. Well, certainly the patient would know that. The person in the situation would know that for sure but harder for a doctor. One doctor might make one decision and another doctor may make a different decision. I do not like the idea that a patient could go through any number of doctors who think it was inappropriate to let them access voluntary euthanasia and keep going until they find two who think it is appropriate. I do not think it is appropriate that doctors could become known for having a view that leans them towards accepting that the patient fits into that category. Doctors could be essentially requested to make that type of decision over and over again.

I would be more comfortable—if I was comfortable at all, let me say very clearly—if there was a situation where it was actually the treating specialist who needed to be one of those doctors, and exactly the same doctor the patient had gone to initially in the hope that that doctor could cure them from whatever the ailment was, and we think very often about cancer, but of course it is not only cancer. But if the patient went to a doctor in the hope that that doctor could cure them, and then if it needed to be the same doctor who actually had to say, if it was the case, that the patient in that specialist doctor's opinion did satisfy those conditions, hypothetically it would be the patient's GP, the person you would like to think the patient had had a long and positive history with.

In that example, that is, the patient's GP and the patient's treating specialist, if those two doctors were to both assess the patient as meeting those criteria of insufferable pain and expected to die within six months from a terminal illness, then to me that would be vastly different from being able to just find any two doctors anywhere in the state who would say that the patient met those criteria. Hypothetically those doctors could be doing it over and over again for an unlimited number of people and so potentially let their particular style of assessment be used in that way.

I say quite openly, too, that if there were doctors whose particular style of assessment lent them away from recognising that the patient met those conditions, well, I would not want the patient forced to one of those doctors either. So it does make sense to me that it is the GP and the treating specialist—the same people this patient has dealt with and sought help from to be cured and to be healthy, the same the same people who know this patient better than anybody else—who should be the ones to say, if it is the case, 'This patient does now meet the criteria.'

I just wanted to put those views on the record. I understand that I am talking about the previous bill, not the current bill; I fully recognise that. I do not mean any disrespect to the current mover of the current bill, but I think it is important that we all put our views on the record on these things. These are difficult decisions and not the ones that members of parliament should shy away from. With that contribution, I put my perspective very firmly on the record.

I will vote to support the second reading so that we can get to the committee stage, as I have always done on all these difficult conscience issues, whether it be abortion, prostitution or euthanasia, and I will do the same again. I will listen incredibly closely. I will most likely participate in the committee stage of the bill, and I will make my decision on the third reading speech based on the final version of the bill presented to us at that time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (12:16): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	22
Noes	22
Majority	0

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.

AYES

Brown, M.E. (teller)
 Duluk, S.
 Hughes, E.J.
 Michaels, A.
 Picton, C.J.
 Wortley, D.

Close, S.E.
 Gee, J.P.
 Koutsantonis, A.
 Mullighan, S.C.
 Stinson, J.M.

Cook, N.F.
 Hildyard, K.A.
 Malinauskas, P.
 Odenwalder, L.K.
 Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
 Cregan, D.
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)
 Marshall, S.S.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Sanderson, R.
 Treloar, P.A.
 Wingard, C.L.

Chapman, V.A.
 Ellis, F.J.
 Knoll, S.K.
 McBride, N.
 Pisoni, D.G.
 Speirs, D.J.
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cowdrey, M.J.
 Gardner, J.A.W.
 Luethen, P.
 Murray, S.
 Power, C.
 Tarzia, V.A.
 Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Piccolo, A.

Pederick, A.S.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 ayes and 22 noes, the Speaker has a casting vote in accordance with standing order 180. I cast that vote with the noes. The motion is thus passed in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:23): I rise to speak on the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill 2020, as introduced by Dr Susan Close, member for Port Adelaide in this house. Honourable members are aware that the Hon. Kyam Maher of the other place has also introduced a bill of the same content. That is a matter which, as I understand it, is progressing in that chamber.

How these things ultimately come together is yet to be determined, but it is capable for each of our houses of parliament to consider contemporaneously a bill of the same content. Members would be aware that this bill's introduction here and in the other place has followed the report of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices, dated 13 October 2020. I commend and thank members of the committee for the consideration of this matter.

In the time I have been here there have been several attempts to pass legislation to allow voluntary assisted dying. The most recent was the Death with Dignity Bill 2016, introduced by the former member for Morphett, Dr Duncan McFetridge, which was defeated by one vote.

Historically in this house, I have considered with some scrutiny bills that have introduced this subject matter, and it has always been of concern to me that bills were presented for our consideration to allow for a procedure where the person seeking to do so was not terminally ill. This bill is different. I confirm that I will support the bill at the second reading and that, in the event there are amendments for consideration, of course we would want to respectfully consider all amendments, but I can say that the single biggest factor to support a bill of this nature is the fact that the proponents of such a bill have not persisted in seeking to apply too broadly such a process of approval for the purposes of lawful support, medically assisted, in a dignified death.

Victoria and Western Australia have passed voluntary assisted dying legislation, Tasmania currently has a bill before it and the Queensland government has announced its intention to introduce legislation. An Independent MP in New South Wales has announced that he will also introduce a bill into the New South Wales parliament. This is not an issue that is going to go away, and I think some in our house, our parliament here in South Australia, have thought that it always would. But the reality

is that this is a 21st century issue we must address and we must be very careful to scrutinise such legislation.

This bill closely mirrors the Victorian Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017. It does a number of things that I will briefly refer to in a moment. Importantly, I think for all Australians, that bill is under regular review, and the statistical data and information surrounding its application are things that I certainly take notice of and would urge other members to consider.

The purpose of this bill is to limit the access to voluntary assisted dying to persons who must be over the age of 18 years, who are an Australian citizen and who have been resident in South Australia for 12 months. Further, they must be a person who has decision-making capacity in relation to voluntary assisted dying and has an incurable, advanced, progressive disease that will cause death within six months, or 12 months for neurodegenerative diseases, and is causing suffering that cannot be relieved in a manner that the person considers tolerable.

The process has been referred to by other speakers, in particular my colleague the Minister for Energy and Mining. He has clearly set out that the threshold, the steps that are to be undertaken, is the requirement that doctors both receive a request and do the assessment, that the consulting assessment be done by different doctors and that there is a written declaration by the parties, etc. These are all important and part of a very rigorous process.

There are other safeguards in the bill that have been identified. Firstly, a doctor must not raise voluntary assisted dying with a patient; secondly, doctors must complete approved training courses; thirdly, doctors and other health workers can conscientiously object to participating in the VAD system; and, finally, a person may change their mind at any time. I understand why the safeguard of the doctor not introducing this issue into the conversation with their patients is there. I do not think it actually assists, but nevertheless I note that it is there and may well be the subject of further consideration if this bill is supported at the second reading.

The Victorian Voluntary Assisted Dying Review Board has published three reports since the Victorian legislation commenced, and I understand there is another extant. Between June 2019 and June 2020, there were 124 people who had died from taking the prescribed medications. The most recent report, in June 2020, stated that compliance with the act was high. I received some data just recently on a briefing to suggest that there are a very great number, I think over 200, who had made inquiry but had not sought, once they had had advice, to proceed with an application of the law in this regard. Importantly, the bill also proposes to establish a voluntary assisted dying review board, which I would strongly commend be considered by members.

An impressive addition for my consideration, and a very new feature in these debates, is that South Australia Police have expressed their views in a letter to the joint committee dated 21 February 2020, supportive of a legislative scheme similar to Victoria. SAPOL have noted that police attend to investigate the scene of every death by suicide. SA Police indicated that 10 people took their lives as a result of terminal illness between 1 January 2019 and February 2020—approximately 11 per cent of suicides in that period.

SAPOL also submitted that many of these deaths were undignified, violent and often committed in isolation. There may also be a degree of pain suffered, depending on the method and level of expertise of the person when they take their life. I find it quite disturbing to read that information, but I thank SA Police not only for their services in dealing with these matters but also for having the courage to present a submission confirming their indication of support.

I have spoken to the Coroner about suicide matters in recent times, particularly as we have just been through COVID, and that is an area of consideration that we will be keeping a very close eye on. I am pleased to report that there has not been any identified increase in suicides in South Australia, but this profile of those who are using it as a mechanism, crudely or otherwise, is quite disturbing.

I conclude by saying that my husband died of a terminal illness. He had a stroke and he had cancer treatment. He was in a circumstance where I was advised that he would not come out of a coma and that he would die. I had the valuable assistance of my sister-in-law, his sister, during that time to support me and our children to deal with it. It is a difficult time. I think my husband was lucky

to have had a condition that enabled him to be given morphine to deal with pain. Not everyone has that. That is the one limitation of palliative care—the limitation of it—that concerns me.

Doctors administered morphine to my husband and he died that night. That is a difficult situation, but it is not unique to me or others who lose a spouse, a child, a parent, a brother or a sister in those circumstances. We need to address the very real situation of people who are, often with the support of our medical profession, able to enjoy prolonged lives and better lives as a result of their support, advice and intervention. We also need to understand that there is an element that needs some really considered assistance in allowing people to die with dignity. I will support the second reading of the bill.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (12:33): I rise to indicate that I will be supporting the second reading of the bill. This has been an ongoing debate in this parliament for, I think, the entire 15 years that I have been in this place. Certainly, when I am out in my electorate of Unley, particularly senior members of the electorate raise with me what my views are on euthanasia, and whether I share their views, and that they support the ability for people to be in control of not only their own lives but also the time that they leave this earth.

People have quite different views on what medical mechanisms should be in place. As presented in the bill, the six-month diagnosis of terminal cancer is a very good measure because, if we did not have a constraint like that, we know how depression is such a significant cause of death by suicide. We would not want to have anything endorsed in this parliament that did not recognize the complexities of depression. Being diagnosed with depression does not mean that you will die. The only way that you will die from having depression is if you do, in fact, take your own life caused by the depression. This obviously protects people in that position.

Having a family member who took that path more than 10 years ago now, I know how devastating it is for the families and loved ones who are left behind in that situation. It was reported to me that there was a sense of relief in my brother in the few days before he committed the act. He had already made the decision to do it and felt relieved. In hindsight, it was very easy to work out why there was that change in behaviour and a change in mood. Obviously, I want to make clear in supporting the second reading of this bill that people like that will be protected. There will be no state-sanctioned end of life for people in that situation.

I am very pleased that we have a Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention in this government under Premier Marshall. Work is being done to highlight the impact of depression and suicide in South Australia and to offer support. Some of the calls we are seeing are from those who are supportive of euthanasia. We are seeing a vast majority of people over a particular age in particular wanting to have this option. Never before have people lived as long as they are living and never before were they living such full lives in their senior years. It was not that long ago that people in their 60s were seen as hanging around waiting to see their time out, waiting to die. Now we know that people in their 60s are starting new careers.

Sixty is the new 40 now, so people are living fuller lives and getting more out of life. Even if their families are not with them, through technology they have more access to their families than they have ever had, so they are enjoying their senior years much more. Many of them have a financial capacity to prolong their quality of life for longer. So you can certainly understand that when they get to a stage in their life when they have been diagnosed with a terminal illness they want to be in control of that situation as well. They want to do that for themselves. The decision they make is not for others; they have been making decisions for others all their life. This is a decision they can make for themselves.

In supporting the second reading, I do not think that I would choose that decision, but it is not my role to stop others from making that decision. It is an extraordinary situation here in South Australia that you can actually choose your funeral plan, you can choose where you are buried, but you cannot choose your time of leaving this earth when you have been diagnosed with a painful terminal illness.

So this is really my motivation in supporting the second reading, keeping this debate going and getting to the committee stage so that questions that members may wish to ask can be asked and clarified. There may also be an opportunity for amendments during that period, but I do not think it is right for this debate not to move into the committee stage.

We want to get this right. We know this bill is modelled on bills that have so far worked in Victoria and there is information that is available on the success or otherwise of that bill operating in Victoria. This goes back to where does government start or where does government stop in interfering in people's lives or influencing people's lives.

I think the two things that are the most personal are birth and death. You cannot get anything more personal than that in somebody's life. When you are born, all of a sudden you have lost that direct support from your mother and you are out on your own, although you do have that support to grow and be an independent person. It is every parent's role, of course, for their children to grow up to be independent and, we would hope, happy. They are the two key roles of parenthood for children: to grow up to be independent and happy.

Having established that, if you are successful as a parent, obviously you prepare that child for when they do get to a time in their life when they have been diagnosed with a terminal illness that they are independent enough to be in the position to make that decision and nobody else. I do not believe this has anything to do with anything other than people's individual ability and individual right to be in control of their own lives.

The bill itself and the whole topic of euthanasia have well and truly been debated since I have been a member of this place. I have supported the previous bills. I remember that the Hon. Bob Such got very close to getting a bill through this place and I was pleased to have supported that bill at that time as well. I am also very pleased to indicate that I will be supporting the second reading of this bill and participating in the committee process when we move to that next stage.

I believe the bill itself has probably been worth the wait. I think there are improvements. Things that have been raised in previous debates in this place have been addressed. Hopefully, that will give comfort to others who may have had concerns about previous bills so they can consider supporting at least the second reading so that we can continue debate in this place and give it the debate that is worth having. It would be a shame to cut short the debate on this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES (LPG CYLINDER LABELLING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December 2020.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:44): I rise to make a very important contribution to the Dangerous Substances (LPG Cylinder Labelling) Amendment Bill 2020. This is a very important and very difficult topic this chamber is having to grapple with, and I know that it is a very difficult topic for you and your community, Mr Deputy Speaker, given some really awful recent events.

LPG safety is an issue the world has had to deal and grapple with for some 140 or 150 years. Some of the earliest liquified gases used for lighting and heating back in the 1800s naturally had a sulfur compound that gave them a smell. That smell helped people recognise that there was a dangerous substance in the air. Having done a bit of research on this topic for the purpose of this debate, I understand some of the real dangers around inhaling or consuming LNG or other natural gases. My research shows that they can be dangerous or deadly very quickly; in fact, you do not need to have much exposure or inhale or ingest much before they leave some lasting, if not deadly, effects.

In the early 1800s, there was town gas, especially in places like the UK, which was used for lighting and heating. Essentially, the carbonisation of coal created hydrogen and carbon monoxide, and that gas contained the sulfur compounds that gave it a gassy odour, so as it leaked it smelled and people understood it was there in the room. The smell of odourised gas is quite distinctive, and I learned quite early on and quite young from my parents that its smell meant there was gas in the air. If you have ever gone with mum or dad to get a gas cylinder refilled or turned on the gas stove, you would have smelled that unmistakable smell. The gas itself, however, is made absent those sulfur compounds and does not have a natural smell to it, which is quite dangerous.

The first odourisation of gas came in the 1880s in Germany, where they started to add ethyl mercaptan to water gas to intentionally reproduce that gassy odour. However, the real advance and the real change in adding an odour to LNG and other natural gases happened in the 1930s. There was an awful case at the New London School, in Texas, which was built in 1932 and had natural gas lines built as part of it. In 1937, the school board decided to cut costs by dropping the contract with the local gas company. The residual gas that existed in those lines would often be tapped and used as a way to recover money, that gas being valuable and could be used for other purposes.

In the instance where the gas lines were tapped at the New London School in Texas, there was a leak along a portion of the line. That gas made its way throughout the length and breadth of the school in the crawlspace. From there, a spark ignited the gas, which led to a massive explosion and up to 295 deaths. It was an awful situation and unfortunately a really awful cautionary tale that led to the odourisation of gas as a way to make sure people know by the natural incidence of smelling gas in the air that there is either a leak somewhere or unexpended, unexpired gas around.

We have a whole series and a whole framework these days around how pressurised LNG, for instance, is transported in nine-litre bottles around the country, and those regulations are pretty good. We do not see or hear of explosions on any regular basis; it does happen from time to time, especially with older and corroded gas bottles. We have had a couple of examples but, again, to my understanding those examples very much fall outside what would be common practice in making sure that you keep your gas bottles safe.

In fact, it used to be—and it still is the norm—that you could take your gas bottle and get it refilled. What has happened, especially over the last decade, is a move away from taking the gas bottle and getting it filled, as I remember back in the late eighties and nineties, to a situation today where you go and swap a gas bottle. By virtue of doing that, it saves time for an attendant at a petrol station, for instance, to have to fill it up, but it also gives opportunity for the company selling the gas to test and check that those gas bottles are safe. I think that is a very good development, one that no doubt saves time, as people are able to just swap those gas bottles over, and also introduces an added safety step that helps to make the purchasing and the use of LPG specifically much more safe.

In Angaston, we recently had gas come to the town. It sounds a bit archaic, but gas is not available throughout much of South Australia. In fact, I did read the other week that bringing gas to Mount Barker, which is something that I understand has been in the pipeline for a long time—no pun intended—was abandoned on the basis that it was not commercial anymore. But there is an opportunity in Angaston for us to tap into natural gas.

The difficulty for my household is that, when we bought our house in 2014 and redeveloped and renovated it, we put in all electric appliances. I understand that the gas price is pretty high at the moment, so making the switch now is not as much of an economically viable choice as it used to be. The cost of changing all those appliances over, whether that be the hot-water service or whether that be the gas stove, would add a cost that makes it not viable to do.

I know that in recent times we had a tragic death from the ingestion of natural gas here in South Australia, and that is an awful tragedy. Making sense of that tragedy and helping to learn the lessons from that tragedy are things that we should do as these incidents occur. In fact, there is some suggestion that we should do so before incidents occur. However, it gives us an opportunity to reflect on and look at how we can further improve safety systems in relation to the provision of natural gas.

Here in South Australia we have a piece of legislation before us that seeks to create a change at a state level. I understand from media reports and from speaking to the Treasurer that a national solution is being proffered at the moment to improve labelling right across the country so that it is about improving safety not just here in South Australia but right across the country. In fact, the companies that supply gas in its various forms are national, so it does make sense for those solutions to be national so that we can learn the lessons and help to improve safety in this regard right across the country.

This is an important issue. It is good to see that there is progress being made. Unfortunately, it does come after an awfully tragic incident, but if we can help to stop that kind of incident happening into the future then we can know that we have helped to improve safety for what is a very useful but also a very dangerous substance for all Australians right across this country.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEASES (DESIGNATED ANCHOR LEASE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 February 2021.)

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:55): I take this opportunity to rise on behalf of the people of Stuart to discuss this bill that has been put forward by the member for Florey, no doubt in a very strong desire to support commercial tenants in larger retail establishments. She makes it very clear in the bill that it refers to larger retail establishments that have an anchor tenant, or perhaps two or three or four.

If I think about the member for Florey's electorate, it is a long way from mine, but Tea Tree Plaza comes quickly to mind. She may well have others—I am sure she does have others—in her electorate that would fit into this category, but it is the Tea Tree Plaza type arrangement the member is talking about. What the member wants to do is set up a situation whereby if the anchor tenant, or an anchor tenant, in one of these large shopping malls, essentially, is to leave for one reason or another, the other smaller tenants in that shopping centre would get some protections.

In circumstances where the lease of an anchor tenant is to be terminated or not renewed, the lessor must give at least three months' notice to all other lessees, i.e. smaller lessees, which may request a rent review according to certain criteria. Until the rent review is determined by an independent valuer, the rent would be reduced by the greater of either 10 per cent or an amount prescribed in the regulations. That is a quick summary of what the member wants to do.

In terms of my contribution, I have been a tenant in commercial premises, one of them very large commercial premises. There was me and two business partners, and I was the managing partner. In fact, one of these properties had an extremely large rent by my standards, well in excess of \$200,000 a year, and there were others as well.

I come to this debate as a person who has some experience in business and certainly some experience of the pressures associated with being a commercial tenant. I have never been a commercial tenant in a shopping centre. I have never been a commercial tenant in the context this bill addresses. I acknowledge that, but I certainly have a great deal of sympathy for particularly the smaller tenants in these commercial shopping centres, and I have a great deal of sympathy for why the member for Florey would want to support them in this way.

There would, of course, be different circumstances for the different tenants. It might be that one tenant is a franchisee of a bigger chain that has a name and a reputation and an opportunity to draw trade in its own right, or they might just be a one-person or perhaps a family business, a relatively small family business, which really does need the foot traffic the anchor tenant creates in the property for that small business to survive.

There would also be differences between a tenant whose shop faces inside the shopping centre versus facing outside the shopping centre, because then the pull of the anchor tenant would be different. For a tenant whose shop face is very close to the entrance of the anchor tenant's trading premises or one that is close to the door or somewhere else internally, there would also be a very different impact. I certainly have sympathy for wanting to support these small tenants, but if this chamber were to support this private member's bill we would need to find a way to provide the appropriate support in different ways for different tenants based upon their different circumstances.

Debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00

*Petitions***WAITE GATEHOUSE**

Mr DULUK (Waite): Presented a petition signed by 8,741 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reverse its decision to demolish the Waite Gatehouse.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BRIGHTON ROAD

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 111 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to provide the community with a comprehensive business case for proposed roadworks on Brighton Road.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport is called to order. The member for West Torrens is on two warnings.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:02): I bring up the 27th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

Mr TRELOAR: I bring up the 28th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time***VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICE**

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$3.7 million reduction to the Victim Support Service budget made in the 2019-20 state budget so that female victims of violence can be better supported?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:08): The Victim Support Service has operated for over 40 years in South Australia and continues to have a role in providing services to victims. Approximately two years ago, a particular program relating to counselling services for persons who were the victims of child and/or adult sexual abuse went out to tender. Relationships Australia SA, which undertakes considerable counselling and other services in South Australia for the government and others—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell!

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —an entity that has been operating for some 70 years in South Australia—was the successful applicant to undertake that work.

In addition, some other services were provided by the Victim Support Service (VSS), including assisting persons at court and also assisting in the preparation of victim impact statements.

Both of those responsibilities, with funding, have been provided since that time to the Commissioner for Victims' Rights, and her division now provides support of that.

She is also responsible for the preparation of initiatives to look at how we might additionally serve and support victims, including a project she is still working on relating to the advice to victims in relation to serious offences and the progress of those matters through prosecution and the courts. This was something that, in opposition, we found was highly deficient in relation to how that was managed, or lack thereof, and it is a commitment that we have made to do that.

We have been working with the commissioner for victims of crime and the police commissioner in particular, but one might appreciate that both the courts and the Department for Correctional Services also have a key role in the progress of a prosecution to sentence in relation to serious offences, and therefore that is another aspect that the commissioner is currently still addressing. I think that otherwise answers the question.

This is a provision of a service that is important to the government. A tender has gone out. The successful tenderer has received it. They are undertaking that work across the state and they continue to provide that excellent service.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Reynell, I call to order the member for Badcoe. I call to order the member for Reynell.

WOMEN'S DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COURT ASSISTANCE SERVICE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$780,000 cut to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance program announced in the 2019-20 state budget?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:12): I thank the member for the question, and I do ask her to remember, or at least review, what I have just said in response to the previous question. The court assistance service, and the issue in relation to the support for victim impact statement preparation, has been a responsibility that has transferred to the Commissioner for Victims' Rights unit within that division with those services, and those services are continuing. I reassure the people of South Australia that those services are continuing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and they are under the responsibility of the Commissioner for Victims' Rights—

An honourable member: All talk!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, I don't suggest the interjection is suggesting that's all talk. I hope they are not referring to the Commissioner for Victims' Rights.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Bronwyn Killmier, who has been appointed in this very important role, I think is doing an outstanding job, and the services that are required to support women in the domestic violence service have been transferred. There is a third area—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —which may be referred to by the member, and that relates to a legal advice provided under contract—which, again, has been through tender—and the Legal Services Commission was successful to provide that advice to women, particularly in the courts, to ensure that they have advice precedent to their matters in court so that they are actually able to get that advice. We think that is very important.

When I came into office, I found that the contract with the VSS for this service was actually basically a social worker contract for a legal service. That in itself had some major deficiencies, so we did act—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to ensure that that legal service was undertaken by legal practitioners, and therefore it was put out to tender. Several tendered for it. The Legal Services Commission were successful. I meet regularly with them, and I am very pleased that they are continuing to undertake that role.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Reynell, I call to order the member for Elizabeth and the member for Wright, I call to order the member for Playford, I warn the member for Reynell and I call to order the member for Lee.

SAFE CITY GRANT

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$250,000 cut to the safe city grant program that supports creating safer environments in the city, which he announced in the 2018-19 state budget?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell will resume her seat. The Minister for—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned. The Minister for Energy and Mining on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, sir. I didn't talk about the previous question, which was out of order. This one is out of order as well with regard to standing order 97. If the member would like to provide all of that information, she certainly can do that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right and members on my left! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If the member would like to provide information and/or her assertions, she can do it by seeking leave.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee on the point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This is information which has been tabled before the house in the 2018-19 budget papers, specifically Budget Paper 5—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no occasion—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —information specifically already provided to the house.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no occasion for the giving of an impromptu speech on a point of order, and that is an observation to all members. On the point of order, I uphold the point of order. I have listened carefully to the member for Reynell's question on this occasion and on the previous occasion. Should the member for Reynell wish to introduce facts, then the member for Reynell is entitled to seek leave to do so.

Ms HILDYARD: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$250,000 cut to the safe city grant program that supports creating safer environments in the city? With your leave and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Whetstone: They've got the B team out today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HILDYARD: The B team!

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Ms HILDYARD: We have to put up with this constantly, Mr Speaker—constantly from the member for Chaffey. Get him in order—no more.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! In case any member wishes to raise a point of order, any member is entitled to do so. The member for Reynell has the call. The member for Reynell is entitled to be heard in silence.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: I would ask the member for Chaffey to withdraw his remarks about the B team toward the women of the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! On the point of order, the Minister for Energy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned for a second time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned. The Minister for Energy and Mining on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The member opposite is quite entitled to ask for an apology and/or withdrawal, but he's not entitled to change the statement or comment on the statement in the way that he did.

The SPEAKER: On the point of order and in circumstances in which there were a number of simultaneous interjections on both sides of the house, unfortunately, for better or worse, I did not hear any particular remarks that have been referred to in the course of the point of order. There has been a request that the member for Chaffey withdraw remarks that have been deemed offensive. Does the member for Chaffey wish to be heard on that point and/or withdraw any remarks that he made? If not, I undertake to the house to go back and look at the record and rule as may be appropriate.

Mr WHETSTONE: Sir, I withdraw calling the Labor Party a B team.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey is called to order. The member for Reynell has the call.

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order according to standing order 125. I do take offence at the member for Chaffey calling myself and other Labor women the B team.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education on the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, I would submit that there's no point of order. The member for Chaffey has withdrawn the characterisation. To whom it was directed has also been dealt with previously.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell will cease interjecting. On the point of order raised by the member for Reynell, I have heard the member for Chaffey withdraw what he described as the remark that he made. As things stand, I can take the matter no further. Should members wish me to do so, I will consider the record and any available evidence to me and come back should there be any further matter to bring to the attention of the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell has the call.

Ms HILDYARD: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$250,000 cut to the safe city grant program that supports creating safer environments in the city? With your leave and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: The 2018-19 state budget tabled in this house set out a \$250,000 cut to the safe city grant program.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:21): I thank the member for the question. She has raised the question of CCTV coverage in the past in relation to this project, but for the benefit of other members who may not be aware, the safe city CCTV network is actually owned by the City of Adelaide and is monitored by the Police Security Services Branch of South Australia Police within its own existing resources. That continues.

The member refers to a cut. I tell the house that the Attorney-General's Department three-year funding agreement with the City of Adelaide ceased on 30 June 2020. The member may have omitted to either find out about or be aware, but I inform her that, as part of the Safer City Action Plan Table 2019-23, the City of Adelaide itself has allocated \$2 million relating to city-wide CCTV coverage and monitoring.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would suggest that that will certainly cover the matter. Secondly, for the first time ever, this government has supported an \$800,000 contribution towards Crime Stoppers, which is also seeking assistance to keep—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right and members on my left!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —our city safe and to keep South Australians safe. That is what we are committed to do and we will continue to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for King, I warn the member for Elizabeth, I warn the member for Badcoe and I call to order the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters and delivering for our children and future generations?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): I thank the member for King for her excellent question. She is a champion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Schubert is called to order. Interjections across the chamber will cease. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do thank the member for King for the excellent work she does in her local community, promoting good outcomes for current members and future members in that area. I think every single person in South Australia appreciates that we have done well in terms of the coronavirus. I think South Australia is now the safest state in the safest country on this earth. We have delivered good health outcomes. Now what we are focused on is making sure that we can deliver good economic outcomes for now and well into the future. That's why my government is absolutely 100 per cent committed to building what matters for our state across multiple areas.

One of the areas that we are very, very focused on is fixing the mess that we inherited from those opposite with regard to health. The health system was in a state of chaos when we came to government. Transforming Health—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —was a massive dud. We have not heard the words 'transforming' and 'health' in the same sentence from those opposite over the last three years. They should hang their heads in shame. By contrast—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —what we are doing is a massive, massive—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —investment into our health infrastructure and also our health services in South Australia. Only the other day—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —they hate it over there—I was out with the member for King at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: She didn't hate it; she loved it because we are expanding the emergency department. We are doing upgrades and expansions to all the emergency departments in metropolitan Adelaide, and that's the transformation of the facilities that exist in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We also, very importantly, reversed the disgraceful—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kurna is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —act of vandalism against our health system in South Australia, which was the closure of the Repat. Our veterans—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —were camped on the steps of this parliament. They didn't care not for one second about our veterans, not for the people of South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in terms of our health facilities. By contrast, we are developing the Repat facility into a very, very important health precinct for our state. We are also looking after regional health with upgrades to facilities at Eudunda, Loxton and Kapunda hospitals, Naracoorte—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and Angaston hospitals, also Waikerie, Bordertown, Clare, Peterborough and, of course, the Coober Pedy Hospital. We are also massively investing in road infrastructure in South Australia. We are doing that in metropolitan Adelaide and we are also doing it in country SA. We inherited a massive, massive backlog in terms of road maintenance right across the state. We have rolled up our sleeves and we are investing at the moment \$16.7 billion into upgrades of infrastructure right across our state. One of the most important, of course, is the completion of the north-south corridor. This was a project which was first envisaged when I was born, right back—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in 1968. This will take out 21 sets of traffic lights and create 4,000 jobs. We are also massively, massively investing in regional roads so that we can improve the safety for all of those people here in our state. Earlier today, I was with the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing at Memorial Drive—very exciting. I know those opposite hate it. They hated the upgrade of Memorial Drive—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —they hated the upgrade of the Adelaide Oval, with the fantastic new hotel. They opposed everything; it's in their DNA. But I will tell you one thing: we are just getting on. We are delivering for the people of South Australia and they are absolutely loving it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is called to order. Before I call the member for Ramsay, I call to order the Minister for Trade and Investment, I call to order the member for Hurtle Vale, I warn the member for Wright, I warn the member for Kurna and I warn the member for Lee for a second time. The member for Playford and the member for West Torrens can leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable members for West Torrens and Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay.

TAXI CONCIERGE SERVICE

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$800,000 cut in the 2018-19 state budget to the concierge service at managed taxi ranks? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The previous Labor government, to ensure that women had a safe place to catch a taxi in the city late at night, introduced a concierge service. However, in the 2018-19 state budget this service was cut by \$800,000 and unable to continue.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:29): Again, this is a historical matter, but I am happy to inform the house that the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —issue in relation to service provision and safety around taxi ranks remains a matter for consideration. We have worked with the police and we have worked with the Adelaide City Council to deal with this issue, including lighting and the like, and importantly we have also maintained a commitment to deal with surveillance in other parts of the metropolitan area.

In Hutt Street, for example, I recently found that there was funding needed for the provision of surveillance, again for the protection particularly of people who were patrons of or providing a service to retail outlets, and when the funding was identified as being surplus to requirements an extra \$33,000 out of the Justice Rehabilitation Fund was paid to purchase and install safety hardware at Hutt Street.

The direct beneficiaries of that hardware on Hutt Street are BeWon, the Old Croissant Factory, Raj on Taj, Nagomi Japanese, Kin Kin Thai, Coffylosophy, Chicken and Seafood and Karl Chehade Dry Cleaning, and we are awaiting applications from a further nine businesses to be able to provide that service as well. As a government, we have been keen to identify areas of particular need, provide funding to do that and obviously provide it on a tender basis.

I thank the member for Adelaide, my colleague the Minister for Child Protection, who has been a strong advocate for hotspots of concern in relation to advocacy. In the last couple of years and according to recent media reports, there have been some management issues in relation to the people who access the services in Hutt Street, and that has caused some tensions. But she has been a strong advocate for us to consider that. We have worked with police and other health and welfare services. We are very proud of these initiatives and I thank her for her support to those businesses in advocacy and the application of these funds.

CRIME PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY SAFETY GRANTS

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:31): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$4 million cut to the crime prevention grants that ensured safety for women in South Australia? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms COOK: In the 2018-19 budget tabled in this house, there was a \$4 million cut made to the crime prevention and safety grants.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:32): Again, I thank the member for her question. She and others in the house I think agree that crime prevention is important, and we as a government of course, as I have indicated in a number of previous questions, are not only very interested in this area but also work with the local communities—Adelaide City Council in particular in relation to city matters—in relation to surveillance generally and support for protection services with the South Australian police force. Crime prevention is very important to us and we will continue to provide support for that purpose.

DAVENPORT ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:33): My question is directed to the Minister for Education. Can the minister please provide an update to the house on the Marshall Liberal government's support for young people and their families by building key infrastructure in the southern suburbs, particularly in my electorate of Davenport?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:33): I thank the member for Davenport for this important question. I know that he is a passionate advocate for the children and young people in his community and more broadly across the south and, indeed, for the schools and preschools particularly that service those communities.

I was with the member for Davenport just under two weeks ago visiting some sites in his electorate. One of the sites we visited was the Aberfoyle Hub Preschool on Taylors Road. I know Elise Wheaton and the staff at Aberfoyle Hub Preschool are very excited about one of the

government's programs, which is the preschool maintenance funds that have come about as part of our COVID stimulus package.

They were very proud of the work they had done with the \$20,000 they spent last year, and they were very excited about the work they are doing to improve their outdoor areas in the coming five months, a project that has engaged their student body. The children had told them what they wanted, the parents and the staff worked together and they have a really exciting body of work to improve their outdoor area.

Those are discussions and exciting plans that are being replicated in nearly 400 government preschool sites around South Australia in every one of our members' electorates. I encourage all members to reach out to your preschools and learn about this great work that is going on. It is also providing critical jobs for tradies, small businesses and suppliers at a time when they have never needed it more.

In Davenport, in the member's electorate, there are some really exciting big projects as well. One of the most significant is at the Aberfoyle Park High School, which has a \$14 million project that the member for Davenport and I have also appreciated the opportunity to have a look at on a couple of occasions to see that work progressing—new buildings, the refurbishment of existing buildings and indoor and outdoor connectivity being developed. Of course, we are not just focused on the bricks and mortar. The most important work that is done in our schools, of course, is the teaching and learning that go on in the classroom, and there are a range of ways in which that is delivered.

While I have Aberfoyle Park High School in mind, can I say one of the key things we are looking to build is the culture in our schools and the activities our schools undertake. One of the really exciting activities at Aberfoyle Park High School is that they engage in the Australasian Ethics Olympiad. I am sure the house will be very pleased to know that the philosophy club at Aberfoyle Park High School won gold (first place) in the state Ethics Olympiad and recently won a silver medal (second place) in the Australasian finals. It is a tremendous achievement and we congratulate Ashwin Murugappa, Konon Kuboi, Sev Pretila, Georgia Warren and Cadence Butterfield, who were the team who were successful there.

Across the broader southern suburbs, there are a range of terrific infrastructure projects underway. I know that the Christies Beach High School project, worth \$8 million and anticipated to be completed in August, enhancing the school entry and admin areas, refurbishing facilities and removing aged transportables, is going well. At Reynella East College, the \$13 million program includes a new gymnasium classroom and amenities, and Wirreanda Secondary School's \$11½ million program is anticipated for completion in the middle of this year. I imagine the member for Hurtle Vale may well have visited and, if not, I encourage her to visit a number of those new facilities already in use—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —as of the last couple of weeks. It was tremendous to be able to spend some time in that new facility that was delivered about two weeks ago. If the member has been there in the last two weeks, I commend her.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is called to order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The year 7s at Wirreanda Secondary School are, of course, loving the opportunity to have that specialist environment. Across the southern suburbs, there are big programs at Reynella East College, Seaford Secondary College—in particular, the addition of new funding to support modular special options places is much appreciated—and at Woodcroft Primary School, with a tremendous project happening there. The Marshall Liberal government will continue to support the communities of the south in delivering outstanding world-class education facilities.

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$4.75 million cut in the 2018-19 state budget to the Legal Services Commission so that women

can access valuable legal advice? In case the Premier has not read the 2018-19 state budget papers, I will explain.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Enfield will resume her seat. The Minister for Energy and Mining on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and remind members that, in accordance with standing order 97, it is inappropriate to introduce argument or opinion in a question. I will give the member for Enfield an opportunity to rephrase.

Ms MICHAELS: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier reverse the \$4.75 million cut in the 2018-19 state budget to the Legal Services Commission? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms MICHAELS: In Budget Paper 5 of the 2018-19 state budget, page 13, line 2 refers to Legal Services Commission efficiencies totalling \$4.75 million over the forward estimates.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:38): I appreciate the question. It is not the first time we have been asked about this. We did have an estimates process in relation to these matters and these were raised at that time.

There are a couple of issues in relation to the Legal Services Commission. Firstly, a national agreement has been signed. Never before has our state, along with other states, had as much money in the Legal Services Commission, the community legal services and the ALRM. That is the first thing. Secondly, it may not be clear to the member but, if she reads the 2018-19 and 2019-20 budget, she will observe that there was a bringing forward of funds for the Legal Services Commission for the benefit of moneys they got in advance. That was at their request and we agreed to it. To explain it specifically, I am happy to bring the member back a full answer—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —as to exactly what the change of arrangements was. It is not perhaps helpful, but certainly not making it clear to the public, if a component is removed and the rest isn't there. So I will undertake to ensure that the member has a full list of what the provisions are in relation to funding to the—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: We've got that: it's in the budget.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will cease interjecting.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —Legal Services Commission, together with extra moneys that they have been given for other programs, which we are very pleased that they have taken on for the people of South Australia. I just remind other members to appreciate that men, women and children and other members of our LGBT community also receive Legal Services Commission support.

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Premier. How can the women of South Australia have any confidence that you have their interests at heart when you won't answer a single question by a female MP about women's safety issues?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The Minister for Energy and Mining rises on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 97: again, that question clearly contained argument, sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I will give the deputy leader an opportunity to rephrase.

Dr Close: The question stands for itself. He won't answer it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There's no need, Deputy Premier. The question is out of order. I will move on.

LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting South Australians by building key infrastructure to boost the livestock industry?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:41): I thank the member for Hammond for his important question. The member is committed, like all of us on this side of the house, to building what matters, to provide jobs and opportunities here in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government is investing \$12.9 billion in infrastructure over four years to transform the opportunities in South Australia.

I was delighted to join the Premier, the Minister for Trade and Investment, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and the member for Hammond out at Murray Bridge late last year for the sod-turning at Thomas Foods International's new meat processing facility. It is exciting to see the work that is being done and to see Thomas Foods committing to rebuild here in South Australia to develop a world-class abattoir with amazing technology being introduced into that abattoir going forward, following the sad fire that occurred back in 2018 that destroyed their former abattoir.

The abattoir is being built on a greenfield site, and the Marshall government is very much supporting them in their needs, investing in core infrastructure to get access to what is needed at this particular location. The government has invested \$160 million from the Regional Growth Fund towards roadworks and utilities going out to the development.

I am pleased to announce the infrastructure of the roadworks has been completed and now we are seeing work underway and progressing in relation to electricity, water and gas infrastructure. As well as the state government's commitment, the Morrison commonwealth government is also contributing to the project. This is a very important project for the Murray Bridge region and for the state's economy.

Once operational, the new TFI plant is expected to create 2,000 jobs as well as 4,500 indirect jobs. They will be processing 1,200 cattle per day. They will also be processing 15,000 sheep and lambs per day, which is a substantial increase on the capacity of the old abattoir. As well as that, there are 600 additional new jobs there from the old plant. The government is very much supporting our livestock industries. We have also seen the need to invest in this facility to make sure we can supply the export and local markets and maximise the potential out there for farmers' returns.

Through the COVID-19 pandemic, the private sector has been standing up in regional South Australia. They have been out there very much wanting to commit to our economy. There has been a special round of the Regional Growth Fund that has been overwhelmingly responded to with 228 applicants which totalled \$740 million worth of investment wanting to be done. The government has also been investing \$25 million into the South Australian dog fence rebuild. This is also a key project supporting our livestock industries. The first stage has been completed and other stages are in the process of being delivered as we speak.

It's very important that we continue to support the livestock industries in South Australia. They are such an important part of the South Australian economy; they have always been an important part. By investing in the infrastructure to facilitate the rebuild at Thomas Foods and the work that has been done in that one in 100-year opportunity to rebuild the dog fence, the Marshall Liberal government is investing in infrastructure that matters.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Can the minister advise the house how many of the 30 unsuccessful projects submitted

to round 2 of the Regional Growth Fund satisfied the fund's criteria higher than the two uncompetitive grant applications that were approved by the former minister?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:45): I thank the member for the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. The Deputy Premier is called to order. The Premier will cease interjecting. Interjections on my left and on my right, I have made reference earlier this week—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee! I have made reference earlier this sitting week to the particularly objectionable form of interjection across the chamber that is between one member and another. Those, among all interjections, will cease. The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development is entitled to be heard in silence. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was about to say, the Regional Growth Fund, the \$160 million over 10 years that the Marshall Liberal government has committed to regions, is such an important part of support for our regional economy as well as the South Australian economy. As stated in my previous answer in relation to Thomas Foods, it is very important that we invest in those regions, that we invest in these projects and that we do what we can to support our regions.

There are many applicants who come forward for these opportunities and it is very important that we understand that they are going to deliver us jobs and they are going to deliver us opportunities to see further investment into our communities in those regions. It is all about the regions and making sure those regions are supported going forward.

As we look at those assessments as they come in, there is very much an opportunity for those to be assessed against the criteria to make sure that they have submitted what's required of them. It goes through a panel process to make sure that they are able to meet the criteria needed to fund these projects. I am very confident that we are actually getting the money on the ground, unlike the former Labor government where they had over \$12 million worth of investments that were never delivered. They made the commitment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: They didn't see them delivered. The money was never spent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: It's extremely disappointing for the regions just to make public announcements that, 'We are going to fund something,' and it never happens. We are about getting the money on the ground, making sure that development actually happens.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Can the minister advise the house how many of the 30 qualifying applications, which were not approved under the Regional Growth Fund round 2, originated from the member for Narungga's electorate?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:49): I thank the member for the question. I am unable to have that detail in front of me of those particular applications. But again I will reinforce how important it is that we support the regions and we support the job opportunities out in those electorates. We want to make sure there is the opportunity for the regional community to prosper for South Australia's benefit. We will

continue to invest in this space. This is such an important area for the South Australian economy and we are doing what needs to be done.

INVESTMENT ATTRACTION

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister update the house on how the government is securing business and consumer confidence through programs that are attracting investment into South Australia?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (14:49): Thank you, member for Flinders. Of course, he comes from a great electorate, Eyre Peninsula being the heart of a real engine room for our economy. It is great to go down and visit the member for Flinders, being with him at Port Lincoln and seeing some of the great aquaculture they have down there, whether it is Coffin Bay oysters or, closer to Port Lincoln, the kingfish and bluefin tuna as well. It is fantastic produce there in our traditional industry that we have here in South Australia.

We are always looking to the future and what is going on into the future, so we are also setting up those industries of the future. One of those precincts is, of course, Lot Fourteen. That is really starting to show in terms of changing where we are going in the economy. As I spoke about just previously in parliament, AWS have arrived here and want to set up in Adelaide, which is fantastic news. They are one of the top two businesses in the world, coming right here to South Australia. That is jobs for South Australians, high-value jobs as well.

It is not just about getting those big key anchors. It is also about the ecosystem trying to get those smaller businesses. They can feed off, build into and work with those bigger ones and then grow out and one day become larger companies themselves. As a government, we really want to encourage that. We want to attract those sorts of small, thriving, globally focused businesses.

That is why we have the Landing Pad program, which is a fantastic program. There is \$4 million of funding in that program. It is a way to try to get these small businesses set up in South Australia in their first 12 months and get them to understand what it is like in South Australia. It provides up to \$80,000 in the first 12 months for each of those small businesses. There is up to \$40,000 towards setting up their office and also a little around their working space and reimbursing office expenses.

Additionally, there is another up to \$40,000 in those first 12 months to try to understand what the tax system is like in Australia and what the legal environment is in South Australia. It is so important to help them with that sort of advice. There is even some marketing as well. Our department also tries to work with these businesses to provide them with non-financial support. In those partnerships, Lot Fourteen is about having businesses interact and trying to build on that.

Recently, I had a great opportunity to speak to all businesses that are part of the Landing Pad program. They are businesses that have come from Canada, India, Spain, France, Hong Kong, New Zealand and also the USA. These are high-growth companies, and they have looked to set up here in South Australia. If I could just talk about one of them, CH4—which goes along with the aquaculture theme the member for Flinders mentioned—is a fantastic business. I spoke with their CEO, Steve Meller. He is a businessperson, an entrepreneur, who has come out of Silicon Valley and built up below-the-line profits of over \$20 billion in his time.

He is now coming here to South Australia and setting up a seaweed growing and cultivation company. The seaweed can be processed in such a way that it can be given as feedstock to cattle. We know that cattle produce methane emissions. Methane is 25 per cent more intense in terms of the greenhouse effect and carbon dioxide, so it is an important industry to try to mitigate methane emissions. This goes a long way towards that. It only takes up about 1 per cent of their feedstock and they are getting great results.

That is just one of the businesses. These are future growth industries. That is a massive opportunity for our state. I am glad that we are leading the way from that point of view. That is building the economy here, building jobs for South Australia, and that is what we will be working hard on every single day we are in government.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Can the minister advise the house how many of the 30 qualifying applications for the Regional Growth Fund round 2 were unsuccessful from the member for MacKillop's electorate?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:54): I thank the member for Lee for his question. Again, I want very much to point out that getting this money out onto the ground, getting these jobs out into the regional areas and regional electorates, is very important. Unfortunately for the Labor Party, it has very few regional electorates, but we very much see the support right across South Australia. There is no favouritism along where it goes. It is very much—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: There is no favouritism where it goes. It is going to projects that deliver the jobs out there in the community. It is about getting long-term investment out in those regions. It is so important that we continue to support our regions.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. What message does it send to regional businesses and councils that their qualifying submissions were rejected for funding while uncompetitive grants, including one in the current minister's electorate, were approved for funding?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have heard the question. The Minister for Energy and Mining rises on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Again, another question out of order under standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, Minister for Energy and Mining, I was unable to hear the opening of your remarks on the point of order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Another question out of order under standing order 97: the question contained a great deal of argument.

The SPEAKER: The question contained argument. If the member for Lee wishes to seek leave to introduce facts, I will give him an opportunity to do so.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will ask the question again. My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. What message does it send to regional businesses and councils that their qualifying submissions were rejected for funding while uncompetitive grants, including those in the current minister's electorate, were approved? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yesterday, the Auditor-General's supplementary report to the annual report was tabled in this place, and included in that report on page 3, for those who are interested, the Auditor-General says—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Auditor-General says:

We found that the list of projects approved in Round 2 included two projects the Panel assessed as uncompetitive (using the criteria it applied to all applications) and did not recommend. PIRSA advised that these projects were approved by the former Minister using his discretion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57): I have listened to the questions that have been put to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, who I note to the house was not a member of the cabinet and not part of the decision-making and so I am not quite sure as to why the question came with an assertion that perhaps there was some type of favouritism given to one of the projects that was in the current minister's electorate area.

I point the member to the final two paragraphs on page 6, where I think the Auditor-General takes into account a detailed explanation that has been provided by the former Minister for Regional Development, and I quote:

The former Minister advised that he consulted with the Panel Chair to consider the next most worthy projects and subsequently approved the two replacement projects.

He goes on to say:

Having considered the former Minister's response I note the Panel report was not presented as a ranked list of projects after the initial 10 recommended projects. It is my view that the rationale to depart from the recommended projects should be documented as a record of the decision making process.

There is no finding against the former minister. There is no finding—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —against the cabinet decision for these projects.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Unequivocally—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The member should have read right through to page 4 before writing out his questions for today's question time. I just suggest that the member actually read a little bit further into the Auditor-General's Report. I note that they've obviously got some changes in their personnel. They don't have as many people writing questions up in the dream factory as they used to. Some people over on that side are hoping they can get Mr Naughton back as quickly as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He seemed to have a more logical flow—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —than what we have seen today and what we have seen in recent times. It is pretty embarrassing what is going on over there at the moment. One minute they can't write questions, the next minute they are running their own advertising campaign, Meet Pete. Have you seen this? Meet Pete. Nobody knows who Pete is, so they've got to run advertising programs right across South Australia—Meet Pete. I note that they're not saying 'Meet Tom.' Forget that. There is no interest in Meet Tom. Hide him under a rock. But now they've got to try to introduce the Leader of the Opposition three years into the electoral cycle. What a debacle over there!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting. The member for Lee and the member for West Torrens will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

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

The SPEAKER: The house will note, and I draw to all honourable members' attention, that any member is entitled to raise a point of order in relation to proceedings, including in the course of the time allocated for questions without notice, and I stand ready to rule on points of order as they are made. Should there be a significant departure from either a question with respect to standing order 97 or an answer with respect to standing order 98, then the Speaker may be moved to intervene. The Speaker will be somewhat slow to do so in the absence of a member rising to raise a point of order.

I just bring those matters to the attention of the house. I am otherwise listening carefully and remind all members that both the questioner and the minister responding to the question are entitled to be heard in silence. Does the leader seek the call?

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier take any responsibility for the crisis levels of overcrowding in our emergency departments? With your leave and that the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: As at 1pm today, the SA Health Emergency Dashboard showed every metropolitan ED at Code White or Code Red levels or at exceeding capacity, including 13 patients waiting over 24 hours for a bed. At the Royal Adelaide Hospital alone, there were 15 mental health patients waiting for more than an eight-hour period for a bed.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:02): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. He is quite correct: there is a surge in demand currently being experienced right across South Australia, and that is exactly and precisely—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. It's true to say that I am not in a position to hear the Premier responding to the leader's question as things stand. There are limits to the capacity of the Chair without the cooperation of both sides to permit all members to have the opportunity to hear both question and answer. I remind members that the questioner and the minister responding to the question are entitled to be heard in silence. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying to the house, there is indeed a surge in demand currently being experienced in South Australia. This does occur from time to time and it's one of the reasons why since coming to government we have put an additional \$2.2 billion worth of new money into the budget here in South Australia.

We are currently spending an additional \$1.1 billion in a range of capital projects around South Australia, and we do that, we make those two sets of investments, to improve on the system that we inherited so that we are in a position to be able to cope with these surges, which do occur from time to time. In terms of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —operating budget, we are very proud since coming to government to have a very significant increase in the number of doctors and nurses in the system here in South Australia. In fact, I am advised that we have 286 nurses and midwives over and above what the Auditor-General reported we inherited when we came to government.

We have 247 medical FTEs over and above what we inherited when we came to government. We are investing a massive amount of money in capital projects right across this state—right across this state—upgrading and expanding the emergency departments here in our state. Down at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, as those opposite would be well aware, they cut the services for the 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week cardiac services. This was very, very unpopular. One of the first things that we did on coming to government was to put those services back into place.

The opposition should hang their head in shame. The number one person who should hang their head in shame is of course the Leader of the Opposition, who was the health minister in place right up until the last election. We invested \$4 million in upgrading the cardiac cath labs down at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the stage 3 developments are currently underway. These are extraordinarily important projects.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The projects and the investment that we are making are not only focused on metropolitan Adelaide, where often we do experience some of the most acute surge situations. We are investing to address the backlog in country hospital maintenance right across this state. We take this issue very seriously. We inherited a broken system. What we are doing now is working every single day to make sure that we can expand our capacity and our capability to meet the current and the future needs of the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Kavel, I call to order the member for Hammond.

SERVICE SA MOUNT BARKER

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on the opening of the Service SA centre in Mount Barker for the Hills?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:06): I thank the member for the question. It was just a few weeks ago that I was up in Mount Barker with the member for Kavel and yourself, sir, the member for Heysen—two fantastic advocates for their respective communities, who work incredibly hard to deliver the outcomes for the people in their electorates.

I had the great pleasure of showing these two members the brand-new Service SA centre in Mount Barker, which opened to the public this month. This is a landmark moment for the member for Kavel, the member for Heysen and the member for Hammond as well to deliver the Marshall government's election commitment to their communities.

We know that the wider Hills district but particularly townships like Mount Barker have experienced explosive growth in recent times. That's why the Marshall government is planning for the future for these communities by bringing the Service SA centre right to their doorstep. Delivering better services for the people of South Australia is something that the Marshall government is passionate about.

Until now, the people of those communities who wanted to go to the Service SA centre would have had to go to Murray Bridge or down to Mitcham if they weren't operating in town or working in town. To have it in Mount Barker is a great win for them. Now the people of their communities have that option, and it is far more convenient and more accessible for them to access those government services. The new Mount Barker facility is modelled on the Currie Street Service SA centre, which is the flagship store of the entire network.

The Currie Street Service SA centre opened in February 2020, replacing the former North Terrace site, and it has been a raging success. So far, we have used that template for the Mount Barker operation. The Mount Barker centre is roughly 160 square metres and has two face-to-face counters as well as a manager's office for meetings. It has seven digital kiosks, made up of two self-service points and five assisted service points, which have been loved by the local community up there since it opened.

The Currie Street centre uses new technology and customer flow measures that have seen waiting times reduced, and we anticipate the same benefits will flow to Mount Barker. It is a modern,

attractive, clean, fresh format store which is orientated towards providing good old-fashioned service but also helping transition towards using streamlined digital and self-service options.

The Mount Barker centre will adopt the same technology to improve customer satisfaction, shorten waiting times, provide accessibility, offer assistance to the elderly and provide education to customers on digital transaction options. Importantly for this community given its population growth, the growing demographic there, there will be the provision of learner theory testing and hazard perception testing for people to acquire their driver's licences. That is something that the member for Kavel pushed for very hard, and we are glad to deliver that.

As mentioned before, the facility is equipped with a number of self-service digital kiosks, counters for face-to-face interactions with the friendly Service SA staff and a comfortable waiting room and meeting room and office space as well. Importantly, the staff have amenities such as a kitchenette and a dining and back-office space. The centre is located right in the heart of Mount Barker on Morphett Street, an epicentre for the explosive growth that I mentioned previously.

When you enter, you will be greeted at the reception desk by a friendly face with a friendly smile at one of the Service SA centres. But I must say, the smiles on the staff when I entered this centre were nowhere near as big as the smiles on the faces of the member for Kavel and the member for Heysen when I visited with them as they deliver better services for their local community. That was a commitment we made when we came to government. We promised more jobs, lower costs and better services, and this is an example of delivering those better services.

GLENELG RIVER SHACK LEASES

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Environment. Can the minister inform Kim Cawthorne from my electorate when her family and others will obtain a renewal of lease for their shacks on the Glenelg River?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:10): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. The shack lease project is a complicated one, as shacks throughout the state are undergoing these tenure changes to give people certainty in relation to either long tenure or freehold, depending on the area—long tenure for areas on Crown land in the protected estates, such as national parks and on the Glenelg River, and then freehold in some of the easier sites, such as the Smoky Bay shacks over on the West Coast.

In relation to the Glenelg River shacks, these are particularly complicated, given that they sit out over a river and have required quite a bit of infrastructure works, kindly supported by not only the Department for Environment and Water but also shack owners and the local council, the District Council of Grant. In relation to each of those individual leases for the Glenelg River, it is complicated to issue those. I will endeavour to get those to each of the current leaseholders for the Glenelg River shacks by the end of 2021.

BALAKLAVA HOSPITAL

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:11): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in the house. Can the minister update the house on the future direction of the Balaklava hospital operating theatre and also the future direction of the Balaklava hospital in general? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: That's exactly how you do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Energy and Mining is called to order. The member for Frome has the call.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: In late 2019, the planned surgeries of the operating theatre were cancelled due to problems with tree roots blocking underground pipes, and the decision was made to suspend theatre operations at the time. Since then, there have been numerous meetings and consultation regarding the future direction of the operating theatre. However, to date there has been no firm direction for the Balaklava community to understand the future of the operating theatre and also the future of the Balaklava hospital. The people of Balaklava and surrounding areas are looking

for a positive and good result announcement regarding the issues and concerns raised by the decision to cease the operation of the theatre.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:12): I thank the member for his question in relation to the Minister for Health's portfolio. I will approach the Minister for Health, as is the usual practice, and verify the particulars as identified in the member's question or otherwise and bring back a response to the member in the house.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Minister, what steps is the government undertaking to ensure that South Australian grown timber is kept in South Australia in order for timber yards to remain viable so that small businesses and small builders have a reasonable amount of timber supply to build homes and employ South Australians and keep their businesses afloat? Sir, with your leave and that of the house I will further explain.

Leave granted.

Mr DULUK: The HomeBuilder scheme has had a significant number of applications in South Australia, which is obviously fantastic for the local industry. However, several of my constituents have recently contacted my office to express their concern about their businesses grinding to a halt because of a shortage of timber and the ability to meet HomeBuilder demand.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:14): I thank the member for a very important question. It's a very challenging time in the building sector for meeting the needs of the demand that's out there, stimulated by the federal government's commitment in this space to stimulate the economy.

There has also been an interesting worldwide increased demand for timber as well that's on top of that. We have seen sawn timber imports into Australia in the 2018-19 year go from being 17 per cent of the sawn timber here in Australia down to 11 per cent in the 2019-20 year, so there are significant pressures there.

There is very much an increased demand. We are working with the timber industry, organising meetings with them, to see whether they may be able to assist in this space, but we are finding the sheer demand a challenge and it is very difficult to influence that ability to impact on that demand.

ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. What can the minister tell the house about the fight against the silent pandemic AMR and how South Australia's share of this important work could be made larger?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:15): That's a question I will have to get back to you later on when I have spoken to the department.

ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:15): Supplementary: I am at a loss. You have been quoted in two newspaper articles this week about it and I thought you would like the opportunity to tell us, considering South Australia was the home of penicillin, named after my electorate of Florey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:15): As I have said, I will take that on notice.

The SPEAKER: The member for Frome.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Frome has the call. The member for Frome is entitled to be heard in silence.

COVID-19 SUPPORT PAYMENTS

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:16): My question again is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house as to the compensation made to Bakers Delight in Port Pirie for loss of trade during the sudden three-day shutdown in November last year due to COVID-19 closures? With your leave, sir, I will explain to the house.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: On 10 December I wrote a letter to the Hon. Rob Lucas, the Treasurer, and I quote:

Under the restrictions Supermarkets were allowed to open and this operation is in the mall area opposite Coles providing a food product. From earlier reports there was no mention that Bakers were not allowed to open, in actual fact as can be seen from the highlighted area [the bakers were allowed to be open]...

During the morning [Bakers Delight in Port Pirie] became aware of some Bakers Delight stores in Adelaide being told to close. There were variations to the information being advised and some were told to close and others operating with restricted hours...Of 43 Bakers Delight bakeries in the state, 15 were closed and the others allowed to trade. It appeared that Police [Officers] interpreted differently and therefore the approach was not uniform.

The response on 21 December from the Treasurer was that that was referred to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:17): I thank the member for the question for the Minister for Health. As is the usual practice, I will put the question as identified to the Minister for Health and bring back any particulars, as appropriate, in response to the house.

SNAPPER FISHING

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Can the minister confirm to the house that the recent snapper closure in the South-East is based on science?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:18): I thank the member for the question. Yes, it's very important that we follow the science in relation to this. It's very important that we protect the fishery going forward for South Australians to be able to catch fish into the future. It is very important that when the science tells us that a total allowable catch has been reached for any sector we need to stop.

SNAPPER FISHING

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:18): Supplementary to the Minister for Primary Industries: will the minister table that science?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:18): I thank the member for the question. I will have a look into that and see whether it would be appropriate.

ARTS SA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:18): My question is to the Premier in his role as Minister for the Arts. How important are middle-sized theatres to the Adelaide arts scene and what has been done since my first letter to you about the restoration of the Royalty Theatre so it can continue to play its part in future Festival and Fringe events?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:19): As the member would be more than aware, we are very significantly upgrading the capacity of arts venues right across the state. Some of them are for our performing arts and some of them are for our visual arts. Of course, today we were at Memorial Drive, where we know that we are going to have a fantastic facility not only for elite sport but also for the arts. The Memorial Drive courts were used right throughout my childhood as a fantastic venue for a range of concerts. I have already spoken to the artistic directors of both the Adelaide Festival and the Fringe Festival—and, indeed, the WOMAD festival—about the potential for using that facility going forward.

The Royalty Theatre is not a facility that is owned by the people of South Australia. We've got to prioritise our taxpayer dollars on making sure that we can continue to improve the facilities that we own. Having said that, I think the member makes a good point. The Royalty Theatre, like some other private theatres in South Australia, has played an important part in providing that additional venue capacity for our state during the surge times of the Fringe and the Festival. We haven't seen fit at this stage to put additional money into this area.

The member would note that last year any discretionary money was really focused primarily on supporting those artists who had been adversely affected by the coronavirus. In fact, we put a very significant additional amount of money into the arts budget last year to support those people who were doing it extraordinarily tough. It is not to say that we would rule out putting money into private facilities going forward.

I know that several years ago we put some money into upgrading the air conditioning at the Thebarton Theatre. This is not a theatre that is owned by the people of South Australia; it is a facility that is owned by the West Torrens council, so there is precedent for the taxpayer to put money into those private facilities. As I said, last year was really a focus on any discretionary money in the arts budget to go toward supporting artists adversely affected by the coronavirus.

ROYALTY THEATRE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:21): Supplementary again to the Premier in his role as Minister for the Arts: is it fair to portray the Royalty Theatre as a private theatre when any income at the Royalty is used to support the women's sport of calisthenics? Couldn't you kill two birds with one stone by working with the Minister for Recreation and Sport, who, when he responded to my letter, advised me of two grants, one of which they would not actually be eligible for? There is no way for them to lift the theatre out of the problems they have unless they have some support to upgrade the facility so they can augment their income through arts.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:22): I thank the member for the question and appreciate her interest in calisthenics. I note that \$214 million was put into the budget the last time around and a number of those grant applications are eligible for all sports to apply to. They are fifty-fifty funding operations, so they will have to put some of their own money in.

Across the board, since coming into government, I think we have put in excess of \$350 million into sport. Those programs are very much open to all sports, including calisthenics. The other great thing we did, of course, was increase the sports voucher from \$50 to \$100, which I think has been really well received. We have included dance, and calisthenics fits into that scope as well. We are very keen to keep talking with the member about opportunities there and encourage them to apply through those grant processes.

ROYALTY THEATRE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:23): Further supplementary: would you consider buying the Royalty Theatre, sir?

The SPEAKER: Is the question directed to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! Member for Florey, is the question directed—

Ms BEDFORD: The Premier. I was looking at the Premier.

The SPEAKER: The question is directed to the Premier. The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:23): Again, I am very keen to work with the member on opportunities. It is not on the agenda to buy that venue, no.

*Personal Explanation***MEMBER'S REMARKS**

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:23): I rise to make a personal explanation. I have been having quite a few chips from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition today. When I rose to leave the chamber, I was confronted with, 'Can't wait to get out of the chamber.'

The SPEAKER: The Premier might just pause. The Premier requires leave. Does the Premier seek leave?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, sir.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I find it extraordinary the assertion from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who shouted across the chamber as I got up to leave question time—which I do every day after we finish question time because we have important work in government to get on with—'Can't wait to get out of the chamber.' It flows on from a comment that she made earlier with a question, which was ruled by the Speaker out of order, regarding my inability to answer questions that the opposition had put today. I make this point by way of a personal explanation: none of those questions were directed to any of the portfolios that I am responsible for.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And there were people sitting in this chamber—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —who have the direct responsibility for these areas. So as per usual—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —what we get from the opposition is just politics—politics, politics, politics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am extraordinarily proud of my government's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am extraordinarily proud of the way that my government has addressed a range of issues which affect women in South Australia since coming to government. We have advanced a range of legislation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The occasion for giving a personal explanation, in accordance with standing order 108, is just that: it is an occasion to give a personal explanation and not to engage in broader debate. I remind the Premier of the need to confine remarks accordingly. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will conclude now because I do have other important business to attend to out of this, but I utterly reject the assertion from the deputy leader that I cannot wait to

get out of this chamber. I enjoy fulfilling my responsibility in this chamber every single day that I come into this place. Again, I make it very clear that I am—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —very proud of every single one of the policies and the funding that we have brought to a range of issues affecting women in this state since coming to government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the house is that the house note grievances. The member for Reynell.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell has the call. The member for Reynell is entitled to be heard in silence.

Grievance Debate

MARCH 4 JUSTICE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:27): Like any of us on this side of the house and the thousands of South Australian women who have spent years of their lives fighting to improve women's lives, Monday's March 4 Justice made me feel just a little more hopeful about a more equal future. The march was characterised by our firm declaration that enough is enough, by solidarity and by steadfast determination to make change.

It was a march attended by women of all ages and from a diverse range of backgrounds. Together, we were united and connected with women marching across the country, refusing to accept what so many of us have had to put up with for most of our lives. Yesterday, in our parliament, following horrendous accounts of sexual and discriminatory harassment outlined in the equal opportunity commissioner's review of harassment in this parliamentary workplace and following the voices of brave women speaking out across the country, we resolved to set up a committee to progress the review's recommendations and to develop a code of conduct.

These motions followed a refusal to prioritise the inquiry being moved when I called for it. It followed obfuscation by the Premier about whether or not he would support a code of conduct, and these motions were followed today by an appalling ongoing delay on debating increases to penalties for breaching domestic violence intervention orders. We will keep marching—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HILDYARD: —we will keep calling out that which harms women—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell will resume her seat. The member for Elder is called to order and warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left! I am listening carefully to the member for Reynell. The member for Reynell has the call and is entitled to be heard in silence, I remind members on my right.

Ms HILDYARD: If we are to collectively achieve gender equality, if we are to cease harming women, this government, this Premier, is going to have to do a whole lot more and a whole lot better than he and his government have done to date. So far they have shown that they just do not get it. This government has utterly failed women and it continues to do so.

Women have been incredibly negatively impacted during the pandemic. This government has failed to understand that women are more likely to work in insecure work and in the industries most impacted and, therefore, most likely to have had interruptions to their earnings and less likely to have accessed JobSeeker.

With a disturbing rise in domestic violence during the pandemic, this government has failed to respond. Our state is hopelessly under-resourced when it comes to intervention services for women experiencing domestic violence. There is a complete lack of ongoing funding for domestic violence prevention hubs. Our motions to inquire into modern slavery and insecure work are stalled. During this term of government, those opposite voted against a bill to include the experience of domestic violence in the Equal Opportunity Act and simply refused for two years straight to ban the appalling disrespectful slogans on Wicked Campers until they were embarrassed into taking action.

The 2018-19 state budget saw cuts to the Legal Services Commission, denying women access to valuable legal advice. In this government's first two budgets nearly \$20 million was cut to programs that provide services to women addressing safety, violence, advocacy and access to legal assistance: \$800,000 from the concierge service that managed taxi ranks to ensure that women had a safe place to catch a taxi in the city late at night was cut, a \$250,000 cut to the City Safe grant program and a \$4 million cut to crime prevention grants that ensured a safer environment for women have been made by those opposite.

The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing cut the \$24 million dedicated Female Facilities Program and the Women in Sport Taskforce. If any women were looking to serve on a sporting board, those opposite cut the Premier's Women's Directory too.

More than a year ago, I wrote to the then Speaker asking for breastfeeding facilities and change tables to be provided in this place, and to you, Mr Speaker, I detailed in writing the inappropriate language that I was subjected to in this place six months ago by a minister. I have been called 'disgusting' in this place by those opposite and have not received an apology. Today, Labor women were appallingly referred to as 'the B team'. Just then, Mr Speaker, the Premier refused to take any questions about women's safety, saying that they were not his responsibility. Absolutely shameful!

This week, we rightly saw women across Australia stand up and say enough is enough. Enough is enough, indeed. Women are calling for change across our community for an end to gendered violence and they rightly want those who are not with them, like those opposite, to get out of their way.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: I take offence at that last statement when it was clearly directed at members of the government to think that we would not be with those women. I would ask the member to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education raises a point of order. The Minister for Education has referred to the remark of the member for Reynell at the conclusion of her grievance directed to those opposite. The offence having been taken by reference to language, not directed to any particular member, I would give the member for Reynell the opportunity—

Mr PICTON: Point of order, sir: there has been a previous precedent in relation to offence against a party or a side of this house where you have made rulings that that cannot be taken as offence against one person, but that seems to be what the minister is trying to do here and you seem to be accepting it.

The SPEAKER: It is in exactly the same terms as I provided the opportunity to the member for Chaffey in the course of question time today. I give the member for Reynell the opportunity to address the point of order and, if the member for Reynell would do so, to withdraw any reference—

Mr PICTON: Which remark was the minister offended by?

The SPEAKER: I will give the minister the opportunity to be precise about it. I think I understand the reference.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: While it is not usually the custom for the aggrieved party to repeat, nevertheless the remark suggested that members of the government were standing in the way of those women who are seeking justice. I do not believe that I fulfil that characterisation. I do not believe any member of the government does, and I have identified I have offence. Sir, I understand your ruling is not requiring withdrawal but giving the opportunity for it, as the member for Chaffey did. I am happy with that outcome if the member wants to.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is appropriately made in respect of standing order 126. It is not addressed to remarks that are directed towards any individual member. In the circumstances, I give the member for Reynell the opportunity to take the call should she wish. I do not require the member for Reynell to withdraw those words. Does the member for Reynell seek the call?

Ms Hildyard: No.

MARCH 4 JUSTICE

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:36): I rise to make a contribution to the house. I, too, commend the March 4 Justice program this week, which was to acknowledge across Australia, largely by women but supported strongly by men, some of the inequities that still apply to women in our community. I think it is important, as I have said in this house several times this week, that we do listen and that we do understand that people will not be silenced, and this needs to be addressed.

Whilst the preceding member indicated concerns about the inappropriate language that has been addressed to her, I could spend the entire afternoon giving you a litany of the occasions on which my dress, appearance, attendance or contribution have been criticised and spoken of in a most disgusting manner, even in this house. I am not going to bother to go through that again. It was by former members. In the rough-and-tumble of debate, the robustness of those contributions has to be taken into account, but some of it has been indecent and objectionable and disgusting. I am not going to waste time going through it all. I abhor it. I think it is disgraceful if it is imposed on others.

What has then translated is that somehow or other the contribution of the government in the last three years has minimised, by alleged cutting towards programs—which has been traversed at previous estimates and again today in question time and which is rejected, but nevertheless—the application of the funds. It seems that the opposition's greatest complaint in that area is not what has been cut but who actually continues to provide the service. Even when a service continues, if it is not by a group or someone they endorse or like, they come back to complain about it.

That does not resolve the issue for women. We have made on this side a commitment to women. The Premier appointed, particularly in relation to domestic violence, our very own member for Elder to undertake a ministerial contribution in that regard because it is important to us that we deal with it. There are many programs that we have done and there are many extra services that we have pursued. Why? Because it matters.

We do know that sometimes we have to provide extra services, whether it is housing or whether it is the provision of a place for legal services or advice. Yarrow Place, for example, now has \$1 million over a year to respond to a program for women and children and to extend that across the state. These are services that are at the bottom of the cliff, as they say, and we do understand the need for that, but we are also here to advance legislation that is going to improve the lives of women and children in this state.

Can I say that, whilst there has been reference to the sexual harassment and discrimination report of the acting equal opportunity commissioner in respect of this place, that is, the parliament, as we speak the equal opportunity commissioner is undertaking a review in respect of women legal practitioners. This is another area of angst. It flows specifically and publicly from the allegations of a sexual assault, an abuse and an exploitation by women associates of a former High Court judge at the highest level in the country.

It has been replicated back here on the Chief Justice undertaking work, the Law Society of South Australia, the Bar Association and a number of women's legal organisations saying, 'Well, we want a full inquiry into this,' and that is precisely what has happened, and the government is ensuring that support is given to this agency to make sure it happens. Yes, we are committed on this side of the house to make provision by law for better protection for women and children to ensure in our policies that they are effective and to ensure that there is funding support to make sure that they can be populated and produced.

There is no-one more committed to women having opportunity in the future, and I repeat what I live by—that is, we must as parents and guardians do everything we can to educate our girls and teach our boys.

INTEGRITY CARE SA

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:41): Nearly one year ago Annie Smith died a slow and horrific death as a result of neglect. It is alleged she was under the watch of a single support worker, Rosa Maione. The very people who hired Ms Maione, Integrity Care, oversaw the rostering and took therefore responsibility for the competency of its workers who also now are under scrutiny. There are many people as vulnerable as Annie Smith in our community who rely on wonderful support workers.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order, Attorney?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, I just raise the point, for the benefit of the house and the member, that the case to which she has referred is still a matter before the courts. I would ask, sir, that you encourage the member to direct her comments in relation to the general concerns I expect she has as to vulnerable people.

Ms Cook: This has got nothing to do with the case of Annie Smith once I finish this part.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member has just identified the name of the person who has been charged in relation to a matter, and I ask her to confine her remarks to the general comment and not to the matters of that specific case.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Attorney, for raising that point of order. It is actually for me to ask the member to confine her remarks. I have taken on board the conversation that has been had across the chamber, out of order though it is. I take it, member for Hurtle Vale, that you will be confining your remarks from now on, please?

Ms COOK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Thank you for your counsel, Attorney. I will just go back a couple of lines, if you would not mind just waiting, just so I can get back into the flow, because I want to make sure that I do not say anything that is not actually what has been reported to us.

There are many wonderful people working as support workers in the community who support people who are as vulnerable as Annie Smith in our community. Clearly, the agency involved previously did not do a great job, and the people in charge of that organisation should really not have anything to do with employment, oversight or training of support workers.

It has been brought to my attention and publicised that Amy Collins, one of the three former directors of Integrity Care, is now teaching student support workers at a company called Wade Training, an organisation which is run by Amy's own mother and which has direct links to Integrity Care itself.

It is published in online reports that Integrity Care owes substantial loans to Kerrie Wade, to the tune of \$400,000. Other loans to and from directors of the organisations are also published in the financial statements. It beggars belief that a former director at the centre of one of South Australia's most shameful acts of neglect could be delivering education to people who will go on to provide personal care and support to vulnerable South Australians.

We have also had reports of mismanagement of NDIS plans, use of client credit cards and more that has been reported to us. It is concerning. Wade Training was suspended in September 2020 by the Australian Skills Quality Authority. This suspension is currently stayed by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal while under review. It does not fill one with confidence.

Wade Training continues to operate during this time. I am told that it is not just one Integrity Care director who is employed there but virtually the entire Integrity Care administrative team. It is quite a cosy arrangement.

I have been advised by Wade Training staff that there are other staff there directed, and in some places completing, literacy tests for students who are struggling with language skills. A student has reported to me that the owner of the organisation has been seen reading out the answers to assessments directly for students to write down or she and other staff members changing answers on assessments themselves.

What qualifications do these people have? Do they have any recent clinical experience and are they trained in certificates in training and assessment themselves? Several students have also advised that the RTO assessor signing off on their competencies has no qualification all. It is disgusting.

I am advised there has been a report made to SAPOL of an alleged assault by the owner of Wade Training against a student, and both students and former staff have reported to us a culture of bullying and harassment within that training organisation. I am also aware that a worker from a state-government funded RTO was in attendance at the time of this assault.

This person is charged with providing support to students undergoing training and we are told nothing happened as a result of that. In fact, I am told the only thing that happened since then was that the owner responded to this report by then threatening students within the classes. What are the students to do?

I call on the state government to reach out to these students currently enrolled in courses at Wade Training, offer them assistance to move to another provider and ensure that they facilitate any RPL that could be done in order to get them to finish their training. It is not the fault of the students that they have found themselves in this arrangement. They need to complete quality training in order to enter the workforce.

Aged and disability care training providers have a duty of care to provide the qualifications and skills needed for the highest quality care and safety of our most vulnerable, like Annie Smith, and both the state and the federal governments must ensure safeguards and oversights are in place to guarantee this.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:46): On this fine St Patrick's Day, I wish to provide an important update on our Marshall Liberal government's \$96 million upgrade to Modbury Hospital. This was another election promise I made which is being delivered for people living in King. People told me that the Modbury Hospital upgrade and returning local health services were priorities. As a result of my constituents' feedback, I have advocated on their behalf with my colleagues, with the health minister, the Treasurer and the Premier, for better local health services in the north.

I am so pleased we are now getting on with the job to deliver the Modbury Hospital upgrade and we are building what matters for people living in King. People tell me they have not forgotten that Modbury Hospital was downgraded under Labor's disastrous Transforming Health plan. Fast-forward to today and our upgrade of Modbury Hospital is getting closer to completion. This important project will ease pressure on our busy emergency departments, modernise the ageing facility and increase capabilities and facilities for patients and staff.

Did you know that our Modbury Hospital upgrade has created 1,378 jobs so far? How great is this for the north-east? The extensive upgrades to our local Modbury Hospital are all part of the record-breaking, billion-dollar health infrastructure built across the state. Did you know that our \$96 million Modbury Hospital upgrade includes an expanded acute surgical unit, completed eight-bed extended emergency care unit, an acute short stay general medical unit, a new purpose-built 20-bed palliative care unit, the re-establishment of a high dependency unit, a new multilevel outpatient department facility, and an upgraded engineering infrastructure/facade remediation?

So far, we have used 100 tonnes of reinforced steel manufactured locally in Cavan. Recently, at a visit to Floors 2 Go Christmas party, I met another local business owner who won the job to manufacture the flooring for our upgraded hospitals. He told me they have never been busier. There have been around 200 construction workers on site, and 1,378 people have been involved in building this Modbury Hospital upgrade. It is so exciting to see all the progress we have made to date.

On Thursday night, 8 April, the member for Newland and I are hosting a joint community forum on Modbury Hospital with the Hon. Stephen Wade MLC, Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Our joint community forum will be held at the Modbury Bowling Club, which is located at 50-97 Jack High Lane in Ridgehaven. I encourage people in my electorate of King to come and hear from the minister about the details of this \$96 million upgrade to the Modbury Hospital. If you would like to attend, RSVPs are essential for our joint community health forum and are required by Thursday 1 April.

On a statewide perspective, as we speak hospitals across South Australia are undergoing major upgrades. Once complete, there will be new emergency departments, more beds and better facilities for patients and staff across the state. There is no denying the health system we inherited still faces challenges. There is so much more to do, but we will deliver. We have a long-term, sustainable plan.

We have employed hundreds more doctors, nurses and paramedics and are investing \$20 million to address the shortage of doctors and other healthcare professionals in rural areas. A whole range of initiatives are now in place to link people with more appropriate, urgent care in the community. We are looking after people in their home. We are easing the pressure on our busy emergency departments. We are negotiating with the ambulance workforce to agree on more efficient, patient-centred rosters so ambulances can meet patient demand across South Australia. Our health system should provide the very best care to patients at every stage of their lives.

Thank you for the opportunity today to provide an update on how our Marshall Liberal government is delivering better local health services in the north-east, and at the same time we are creating more jobs with our \$96 million upgrade to Modbury Hospital.

MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WOODLAND BIRDS

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:51): I want to talk about the fate of woodland birds in the Mount Lofty Ranges. Before doing that, I put on the record my disappointment that the Premier chose not to attend the women's march on Monday. I heard his interview on 891 the next morning and accepted his argument that cabinet does not move.

I therefore assumed by that he meant that cabinet had precluded his attendance, although I think it might have been able to be suspended. Nonetheless, I accepted it. We then discovered yesterday that the Deputy Premier attended the March after cabinet, and therefore the Premier made an active choice for something else in his diary that was not cabinet ahead of that march. I just put on the record my disappointment in that decision.

There has been a very interesting piece of research done, a longitudinal piece of research that took over 20 years, to look at the fate of woodland birds in the Mount Lofty Ranges. The birds are a significant species in their own right as part of an ecosystem, but they are often regarded as a bellwether species, an indicator of the stress that an ecosystem might be in. They are often representative of underlying forces that are affecting the quality and the health of an ecosystem.

The Nature Conservation Society, in concert with a couple of universities, has spent 20 years studying the appearance of the numbers of woodland birds in the Mount Lofty Ranges, which is one of our biodiversity hotspots. What they have discovered is deeply concerning. Over that 20 years, the number of birds has gone down by about 45 per cent. Of the 65 species that were being tracked over those 20 years, 38 have seen a decline.

There has been a trend whereby species that are more generalist and more hardy, the kind of species that one might expect to see coping in an urbanised environment, have increased, whereas the species that have decreased most substantially are those specialist woodland birds. It is also disturbing to see that there are many bird species on this list that one might have regarded perhaps when I was growing up as being common species that are now drifting towards threatened species status as part of this general decline.

I commend the Nature Conservation Society for this work. It is extremely important and it ought to be extremely useful. It is of course representative not only of what is going on in the Mount Lofty Ranges but what one would expect is occurring across south-eastern Australia, with similar biodiversity and similar pressures.

To address that, there needs to be better management of that land. There needs to be better addressing of pests, including, I imagine, feral cats, and also overabundant species, such as kangaroos, and better management of the way in which clearance can and cannot take place. Of course, we had a system that is designed to assist with that: it is the natural resources management system, now known as Landscape SA.

I am concerned about and will be keeping a close eye on the change in the boundary to what was the natural resources management board that covered Adelaide and the Mount Lofty Ranges.

Now that the government has decided to divide that so that the Mount Lofty Ranges now sit in with the Hills and Fleurieu board, we now have the very big money through levies of Adelaide being divided from the Hills and Fleurieu.

As an example, last year the natural resources management board of Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges had about \$36 million to spend and the Hills and Fleurieu has about \$10 million to spend. If we cannot adequately resource the kind of land management response that is required to recognise that these species are in decline and that they are a bellwether of further decline elsewhere, then we are going to risk losing the integrity of that very important biodiversity.

I also note with some concern that the Nature Conservation Society has requested a meeting with the minister to discuss this report and what can be done and that that meeting was declined. I think that is disappointing and I would ask and expect the minister to—

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Environment will cease interjecting. The minister is called to order. Continue.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister is warned.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister will cease interjecting.

Dr CLOSE: And I would ask him to reconsider for the sake of the health of the environment in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:57): The hypocrisy of those opposite is breathtaking. It is disgusting and it is shocking and, yes, I of all people should not be shocked at the low that Labor are willing to go to for political pointscore. I of all people know firsthand that Labor will say and do anything if they think it is politically advantageous for them to do so. I experienced this firsthand in the lead-up to the 2014 election, when I was bullied, harassed and subjected to racist, lowball attacks. What is worse is that my volunteers in polling booths were also abused and sexually harassed by volunteers of those opposite.

I also saw it firsthand as I watched my federal colleague the member for Boothby, Ms Nicolle Flint, be bullied, harassed and the target of a sexist campaign. Yet those opposite did not speak out or do anything at the time to call out such behaviour. Yet here I am today, once again, shocked at the gutter politics that Labor is willing to engage in, I suppose in the hope that that will win them a few votes. What we have witnessed in question time by those opposite is just appalling.

Let's set the record straight. Let's actually ask the question and let the answer be heard, about what we are doing on this side to ensure women and their children can feel safer and respected in our state. Firstly, in South Australia—a South Australian first—the Premier appointed a sole person dedicated to tackling and preventing domestic and family violence. That person happens to be me.

This is not a tokenistic appointment. No, it is not tokenistic at all. We have backed it up with record funding. For all the questions around what we are doing and how much we are spending on prevention, this is the time to listen up. Since we were elected in 2018, we have committed more than \$21 million. In our first budget, we announced \$11.9 million as we worked to implement the comprehensive suite of initiatives that we promised to tackle domestic and family violence. We have continued to back that up with additional funding.

We are doing things like investing in additional crisis accommodation right across the state. What we heard from the sector is the importance of dedicating some of these crisis beds to perpetrators and really shifting the focus from taking those who have already been subjected to domestic and family violence out of their homes and putting them through another traumatic circumstance of being uprooted. We heard about, rather than uprooting them once again, taking the perpetrator out, wrapping around support, keeping a line of sight over them and really leading the country with this perpetrator pilot program.

We announced funding to ensure that our crisis line here in South Australia could operate 24/7—24/7. It used to operate only during business hours, but we know that domestic family violence does not just happen during business hours. We rolled out our Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, we launched a campaign to break the cycle, we are investing in funding as part of the federal government's Stop it at the Start campaign and we are continuing to support Our Watch, which is really about preventing domestic and family violence and developing the evidence base to inform the work that we are doing. There is so much work that we are doing, yet I look at the clock and I know that we are limited in time.

In conclusion, yes, Monday's rally was an important one. Together, we stood united to say that enough is enough. This goes beyond politics and it goes beyond this parliament. It is about creating safe workplaces for all women across our state—and that is exactly what we are doing. It is about saying discrimination, sexual harassment and abuse are never okay. It is about saying enough is enough and we do want cultural change and we want it now.

Those of us in this place need to be the positive role models, we need to act and we need to look beyond our own little patch. We need to get out of the gutter—and I direct that to those opposite. You need to get out of the gutter and join us in being positive role models, stop scaremongering and actually be the change that is needed.

MEDICAL CANNABIS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:02): I want to talk about medical cannabis, something I have spoken about in this house many, many times before. It is my firm belief that South Australians should have access to the best healthcare and treatment options for their condition and quality of life. Many are turning to medical cannabis products, a treatment that is succeeding where some traditional medications have failed. However, our state needs to address the major legislative and jurisdictional challenges to the production and supply of medical cannabis.

Last year, the Premier announced that a pilot will be established to trial the use of medical cannabis to treat severe epilepsy in children in this state. For people like Mount Gambier's Campbell and Julie Hopgood and their daughter Alyssa, this trial cannot come soon enough. Alyssa is 14 and, along with an intellectual disability, has Lennox-Gastaut syndrome, which is a rare and severe form of epilepsy that develops in childhood.

Since the age of one, Alyssa has suffered seizures multiple times of day and night that have severely affected her quality of life. At one stage, an EEG showed she was having four visible seizures every 10 seconds. Although she has a bright and cheeky personality, her constant seizures have stolen her ability to communicate, read or write. She is currently on eight medications and a strict ketogenic diet. It has severely affected her family's life

For five months, Alyssa literally slept in a swag outside her parent's bedroom so they could help her if she had a tonic seizure during the night. Campbell and Julie have tried every medication on the market in multiple combinations to try to control her seizures, including specialised drug trials. Nothing has worked long term, and a lot of them have caused major side effects and, at worst, for Alyssa to attempt self-harm and become aggressive.

Campbell and Julie said they begged their neurologist for three years to try medical cannabis, and in May 2020 they were written a script and tried CBD oil for the first time. They described to me giving her the first dose of oil via a syringe on 18 May last year. For the first time in her life, Alyssa slept through the night and did not have any visible seizures. The pattern continued day after day, night after night.

Campbell and Julie set up in her room a specialised camera (a SAMI), which records every movement and rings an alarm if a seizure happens. Since July last year, fewer than 20 seizures have been recorded. Not only have the seizures lessened but there have been major improvements in Alyssa's life due to the combination of CBD oil, medication and the diet. Her cognitive abilities, participation and focus have improved and the Hopgoods' quality time with their daughter has also improved.

The Hopgoods are desperate to continue treating Alyssa with CBD oil, but the medication comes at a cost. At \$150 to \$200 for one bottle that lasts around 12 days, it is costing them \$500 a

month for the oil. That is \$6,000 a year—a big financial burden for any family or individual to bear. Now they are stuck in a place recognisable to quite a few South Australian families: how do the Hopgoods afford a treatment that is working for their daughter? They have applied for a subsidy based on compassionate grounds but have been knocked back. Ironically, CBD has been recommended to be subsidised for another rare form of epilepsy that begins in childhood, Dravet syndrome, but not for Lennox-Gastaut syndrome.

The medical cannabis industry needs regulation, controls and a unified approach from both state and federal governments. What we need is a regulatory framework that aligns with other states and the commonwealth and legislative change to support this. We also need to subsidise costs, streamline access pathways and conduct more research and long-term studies into the effects of this drug for multiple conditions. Importantly, we need to ensure South Australians have access to the best health care and treatment options in the world. I would like to thank Minister Wade, who I am about to meet with to talk about trying to lessen this financial burden for the Hopgoods.

WAITE GATEHOUSE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:07): In early December 2020, the state government announced that they would be demolishing the state heritage 130-year-old Waite Gatehouse in my community, on the corner of Fullarton Road and Cross Road, including several significant trees in the Waite Arboretum. This announcement came as a shock to me and many in my community.

That weekend, on 6 December we organised a community rally. I gathered with hundreds on the corner of Cross Road to protest that decision to demolish the gatehouse. So many people attended and members of parliament, including the member for Florey, were there in attendance. Many local groups and organisations took an immediate stance against the demolition of this state heritage listed building, including Protect our Heritage SA, Mitcham Historical Society, Save our Heritage Alliance, Friends of the Waite Arboretum, Friends of Urrbrae House and, indeed, the University of Adelaide.

Why was this so important to this collection of individuals and people passionate about history that we came together? We were there to protect and save an iconic piece of South Australian heritage—a gatehouse since 1890, a building that was state heritage listed in 1982. It was discovered that, if demolished, the gatehouse would be the first state heritage listed building destroyed since the conception of the State Heritage Register four decades ago, in the 1980s. Demolishing the gatehouse would be one very significant step in destroying the integrity of state heritage listing in South Australia, and of course it would be destroying Peter Waite's legacy and the legacy of Peter Waite to the people of South Australia, and his bequest is quite phenomenal.

As the member for Waite, it has been my responsibility to represent the concerns of my community. After speaking at the initial rally, I was able to work with the Public Works Committee of this parliament, asking them to receive evidence from engineering company Mammoth Movers, who were quoted to move the gatehouse, and as such they did. This played an important role, in my view, in the government pursuing full and proper quotes to seek not the destruction of the gatehouse but alternative purposes for it and for its move.

We continued to pressure the government to change their position, with many features on radio, television and in the press. The petition that we initiated and I presented today to this parliament with over 8,741 signatures to protect that building and to stop its demolition was a key part of that press, television and radio campaign. I have spoken out in this place on numerous occasions to preserve heritage and to protect our environment.

In an interesting turn of events, the state government announced some months ago that they would offer the University of Adelaide \$4 million to relocate the gatehouse. To many, this was very much seen by the community as the government trying to handball their decision-making in regard to the gatehouse to the university. Over the last couple of months, for those following the debate, there has been pressure, toing and froing, meetings and discussions between the university, the government and members of our community.

People could see that sentiment was changing and there was a huge upswell of support to save the gatehouse, with the hashtag #SaveTheGatehouse trending heavily on social media, for those who follow it. There has been an online petition, which over 17,000 people have signed, and

there was a second rally held, with over 1,000 people attending that rally, which I think in this day and age is certainly an important milestone and measure, especially in relation to heritage matters.

It was fantastic at that rally to have George Morgan, the great-grandson of Peter Waite, speak, as well as Professor Norman Etherington from Adelaide University (retired), the head of the National Trust and Dr Jennifer Gardner OAM on behalf of the university. I thank the organising committee for saving the gatehouse, led by Professor Warren Jones AO, Joanna Wells, Ron Bellchambers, John Wood and Geoff Saurer. These individuals met with my office pretty much every Friday for the last three to four months to work out how we could work with the community to save the Waite Gatehouse.

On Monday, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you may be aware, the state government announced that they would not demolish the gatehouse but save it and work with the uni to repurpose it. I am glad that the minister has listened to the people of South Australia. I am glad to be able to have spoken to and worked with the minister to ensure that there is a better outcome for the people of South Australia. This shows the importance of community wins on grassroots campaigns. We saved the Repat hospital in our community, we saved the Mitcham Service SA centre in our community, we saved local bus routes in our community and, because we worked together, we saved the Waite Gatehouse.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COVID-19 PERMANENT MEASURES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:12): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003, the Acts Interpretation Act 1915, the Emergency Management Act 2004, the Environment Protection Act 1993, the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Real Property Act 1886 and the South Australian Public Health Act 2011, and to make related amendments to the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021. Measures to reduce the spread of COVID-19 are fundamental to our ongoing response in keeping the community safe. The declaration of a major emergency, in place since 22 March 2020 (that is, last year), provides the authorising context for the important social distancing and public health measures issued by the State Coordinator through directions.

The COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, which I will refer to as the COVID act, was enacted to temporarily adjust some legislative requirements that were difficult to satisfy during the pandemic. However, the COVID act will expire on 31 May 2021.

This bill proposes to permanently enact some of the provisions of the COVID act so that they will not need to be extended again. The provisions in the bill that are to be permanently enacted have assisted in the management of the COVID-19 pandemic and will be useful for other emergencies in the future. They will also modernise some practices in South Australia. This bill also makes some other amendments not reflected in the COVID act to promote social distancing.

I will now deal with each of the provisions of the bill. Clauses 4 and 14 of the bill amend the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003 and the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 respectively to allow those standing committees to meet via AVL or audio means.

Clause 5 of the bill amends the Acts Interpretation Act to provide that, despite a provision of any other act or law, a requirement that a meeting occur with two or more persons physically present can take place via audiovisual or audio means. This clause clarifies that this does not apply to

requirements that a person be physically present to witness the signing, execution, certification or stamping of a document or to take any oath, affirmation or declaration.

Part 4 of the bill amends the Emergency Management Act 2004 to assist the State Coordinator and authorised officers in the exercise of powers and functions. Clause 6 of the bill amends section 17 of the Emergency Management Act 2004 to enable authorised officers to be issued with their identity cards as soon as practicable and to produce such other proof of their appointment when they exercise their powers if they do not yet have an identity card.

New section 26B makes it clear that if the State Coordinator requires the disclosure of information by a direction or requirement under section 25, then that person is under no obligation to maintain secrecy or other restriction on the disclosure of the information except an obligation or restriction designed to keep the identity of an informant secret.

Under section 28(1) of the Emergency Management Act 2004, it is an offence to refuse or fail to comply with a requirement or direction of the State Coordinator or authorised officer without reasonable excuse. Clause 9 of the bill amends this section so that the offence is now expiable with a fine of \$1,000 for a natural person or \$5,000 for a body corporate. These provisions have been and will continue to be essential in supporting the State Coordinator in managing the COVID-19 pandemic in this state. These provisions will also be helpful in other emergency situations that arise in the future.

Clause 9 of the bill amends the Emergency Management Act 2004 to provide that no civil liability attaches to the Crown with no civil or criminal liability attached to any person acting in good faith in respect of any acts or omissions in relation to a power or function under the COVID act, the South Australian Public Health Act 2011 or other prescribed act in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is important to have these provisions in place to ensure appropriate decisions can be made to manage the COVID-19 pandemic without fear of liability arising in the future.

Clause 10 of the bill amends section 19 of the Environment Protection Act 1993 to provide that the roundtable conference may occur at intervals determined by the Environment Protection Authority instead of annually. This amendment is not currently contained in the COVID act but is necessary to enable the meeting to be deferred in order to promote social distancing. In the event the roundtable conference does not occur, there are other means of wider community and stakeholder engagement that can be undertaken. Clause 11 of the bill amends section 71A of the Environment Protection Act 1993 to allow container deposit refunds to be refunded electronically.

Part 6 of the bill amends the Mental Health Act 2009 to allow community visitors and the Chief Psychiatrist to undertake inspections and visits via audiovisual means if it is not reasonably practicable to physically visit or enter the relevant premises, having regard to factors such as the availability of community visitors, the remoteness of the relevant premises or the need to prevent contagious diseases. Details of such visits must be made available on a publicly accessible website.

Part 8 of the bill amends the Real Property Act 1886 to reflect the modifications that are currently made under the COVID-19 Emergency Response (Section 16) Regulations 2020. Under section 128 of the Real Property Act 1886, a mortgage must be executed by the mortgagor and the mortgagee if land is to be charged or made security in favour of a mortgagee. Section 128 provides that the Registrar-General may register a mortgage that is executed solely by the mortgagee if a mortgage on the same terms as the mortgage lodged for registration, called the corresponding mortgage, has been executed by the mortgagor and the mortgagee. Clause 16 of the bill amends this section so there is no need for the corresponding mortgage to be executed by the mortgagee. This allows for corresponding mortgages to be executed remotely by the mortgagor.

Clause 17 of the bill amends section 153A of the Real Property Act 1886. This amendment is not currently in the COVID act or regulations but is consistent with the amendment in clause 17. Section 153A of the Real Property Act 1886 provides that the Registrar-General may register an instrument renewing or extending a mortgage that is executed solely by the mortgagee if the Registrar-General is satisfied that a document on the same terms as the instrument lodged for registration, called the corresponding document, has been executed by the mortgagor and the mortgagee.

This section is amended to remove the requirement for a mortgagee to execute a corresponding document. This will allow for the remote execution of a corresponding document by

mortgagors. These amendments will be welcomed by the banking industry, including the Australian Banking Association and the financial institutions, to reduce barriers to the electronic execution of these documents and remove a duplication of work.

Clauses 16 and 17 also amend sections 128 and 153A respectively to clarify that there are no witnessing requirements for the execution of a mortgage, a corresponding mortgage, an instrument renewing or extending a mortgage or a corresponding document. These amendments are not contained in the COVID act or its regulations but are important to clarify for the banking industry that there are no witnessing requirements for these documents to promote social distancing.

Part 9 of the bill amends the South Australian Public Health Act 2011, hereafter referred to as the Public Health Act, and replicates the amendments that are in the COVID act. These amendments have enabled timely and responsive actions to take place in dealing with the pandemic and will be important tools to adequately manage any future outbreaks.

Clause 18 inserts new section 66(2a) of the Public Health Act to enable directions to be made by telephone, fax or other electronic means. Clauses 19 to 22 amend sections 73, 74, 75 and 77 of the public health act to extend the time frame in which written confirmation is provided about a verbal order or direction from 48 hours to 72 hours. These provisions are in relation to directions for people to undergo a test, undertake counselling and remain in isolation.

Clause 23 amends section 99(2) of the Public Health Act to allow the Chief Public Health Officer to authorise the appropriate disclosure of information for medical research or for statistical purposes. Under section 77 of the Public Health Act, the Chief Public Health Officer may make an order detaining people who have, or are suspected of having, a notifiable disease. Clause 22 of the bill amends this provision to allow the Chief Public Health Officer or an authorised officer to apprehend or restrain a person if necessary in order to comply with the detention order. The provision also allows for assistance to be provided by other persons, such as security staff, as necessary.

May I confirm to the house that what this bill does not include is provision for a continuation of what we have described as clarification laws as to the powers of the police. That issue has been raised. It has been considered. I think there is some merit to continue it, but some concerns were raised about it, so this bill does not include those provisions.

As members know, there will be a comprehensive review as required under the act at the conclusion of this particular declaration period relating to COVID-19, and they are all matters that we can consider at a later date. I just reassert that each of these measures are measures that, unless otherwise expressed, have existed over the last 12 months. They have been without incident or moment, and they are matters that need to be continued to expedite the efficient operation of the directions.

Sometimes, it is simply a matter where we just find that the situation cannot be dealt with. I do not think any one of us understood at the time the declarations were made that there was going to be a problem with people getting their cash back for the bottles when they went to the bottle-o. There was no power under the law for money to be received and refunded electronically. This is what fixes that. Sometimes they are not even identified, but we have to come into the 21st century to be able to deal with those issues. I assure the house that there is no mischief in this and it will be a continuation of a continuing process, and certainly one to make sure that we are all kept safe.

I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003

4—Insertion of section 12A

This clause inserts new section 12A into the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause AA1 of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

Part 3—Amendment of Acts Interpretation Act 1915

5—Insertion of section 53

This clause inserts new section 53 into the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in section 17 of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

Part 4—Amendment of Emergency Management Act 2004

6—Amendment of section 17—Authorised officers

This clause amends section 17 of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 1 of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

7—Insertion of section 26B

This clause inserts new section 26B into the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 1(f) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

8—Amendment of section 28—Failure to comply with directions

This clause amends section 28 of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 1(g) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

9—Amendment of section 32A—Protection from liability—COVID-19

This clause amends section 32A of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in section 22 of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

Part 5—Amendment of Environment Protection Act 1993

10—Amendment of section 19—Round-table conference

This clause amends section 19 of the principal Act to modify the frequency with which round-table conferences occur under the section.

11—Amendment of section 71A—Manner of payment of refund amounts

This clause amends section 71A of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 2 of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

Part 6—Amendment of Mental Health Act 2009

12—Amendment of section 52—Visits to and inspections of treatment centres

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 52(1) of the principal Act.

13—Amendment of section 52A—Visits to and inspection of authorised community mental health facilities

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 52A(1) of the principal Act.

14—Insertion of section 52B

This clause inserts new section 52B into the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in section 10A of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020 to the extent that it relates to the principal Act.

Part 7—Amendment of Parliamentary Committees Act 1991

15—Insertion of section 24A

This clause inserts new section 24A into the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 3(b) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

Part 8—Amendment of Real Property Act 1886

16—Amendment of section 128—Mortgage of land

This clause amends section 128 of the principal Act to allow certain documents to be executed by a single party.

17—Amendment of section 153A—Requirements for renewal or extension of mortgage

This clause amends section 128 of the principal Act to allow certain documents to be executed by a single party.

Part 9—South Australian Public Health Act 2011

18—Amendment of section 66—Action to prevent spread of infection

This clause inserts new section 66(2a) into the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 5(a) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

19—Amendment of section 73—Power to require a person to undergo an examination or test

This clause amends section 73(8a) of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 5(b) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

20—Amendment of section 74—Power to require counselling

This clause amends section 74(3a) of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 5(c) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

21—Amendment of section 75—Power to give directions

This clause amends section 75(3a) of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 5(d) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

22—Amendment of section 77—Power to require detention

This clause amends section 77 of the principal Act to make permanent the measures referred to in Schedule 2 clause 5(f) to (j) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

23—Amendment of section 99—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 99(2) of the principal Act to make permanent the measure referred to in Schedule 2 clause 5(k) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020

1—Repeal of section 17

This clause repeals section 17 of the principal Act, the effect of that section now to be dealt with by new section 53 of the Acts Interpretation Act 1915

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

This clause amends Schedule 2 of the principal Act to reflect the permanent changes made by this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. Z.L. Bettison.

*Motions***PFAS DISPOSAL**

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (16:26): I move:

That this house requests that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee investigate and report on the appropriate and safe disposal of PFAS contaminated waste in South Australia, and in particular—

- (a) criteria for disposal of PFAS contaminated waste;
- (b) criteria for site selection (landfill engineering);
- (c) consequences of not having an appropriate pathway for PFAS contaminated waste disposal, including reference to case studies; and
- (d) any other related matters.

As many members of this house and the South Australian community would be more than aware, PFAS is a group of synthetic chemicals that have been extensively used in consumer and industrial projects since around the 1950s. They were used to manufacture non-stick coatings and products that require resistance to fire heat, water stain and weather and in some types of firefighting foam.

This means that the areas that are contaminated by PFAS are often those associated with former or current firefighting stations, both Metropolitan Fire Service stations and Country Fire Service stations and their associated training sites, as well as areas occupied formerly and presently by the Australian Defence Force and its associated entities as well.

There are currently no landfills in South Australia licensed to dispose of PFAS-contaminated waste, and recently the South Australian board of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) asked

the Environment Protection Authority to progress and plan for the broader policy considerations and operational management of PFAS waste in South Australia.

Notwithstanding the ongoing necessary and important work of the EPA, the matter of how South Australia is to appropriately and safely dispose of PFAS-contaminated waste remains of significant interest. As such, I propose that this is a matter that should be analysed by a standing committee of the parliament of South Australia.

I believe that a standing committee will take an evidenced-based and balanced approach to our state's requirement to deal with PFAS. As a state we cannot put our head in the sand. We cannot ignore the existence of PFAS. We will need some sort of pathway, whether that pathway be in-state or interstate disposal, but this parliament needs to have that consideration, needs to work through the issue and needs to do so with evidence and science at the heart of consideration.

To achieve this, I seek the support of members from this place to agree to this motion, which refers the matter to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of this place.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge in the Speaker's gallery Mr Norman Schueler OAM, Chair of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. Welcome, sir.

Bills

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 March 2021.)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (16:30): I note that I am the lead speaker for this bill. Last night, the Governor hosted the Governor's Multicultural Awards—in fact, I think they were the 13th awards. Members from both sides of the house and the crossbench attended, and I was delighted to see the member for Frome in attendance there.

It was an incredibly well-attended event that recognised the contributions South Australian individuals, associations and groups provide to not just multiculturalism but interculturalism as well. That is important because it is not just about acknowledging the diversity in the 200 different groups that we have here. It is about acknowledging each other's culture, understanding and being interested in understanding how we can support each other.

Updating the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act was started under the previous Labor government and we committed to do that, so we support updating this act. It has been 30 years since it has been done, so this is a significant opportunity for this parliament to embrace South Australians and show the future of what we want to talk about in multiculturalism.

We must view this bill in a wider context because it is more than just a bill for an act that will talk about the South Australian Multicultural Commission. Most importantly, this bill is about an act to advance multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia. It will also establish the South Australian Multicultural Commission, and it will provide for the South Australian Multicultural Charter while repealing the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980.

This is an important bill that will become an act because it sets up a structure for us to advance multiculturalism and interculturalism. It is important that we are clear that this is our future. Today is an opportunity for us to deliberate on the future and to envision an active and representative commission where people from our diverse multicultural communities are recognised and heard and have clear access to government.

We believe on this side of the house, as is shared in a bipartisan manner, that representation of the community is important, and our amendments aim to strengthen the role of the proposed South Australian Multicultural Commission. As a former Minister for Multicultural Affairs, this is a portfolio that never leaves you. What stays with you is the people—the people who invite you to share their

culture, to celebrate their culture and to talk to you about their life here in Australia. Because of that, I remain very connected to our diverse multicultural community. I was delighted when our Labor leader asked me to take on this role again as a shadow minister in recent times.

By continuing to be connected to our community, I have heard the calls for change. Even in the government's own consultation report on this bill, first done in 2019, there were significant calls for change. Even at the awards last night, people came up to me to express their disappointment with some aspects of the current draft of the bill. What I heard last night was someone's disappointment that there was no youth representation explicitly mentioned in the bill. They saw me at the leaders awards and said to me, 'I know that you are debating this soon, and I want you to understand what I am concerned about.'

When I spent some time looking at what people had said, it was very clear to me that the bill that was presented to us had some areas that had not translated from the discussion report, the consultant's report, into the bill. I heard that they want a very clear message that government agencies be held to account for implementation of the advancement of multiculturalism and interculturalism. That was very clear in the executive summary. They also want the commission to be more visible. They are also keen to understand the process of appointment to the commission. They want it to be more transparent and to understand the recruitment process.

Other issues raised in this discussion and consultation process were the ideal attributes, skills and experience they wanted to see on the commission. People raised youth regional representation, and of course there were concerns that there was not specific detail about gender representation on the commission. It was also very clear that people were very keen to remove the term 'ethnic'. It was considered outdated and not appropriate as we go forward. That was very clear from what I heard.

To this end, the opposition seeks to be constructive and seeks some further amendments to the bill that was laid before this house. The focus of those amendments is to improve the representative nature of the commission, to strengthen the multicultural charter and to enact it as a regulation of government. We are also keen to give the charter accountability and transparency.

Other areas we will focus on through our proposed amendments include the experiences of those commission members. We are looking for a diversity of experience to be represented. A concern that has been raised very clearly with me is about the resources for the commission. In regard to this bill that was laid before the house, people were concerned that the commission was not given enough certainty of resources and staffing as it should be as a commission to be respected.

There were also questions about whom they should advise. One of the challenges that was raised is that there was a feeling that it was going to be a commission in name only and that what they were moving to be was an advisory group to the minister. Current and former commission members clearly said to me that they want the ability to advise the whole of government, all state authorities. I think this is incredibly important because we see that already in the current act.

As I said, we will seek to have the charter in regulation. A charter is a wonderful thing. I know that we will come up with a form of words we all agree with. But I want more than that, and I heard that from people as well. We want to make sure that we have a reporting mechanism to ensure the charter is enacted to our state authorities; we want to give it teeth. It is great to have a set of words, but really what counts is that it is being enacted and can be measured.

There are two other things I want to touch on, which we will be talking about further during the committee stage, and one is in the parliamentary declaration. Significant changes to the original bill have been proposed by the government, and I acknowledge there has been some work done there. I would particularly like to recognise the amendment to acknowledge that Aboriginal peoples are South Australia's First Peoples and nations and the traditional owners and occupants of land and waters in South Australia. I recognise that it is proposed to be incorporated. That is something that was raised in the consultation period, yet for some reason it did not make it into the bill laid before the house.

There is one area that I feel strongly about, and it is to do with the functions of the committee, and it is in an amendment we have put forward. That is that the multicultural commission has the following functions under this act—and we are proposing that this is (e):

to raise awareness of the harm that racism and other forms of discriminatory behaviour can do to multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia.

Only this week did we see Adelaide United player Kusini Yengi subjected to racial abuse through social media. I give credit to Adelaide United for speaking out strongly when they saw that this had happened. Unfortunately, this happens more than I think we would like to believe. We have work to do in this area. We know that our Asian community has been under fire, had abuse hurled at them post COVID issues, as they are held somehow responsible. We need to call this out. We need to raise awareness of the harm that racism and other forms of discriminatory behaviour can do others. I raise this because I think it is an important function for the commission.

The Australian Refugee Association is part of the Stop Racism Now group, and there are another 24 groups involved in that. They raised this in the consultation report. They raised the issue and their concern around racism, but for some reason it was not in the bill. So I think that is an incredibly important function for this commission to have. It is incredibly important for us to acknowledge this in this bill because we are looking to the future. We are looking to the future, given that this was done 30 years ago and may not be done for some time, for what must change, a true acknowledgement that we are a multicultural society.

One in two of us have a parent born overseas. In my own electorate, 36 per cent of the people who live in the City of Salisbury were born overseas. This is us, this is Australia, but there are some people who do not support that. One of the key messages given to me was that we cannot be complacent. Many people in this house—and I would like to say all the people in this house—believe in multiculturalism. We know that Australia has been built by waves of migrants coming here for a better life.

I often talk about the characteristics of a migrant. They are bold and they are brave. It is a very big decision in your life to leave your family behind to start a new life in a new country. We know some people did not have a choice. In fact, just recently at the opening of the Vietnamese Boat People Monument the reality that people faced if they stayed makes you understand why they took the risk they did. Many people perished on their way here.

People come here for many different reasons. They come here as skilled migrants or as international students. Sometimes people come for love because they fall in love with an Australian. Whatever the decision for someone to come to Australia, we know they make a contribution to us. They make us stronger, they make us better and they certainly have connected us to the world.

I do not talk about this very often, but this function of raising concern and making sure that we raise awareness of the harm of racism is somewhat personal to me because my son is African-Australian. The other day I asked him, 'Do people ever ask you where you come from?' He said, 'Yes, sure, mum, they do all the time.' I had not even thought that that is something he has to explain.

Most of the time I think people ask because they are curious or because they are being friendly, but the fact he has to explain that is something I was not aware of. When I hear that Kusini Yengi, an elite sports person, gets this kind of abuse it does worry me sometimes what my son might experience during his lifetime. I ask the parliament very strongly, through bipartisanship, to make sure that is part of the functions of the commission.

We seek to introduce these amendments in a constructive spirit to help achieve the aims of furthering our multicultural success story. This is an aim that has bipartisan support. I would like to acknowledge the work and contribution of the previous shadow minister for multicultural affairs, the member for Badcoe, and the assistant shadow minister for multicultural affairs, the member for Cheltenham. Both have conducted a significant consultation process regarding the bill.

I would also like to acknowledge the Assistant Minister for Multicultural Affairs and the Deputy Premier for their accessibility in discussing our views on the bill. Already they have acknowledged to me that they will accept and support some of the amendments put forward. I appreciate that. I know that members of our multicultural community will be somewhat disappointed that the Premier, who is responsible for multiculturalism, is not seeing this bill through in the house. I will leave it at that.

This is an important opportunity for us here today to talk about the future and to talk about the importance of multiculturalism and interculturalism. I am very proud to be the lead speaker from

the opposition today. I will have more detailed discussions of the amendment during the committee stage.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:49): I also rise to make a small contribution to the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020 and am looking forward to it getting through the house. As has been said by all sides—by the member for Ramsay in her contribution and, indeed, by the government—multiculturalism in this state is an important, bipartisan issue.

I think it is timely that after several decades there has now been an update and review of the act and a review of the important role that the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission (SAMEAC) plays in our community to ensure that multicultural communities, communities where English is a second language and communities of new migrants and refugees have a space and a voice in the public discourse of our state.

To that extent, I was somewhat surprised when in recent weeks, before this bill came to the house, I was contacted by members of the multicultural and ethnic affairs community about some concerns they had about the bill as then laid on the table. I am really quite relieved that I and indeed other members of the house, especially the member for Florey and my other colleagues in this quarter of the U-shape, have been able to work with people like Mr Norman Schueler, Chair of SAMEAC, Dr Tony Cocchiaro and other members of SAMEAC to ensure that the legislation presented in a bipartisan manner to this house does indeed meet that threshold. I know there are quite a few amendments as tabled by the government, which I look forward to supporting, and of course some amendments by the member for Ramsay as well, which I will give due consideration as the debate goes on.

I will just touch on a very important multicultural event that happened last Saturday up at Hill River, as it was known—it is now known as Polish Hill River—to celebrate the 150 years of settlement at Polish Hill River and the arrival of Father Leon Rogalski S.J. to Polish Hill River some 150 years ago, which is so important. Why is this important to me? It is talking about Polish settlement here in South Australia. Of course, for those who do not know, my own family background is of Polish descent.

Polish Hill River has been around for many years and is an important part of the Clare Valley community and, indeed, the history of migration to and settlement in South Australia, with the first Poles arriving in about 1844 and settling in Tanunda. Those first Poles were Galasz and Wotka (Gallasch and Wuttke, as they were known in Prussian German). It was some time later, in about 1856, that 131 Poles settled in Sevenhill, and several years later, in 1870, Father Leon Rogalski came to Australia to service that community.

It was really the first time that migrant community from Poland had pastoral care in their own language and was so looked after, showing the importance of faith and language to a community. For those who follow the history of the settlement of South Australia, we know that many districts across the state, whether it be Tanunda or up in the Adelaide Hills, where there was strong Prussian German migration, many of those people were fleeing persecution from their homelands at the time.

Indeed, the story of Australian migration and settlement is of people fleeing persecution. Of course, we celebrate St Patrick's Day today. The contribution of the Irish community in Australia is next to none. They obviously played a huge part in the penal colonies of Britain and in the history of this nation. Pretty much every subsequent wave of migrants, whether they be economic or political refugees, or fleeing war, oppression or famine, has come and made its contribution to this state.

It was really an honour to be up at Polish Hill River on Saturday. Of course, the official opening was presided by His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC, our Governor. The Hon. Mr Michael Kolodziejski, the Ambassador of the Republic of Poland was in attendance, as was the Most Reverend Patrick O'Regan, Archbishop of Adelaide, and a huge number from the Polish community in Adelaide—I would say some 200 people. The government was represented by the Hon. Michelle Lensink from the other place, and the member for Frome, Mr Geoff Brock, was there. It was a wonderful occasion for community.

To that extent, I would really like to thank the dedicated volunteers of the Polish Hill River Church Museum, led by chairman, Jerzy (George) Mrotek; vice chair, Irena Sosnowski; treasurer, Krystyna Gajewski; maintenance officer, Richard Novorolski; and curator, Edward Dudzinski. The

secretary is unfilled, but Ted Dudzinski is filling that role at the moment and he probably will for the foreseeable future.

I thank all the members of the Polish Hill River Church Museum, who really are the custodians of 150 years of tradition, of Polish heritage in the Clare Valley and of course across all of South Australia. I know for the last several weekends in the lead-up to last Saturday they were up there maintaining Polish Hill River and ensuring that the festivities on Saturday were exceptional, and indeed they were. Of course, there was a large contingent of pilgrims who came over from Melbourne, especially from the Jesuit order, and quite a lot of Poles from Melbourne came across as well. I think they were excited to get out of Melbourne for the first time in a long time.

It was a really wonderful occasion of celebration. As always, the Governor's address to the community was excellent. I think many in the Polish community see His Excellency as an honorary Pole. His story of migration to this wonderful state I think aligns with that of many from the Polish community. For me, it was fantastic to see last week's celebration go ahead. It was meant to happen last year, but COVID postponed it, so it was actually 151 years of settlement. I thank George Mrotek and his group of volunteers for putting together last Saturday's celebration, which was truly a credit to them.

Across all multicultural communities of South Australia, whether it be in the Polish community, the Vietnamese community, the Cambodian community—

Ms Bedford: The Italian community.

Mr DULUK: —the Italian community, as the member for Florey indicates, as there are many from the Italian community in her electorate—everyone is so proud of what they are doing. I know in a couple of weeks is the Polish-Hungarian Friendship society annual get together, and no doubt the member for Cheltenham will be there, as he is proud of his Hungarian background. So many in this house are proud of those who have come before them and share that special relationship. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, it is so important when it comes to multiculturalism in this state that we have a bipartisan approach—

Ms Bedford: Multipartisan.

Mr DULUK: —multipartisan approach even, as many would say—that all South Australians are on the same page and that we always look to assist those who are new to our nation, who may struggle with our language, our customs and our norms.

That really is the role of SAMEAC now over many, many years, which has been out there to be able to foster that relationship with new Australians, with migrants to this nation, to make them feel welcome and to help show them how their communities can work with the broader society to ensure that there are language classes and that young mums and children especially, over the history of migration, have the support they need in terms of integrating into our communities in a harmonious way. This ensures that all South Australians, no matter where they come from or how long they have been here, can make a wonderful contribution to this state.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (16:58): As have many others in this place, I rise not only to indicate my support for the bill, with some amendments, but also to add some of my own comments to the very thoughtful contributions other members have made around multiculturalism in this state—or, as this bill seeks to modernise, the discussions around interculturalism—and also, I think it is important to say, around ethnic affairs, which has been part of this state's living fabric now for decades.

I have spoken proudly on numerous occasions in this place about my own cultural heritage. My father, a Hungarian refugee, arrived here in 1957 and my mother's side were of good Irish-Scottish stock off the farms of New South Wales many generations ago. It has been heartening to hear the contributions of other members in this place about the different stories they bring to multiculturalism, those members from regional South Australia, those members from the concrete patches of the city. Our stories that connect us with multiculturalism across this state are unique but also do bring us all together in a distinct way.

For me, multiculturalism does not happen by mistake. It certainly does not happen by accident. It happens by design. We have been a country and also, very proudly, a state that have

put multiculturalism at the front and centre of our economic and social policy. We are arguably the greatest living example of harmony and multiculturalism anywhere in the world.

This parliament, no doubt, could look more like our community. I hope that this update to our law will pave a way for this parliament one day to better reflect our community. As our cultural diversity changes in our community, I hope this parliament also does the same. I think they are the sorts of goals that we seek to achieve as a parliament and through the declaration that we will be considering in this bill.

How does this parliament look to those people who seek to call South Australia home? What message do we send? What aspirations can we peg to our operations here that give hope and cause for those who seek to call South Australia home that they should be—not could be but should be—taking their rightful place in this chamber?

In the South Australian Multicultural Bill, as the member for Ramsay and shadow multicultural affairs minister has put, there are a number of important amendments that we will be moving that we seek to improve this update. Representation and diversity in representation are at the core of one of the suite of amendments that we will move. As the member for Ramsay has said, on this side we have conducted a suite of consultations with various stakeholders, but the most informative to the amendments that we seek to move today is actually the consultation that was undertaken by the government itself through multicultural SA.

I have expressed my own concerns that that consultation took place over two years ago or it was completed almost two years ago. The currency of that consultation within the current massively changed situation that we find ourselves in as a community should be considered. Notwithstanding that, the consultation feedback and the consultation process that the government undertook was pretty clear. It was clear that better representation of diverse communities was sought.

For that reason, amendments that will be moved by the opposition will seek to include on the commission itself the voice of refugees, the voice of women, the voice of newly arrived migrants as well as the voice of young people and, in addition, the voice of a regional member. Those things are important because the community, multicultural communities, have told us that they are important. We will also seek to move amendments to improve the declaration. The declaration itself is an important step forward for this parliament.

The parliamentary declaration is an important step forward for this parliament, but it needs to aspire to include a series of targets and goals that we would hopefully see ourselves coming back to in 40 years' time, as we have with the existing act. For that reason, we are seeking to move amendments that will recognise that multiculturalism does not just happen. It happens because of a wave of successive migrations—permanent and temporary migrations as well as the resettlement of refugees here in South Australia.

The charter itself, which is an admirable step forward, needs to have significant currency. For that reason, the amendments we will be seeking to move include the charter as a regulation. Again, we have heard from the community that it is important. It futureproofs the charter. It instils and guarantees, to an extent as best we can, a buy-in to an important step forward in a nonpartisan way.

Within that charter, we believe it important to include at the front and centre a statement that multiculturalism in this country starts with our First Nations people. We are all migrants to this land. Multiculturalism and interculturalism start with those men and women who have been inhabiting this land and celebrating their living culture for now over 60,000 years.

Another important amendment that we seek is, sadly, to call out racism. Racism is insidious. It is backhanded and it is undermining of the values we seek to aspire to as a liberal democracy. I think it is also one of those things we do not speak out about enough and at times we have not spoken about. I acknowledge that the existing act and the proposed bill certainly provide capacity to address or implement a series of strategies to tackle racism, but it is my view, and it is the view of those of us on this side, that it starts by saying that racism exists. It starts by saying that racism undermines multiculturalism. It is only once we acknowledge racism exists that we can truly tackle it head-on.

I hope and trust that this bill will continue our amazing journey as a very proud multicultural community to facilitate and enable communities to tell their stories. It is the stories through those communities who choose to call South Australia home that enrich us and that enliven us. We have heard the iteration of those from so many members who have contributed so far to this second reading debate.

I had a quick look at my diary over the last couple of days and the next couple of days to try to provide some local examples of just what that multicultural evolving, living story looks like for me and for my day and for all our days in this place. I came up with a short list. I think there is about 56 hours worth of stuff here. I had the privilege on the weekend of attending a launch by Bene Aged Care of a suite of stories called LivingProof. Norman Schueler, who is in the gallery today, was there as well.

For those who do not know or have not been familiar with Bene Aged Care, they are a multicultural aged-care provider. LivingProof seeks to break down some of the stereotypes of living and growing older in our community but through a distinct Italian voice. We had the privilege to hear from a man called Guiseppo, who every single day during the pandemic would visit his wife through the window of their aged-care facility to say, 'Hi,' to greet her with love and no doubt to greet her with the humour he presented to us.

I also had the privilege of hearing from academics from our Serbian community who have undertaken a series of work to highlight the horror, shocking abuses and genocide that occurred in the Sinovatz concentration camp during World War II by the fascist regime. Hundreds of thousands of Serbs, Roma, Jews and anti-fascists and socialists were murdered in ways that still profoundly shape the psyche of those who survived.

I attended the Woodville Primary School in my local area, where 70 cultures are represented. We celebrate Nereus on the weekend. As the member for Waite touched upon, I am no doubt having a drink, or a Palinka, at the Polish-Hungarian Friendship Association. We will be with members of our Greek community remembering the 200th anniversary of Greek independence and the sacrifices Greeks made in pursuit of their own freedom.

These are some of the stories that I have the privilege of hearing every single day—those stories that we in this place listen to and inform our approach to shaping the best public policy that we can to protect and advance multiculturalism. This bill, and a focus on the economy, on work and on social and political life, I trust and hope will be something we can proudly look back on in the future as those multicultural stories continue to grow, continue to evolve, continue to be celebrated and continue to strengthen and shape the wonderful, strong community that we call home in South Australia.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (17:12): I am the product of multiculturalism and a very proud product of Australia's acceptance and ability to open its borders to people like my parents who migrated here for a better life. I am eternally grateful for what those pioneers did to encourage mass migration to Australia.

As I was listening to the remarks of my friend the member for Cheltenham, he pointed out something that I think is often lost on a lot of people in the multicultural community, and indeed in the multicultural debate, and that is our first Australians, our Indigenous people of this country, our First Nations. Those people have been still been the most welcoming of all—despite what they have been through—and a lot more welcoming than some of the greetings I have received in some communities, and I include the parliament when I first got here.

I am concerned about the bill, where it started and where we are now. I suspect that good intentions may not have been thoroughly conveyed accurately to all participants in this debate from the government about what its intentions were.

It was not until the advocacy of the multicultural community here in South Australia and the realisation of what was occurring through the changes in the bill that amendments were put forward by the government, and are being put forward by the crossbench and the shadow minister and the parliamentary secretary for multicultural and ethnic affairs here in the opposition.

To put it bluntly, the government botched this. It is not a criticism; it is just a fact. It disappoints me that we have reached the point where members of the multicultural and ethnic affairs community had to reach out quietly to the opposition and the crossbench to voice their dissatisfaction with what

was occurring. That should not need to happen. That should not need to occur, because the whole reason we have this debate is so that their voices are heard, and their voices were not being heard.

When we discovered that those voices were not being heard, and given the new status of this chamber, things changed dramatically. It is amazing to see how quickly change can happen when you really want it to. As they say, necessity is the mother of invention, and no doubt these amendments were the necessity of the government because there would have been changes coming one way or another.

Ms Bedford: Necessity Bedford.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry?

Ms Bedford: I could be called Necessity Bedford.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. Mr Deputy Speaker, one of the major fundamental reasons we have been such a good example of multiculturalism throughout the world is that we have not gone through a process of assimilation, which is very much the US policy of migration, where communities are told to assimilate as quickly as possible.

Indeed, at the turn of the last century former President Theodore Roosevelt wrote extensively about the dangers of migration unless they accepted Americanism, and the idea of Irish Catholics or vast waves of European migration changing the United States forever. The Australian experiment was very different in many aspects and the difference was that we did not so much want people to assimilate to Australian culture but to enrich it, to add to it, to diversify it, to improve it—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: To build it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to build it, and that is what has occurred. Unfortunately, this is often referred to as 'the food outcome' of multiculturalism, which I think is probably the worst example you can use. Every time I hear someone say, 'I love multiculturalism. The curries are amazing,' or 'Gee, I love multiculturalism. Greek food is to die for.'

An honourable member: It is, though.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is, but that is not multiculturalism: that is just good food—and you are welcome. Multiculturalism is the ability to allow people to encourage those from diverse backgrounds to come here and feel welcome, and to know that as citizens their ethnicity, their background and the time they arrive are fundamentally no different from the people who arrived here on the *Buffalo*. That is multiculturalism; that is what it really means—that their voices are just as important as everyone else's.

I do not think there are many people left who do not agree with that principle, but these views are still on the boundaries and fringes of civilised society. I talk about One Nation, I talk about with great shame my political party's former views on the White Australia Policy, and I again talk about some aspects of the Liberal Party when it comes to migration. But we are all evolving together and we are all getting better at this, not just because of the food.

When we get back to basic principles, why are people thirsting to come to Australia? Again, the misconception is, 'Oh, it is the prosperity.' Yes, that is a large contributing factor, but like any other family who wants to leave somewhere dangerous, what are they really seeking? They are seeking freedom from oppression, they are seeking liberty and the ability to raise their families peacefully and offer their children the same future we can offer all of ours and to give them the same opportunity that every parent aspires for their children.

That is what Australia offers: the equality of that opportunity regardless of your race, ethnicity and, hopefully, eventually, even for First Nations people who have been at the bottom of that list in terms of outcomes since we arrived here in this country. That is what multiculturalism is all about.

To contradict everything I have just said, I remember meeting a young man on a tour here at Parliament House from the Thebarton Senior College, which is in my electorate. It is where large groups of migrant communities go to learn languages, basically English, to be able to function in our society. That young man started Parwana, which is an Afghan/Pakistan restaurant at the end of the street that I live in. It is an amazing business.

I do not raise it in parliament to talk about the food, even though the food is amazing. It is about the entrepreneurship and the ability of that family, once they have arrived, to find a structure of multiculturalism that they could plug into very quickly, building on communities that have come before them—the Irish communities, the Jewish communities, the Greek communities, the Italian communities, the Vietnamese communities and now many people from the subcontinent in Africa, who keep on building on each other's strengths. It is taking less and less time for that entrepreneurship to flourish.

Indeed, in regional communities these migrant groups have done great things to refresh dwindling population growth in population centres. They need voices. They need voices at every arm of government, not just to one person but to all of government—education facilities, health facilities, job prospects, entrepreneurship. That is why the amendments being contemplated before this house are so vitally important.

I can go through and give you many, many examples of many communities who have done amazing things. I am exceptionally proud that I was part of a process that appointed a Chief Justice whose parents were migrants—that is a great story—His Honour Chris Kourakis. For me, that is one of the ultimate achievements of Greek migration in South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And Mr Kourakis grew up in Port Lincoln.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He did grow up in Port Lincoln—a constituent of yours. He is the godson of another great constituent of yours, Dr Hagen Stehr AO. We are talking about great stories.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: He's not Greek.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I consider Hagen Stehr Greek. He has married into the Greek community; he is one of our own. No-one else wants him.

Multiculturalism is more than food. It is about the opportunity of Australia. Every citizenship ceremony that I have been to in the West Torrens council, which is where I go because I am one of those rare, lucky MPs in metropolitan Adelaide where almost my entire community is within one council area, so I do not have to pick and choose on Australia Day and every other council citizenship ceremony where I go. One of the points I try to make to our new arrivals is that from the moment they become Australian citizens they are equal before the law to everyone else, from the Prime Minister down.

That legal concept of equality and the rule of law are what really our multicultural system is about. That is why I think it is a remarkable experiment, Australia, that far exceeds what has happened in the United States and far exceeds what has happened in Canada. In terms of nations and multiculturalism, I think we have done it better here than anywhere else, but there is still more we can do. It is not perfect by any stretch of the imagination. There are still people who attempt to marginalise and use ethnicity and race and migration for political purposes. Just go back to the most recent Victorian state election, where there was this notion of African gangs roaming the streets of Melbourne.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: University-level English.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The university-level English test. I also point out, if the current English test was in place, my father would not have got his citizenship. I am disappointed that is creeping back into our system, but I think the system will correct itself and we will move past that.

Another great example of migration and multiculturalism in this country is Mathias Cormann, a Belgian migrant to Australia, who rises to one of the highest levels in the commonwealth government, with a thick accent, embraced by Australians, and now head of the OECD. It is a great example of Australia using that migration and using that talent, to then use the skills he has for Australia's benefit, for us to take for the first time the chair of the OECD. It is a great outcome for our nation, partisan politics aside. I think it is fantastic and a great migration success story.

Gladys Berejiklian is the daughter of Armenian migrants—what a great story that is. She is a remarkable woman. I knew her as a treasurer and she, quite frankly, is a great billboard for multiculturalism in Australia and what that means, giving people who come to this country the same opportunity as people who have been year for decades, if not generations. I think it is remarkable.

I could go on and on all the way back to people like Nick Bolkus. Without a Nick Bolkus you could not have a Steve Condous. Without a Steve Condous you cannot have a Gladys Berejiklian or a Tom Koutsantonis. You cannot get to a Joe Szakacs without people breaking down a barrier before as you move forward. I am exceptionally proud of what our party has done to develop that diversity—diversity of voices, diversity of opinions—taking these communities' voices seriously at the highest levels. That is what this bill should be doing more of.

As the member for Ramsay would know, at the end of my street, near Parwana, there are a number of burgeoning African community centres and entrepreneurs—again, arguing against myself, going back to the restaurant argument, but there they are.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: They are also exporters and importers.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Exporters and importers—entrepreneurship. Multiculturalism really means that they have the same voice as anyone else in Torrensville and are just as important and are heard and are visible. I hope that this bill, once amended, once dealt with appropriately, given the attention it deserves, will strengthen and empower our multicultural communities to do more, because they stand on the shoulders of giants—giants.

The work from Norman Schueler, all the way back from SAMEAC, has been a remarkable example, I think, of bipartisan community building, resilience and strength in the face of sometimes neglect, in the face of sometimes perceived irrelevance or even nuisance. The multicultural community adds benefit to our communities that far outweigh what you can buy late at night after a few drinks.

The last thing I want to add is that multiculturalism also means a lot not just to new migrants or our First Nations people but again to a cohort of people like me and my children for whom the country of origin, where my parents came from, is getting further and further away. I feel that, and I feel anxious about that distance that is growing between me and the culture that I come from. What legislation like this does is reinforce the principle that it is okay to maintain those cultures, that freedom to express our faith, to express our culture, to express our identity, which is no longer just Hellenic but is intrinsically Australian as well.

That is the dream and the aspiration: that my little girl can grow up and my grandchildren will grow up in a country where ethnicity and race are not a determinant in any aspect of whether you can get a job, go to school, get employed, or any determinant in opportunity.

For those of you who are more interested in capital and more interested in entrepreneurship, think of who it is who gets up and leaves a troubled country and moves to a stable country like ours—the bold ones, the risk-takers, the entrepreneurs, the ones who want to strive to get ahead. What do they do? They add value to our country, they employ people, they take risks and they invest.

The first migrants went to Eyre Peninsula, went out to Yorke Peninsula and went out to our regions. The Greeks and Italians went out to Renmark and Coober Pedy, going out just a little bit further north, a little bit further west, ploughing, building, working in our factories, in property, in the arts, and in the professions. It makes you proud to know that this state has fostered so much growth and so much diversity and has done so much.

I will finish with this last story. The first time I ever heard about the Labor Party as a child was my mother telling a story amongst her sisters, and they were talking in Greek—they were cleaning ladies at the Royal Adelaide Hospital—and they were talking about how they could not speak Greek in the lunch room. They had to speak English or not speak at all. There was an Italian friend of my mother's, and I have no idea how they communicated but they did, who said she knew a young lawyer in Norwood, who was actually a member of parliament, who would come down and speak to them. That young man was Don Dunstan.

He turned up. I do not think my mother ever really voted for Don Dunstan, to be fair, but I remember them talking about how he walked in and he could speak Italian and he could speak words of Greek. Then he confronted whoever the operational manager was at the time about this policy of not being able to speak in your native tongue and it changed their lives forever. It was authority in Australia accepting them speaking a different language. It was like, 'Yes, you are no different from any of us.'

That is the power of legislation like this and multiculturalism and that is the power of us saying it is important. That changes their lives, and then they change their children's lives and they all build this nation and make it better and more prosperous and build this great experiment that is Australia, the envy of the world. There is no better place in the world to live than this country. My father has lived here longer than he lived in Greece. If you asked him to choose, he would still say Australia—absolutely, no questions asked, the best decision he ever made. I cannot disagree with him one bit.

I am exceptionally proud of the work the shadow minister and the parliamentary secretary to the Leader of the Opposition have done. I am exceptionally proud of what the crossbench has done to improve the bill and I am exceptionally proud of those communities who spoke up about what they saw as deficiencies in the bill first proposed by the government and I congratulate the government on listening and making those proposed changes. I commend the amendments and ultimately the bill to the house.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (17:32): I also take the opportunity to speak about the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020. I note today being 17 March is St Patrick's Day, so it is a day of celebration for one of our fantastic communities here in South Australia, the Irish community, and really emphasises how important multiculturalism is to South Australia and Australia.

The only way to get to Australia, being an island, is by ocean and of course we are a migratory nation because of that. It really is worth acknowledging our First Nations people here who were the original custodians of this land. Where we are now in parliament is Kurna land. There are many First Nations or Indigenous nations throughout South Australia who are so very important and they are very welcoming people.

Going to ceremonies in my electorate is fantastic, having the Welcome to Country performed by Indigenous elders, where we respect their spiritual relationship with their country and their elders. Tamaru is one of those, and he is working very hard, along with many community leaders, to get that reconciliation in place. We know that they provide a real foundation stone for South Australians here and we have built on that over the years.

My electorate of Morphett is really the site of European settlement here in South Australia in 1836, with that fleet including the *Buffalo* and the *Cygnets*, on which Sir John Morphett arrived and after whom my electorate is named. They were sailing up the coast, looking for fresh water. The Patawalonga at Glenelg feeds out into Holdfast Bay, and that is where they thought there might be an opportunity to settle. At that stage, of course, it was marshland and not the foreshore it is today. Those settlers had to make their way inland and up the Patawalonga. Eventually, they found much more solid land at the site of the Old Gum Tree, where we now hold Proclamation Day on 28 December each year to recognise our transition and going forward from there.

It was an obvious new step for this nation and, from that, over the years there have been migrants from many other countries as well. I think what really has made Australia stand out from other nations is our multiculturalism and the ability for people of all cultures to come here. Approximately one in four Australian citizens were born overseas, and they brought their own unique culture here, which has certainly shaped Australia into the country we live in today. It makes us a rare melting pot of hundreds of cultures and ethnicities, which of course contribute to our Australian way of life.

Moving away from the country you have called home is really difficult at any time. You might be leaving family and friends behind, which makes it more difficult, but also quite often you might be leaving conflict. It really is incumbent on those who are here already to make people arriving into Australia feel welcome, to embrace their multiculturalism and to help make this their new home. Overall, that broad welcoming aspect has built up over years and I think is accelerating as we become more aware of the importance of being welcoming. The culture each migrant brings along is so important and has really made Australia one of the most successful multicultural countries in the world. It is so important that we do celebrate this but also that we continue to work on it.

I have talked about today being St Patrick's Day and of course 21 March is Harmony Day, which is really about celebrating our multiculturalism. The official Harmony Day website provides some interesting statistics regarding multiculturalism in Australia. I mentioned before those Australians born overseas. The website itself says nearly half (49 per cent) of Australians were born overseas or have at least one parent who was, so that its another layer.

I had the pleasure of visiting Glenelg Primary School in a previous year with the Minister for Education. We addressed the leaders of the school, the year 7s, and let them understand what is involved in being a parliamentarian. One of the interesting questions we asked was, 'Who was born overseas?' and quite a few hands went up. Then when we asked whose parents were born overseas, more hands went up, and then when it got to grandparents it was a significant number, well over half. I think that just brings home the depth of migration and multiculturalism here in our community.

Referring back to the Harmony Day website, it identifies over 300 ancestries present and goes on to add that since 1945 more than 7½ million people have migrated to Australia. Importantly, 85 per cent of Australians agree that multiculturalism has been good for Australia.

Apart from English, the most common languages spoken in Australia are Mandarin, Arabic, Cantonese, Vietnamese, Italian, Greek, Filipino, Hindi, Spanish and Punjabi. In addition, it is really pleasing to see the growth in the number of people speaking their traditional Kurna language here in Adelaide, as well as other Indigenous cultures trying to regain that knowledge of language. In fact, more than 70 Indigenous languages are spoken in Australia, which brings that tie-in back from the past through to the present and adds to our culture.

If I could touch a little bit on Morphett, I know I talked about its beginnings from a European perspective. We certainly are still blessed with a diverse community in such a picturesque coastal setting. In the case of my electorate, approximately three-quarters of people were born here in Australia; certainly many more were born overseas and decided to come and live in my community.

The most common countries of birth in Morphett outside Australia include England, India, Scotland, China and New Zealand. The large number of people coming into our community from overseas means that there is obviously a diverse set of languages spoken. I mentioned across Australia, but if we home in on Morphett we see other languages spoken apart from English, being Greek, Italian, Mandarin, Punjabi and Spanish.

When you talk about migrants bringing their culture to South Australia, of course they also have their religious beliefs, which is really important. Not only do we have the various Christian denominations well represented in my electorate of Morphett but we also see Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism and Sikhism, among other religions. I am very proud to also have in my electorate the Marion mosque in Park Holme, along Marion Road, which is run by very capable and dedicated people from the Islamic Society of South Australia. They are very welcoming of me and of the community, and they really try to engage with people in the surrounding areas. I certainly commend them.

That brings me to the bill. We have a fantastic migrant community and the bill is really about how we can go about celebrating that and making sure it is elevated in our thought processes here in parliament. The bill itself is for an act to advance multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia, to establish the South Australian Multicultural Commission, to provide for the South Australian multicultural charter and also to repeal the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980.

It is worth touching briefly on that and acknowledging that important act, which was implemented in 1980 under the Tonkin Liberal government. I also acknowledge the Chair of SAMEAC, Mr Norman Schueler, who is here listening to the debate in parliament today. The SAMEAC Act was a visionary piece of legislation for its time in 1980, and it remains to this day the only item of South Australian legislation related to multicultural affairs.

Amendments were made to this act in 1989, which made it the first item of legislation in the country to define 'multiculturalism'. There again we see South Australia leading the way on a number of these matters that are so very important. Of course, multiculturalism in South Australia has adapted and changed over the course of the 40 years since this act was implemented. As such, it is right and worthwhile that an updated act be implemented, which reflects a more modern understanding of multiculturalism and diversity.

To that end, in 2019 the Marshall Liberal government conducted a legislative review of the SAMEAC Act to help shape new legislation. The consultation phase of the review featured six community forums, an invitation-only stakeholder workshop and some written submissions, as well as an online forum and an online survey via YourSAy. The key themes from this review were that

the concept of multiculturalism should be modernised to reflect changes in thinking and practices. SAMEAC's functions should be modernised.

Importantly, the legislation should recognise Aboriginal South Australians as carriers of the original cultures in this state, which I sought to acknowledge at the opening of my contribution as well. SAMEAC member appointments should be more transparent and the language of the SAMEAC should be contemporised. So the bill that we have before us today does reflect much of this feedback received during the consultation.

We as a government—and I also—thank all those who were involved in this consultation period for their passion. We acknowledge that passion and their interest in modernising our state's multicultural laws. This is aimed at delivering better services and policies for all of us in the community. As I mentioned before, South Australia has been a leader in multicultural affairs legislation for a long time and, as a state, we really are proud and have a justified reputation in this area. Of course, it is vital that we continue to underpin policies, programs and activities with contemporary legislation here.

I will just touch on some issues in Morphett that are important to us, but I will also speak to the sense of celebration in the citizenship ceremonies that we conduct. I have some fantastic councils that conduct citizenship ceremonies in my electorate—the City of West Torrens, the City of Marion and the City of Holdfast Bay. They put a lot of effort into running these citizenship ceremonies.

My former role as Mayor of Holdfast Bay, prior to coming into parliament, gave me an insight into how fortunate we are, the Australians who are born here, who automatically get citizenship, and what it actually means to those who come along. Often they are called up to receive their citizenship and quite often they have young children and the young children have beaming smiles. They come from all different countries. For example, they come from Russia, Iran, China, South America and some of the more traditional European and US countries and, of course, from Africa.

I will share a story about a lady who came from Iran. The political classes in a lot of countries are removed from their citizenry. She came along and grabbed onto my arm and was holding my jacket for about two minutes with a smile on her face because she could not believe that she was able to do that and that she had such access to her representatives. To me, that hit home about the importance of democracy and the message that those citizens put in their citizenship swearing in. They respect the rule of law and they value and uphold democracy. That is so very important and I commend the councils.

Holdfast Bay quite often has the ceremony on the foreshore. It is a magnificent setting where you have the waves and quite often in the mornings the sea is very tranquil and calm. I do not think there could be a better place in Australia to hold a citizenship ceremony. As I said, Marion conducts many citizenship ceremonies. The one that was held in January at the Hendrie Street Reserve was a celebration where many cultures attended and it was witnessed by a lot of family and friends. It was followed by a sausage sizzle and a barbecue, which was a chance for the new arrivals to get to know everyone else, followed by some music, which I think is a great welcome to this country.

Of course, a lot of those migrants come from countries that are landlocked, African countries especially, or in Nepal where they do not have access to water. I mentioned before the beautiful oceans that we have and the coastline along Morphett. Of course, that looks very benign and safe, so it has issues when migrants want to go in. They wade in. Sometimes they do not even take their clothes off, they are that happy to get in there and cool off. They can wade along there, but unfortunately our community has experienced tragedy in this regard.

Two young boys from the Burundi nation tragically drowned a number of years ago after they got in trouble when they went into the water. There is a little drift that goes in a northerly direction from the jetty towards the rock groyne. Over time, it has carved out a trough near that groyne, so there is a quite sudden drop. It goes from being waist-level or chest-level water to all of a sudden being above your head. If you do not have the ability to swim, then that is when you suddenly get in trouble.

Unfortunately, these two boys drowned, losing their lives tragically near the Glenelg breakwater despite the best efforts of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club at the time. A number of lifesavers were there on hand and were able to assist, but it really was heartfelt for their families. Out

of that, I think it has been recognised by Surf Life Saving, the state government and the federal government that it is really important that we provide programs to help our migrants.

If I could just mention two of those programs, there is On the Same Wave, which has been run successfully for many years. Surf lifesaving clubs along the coast help out these migrants. There is also the Sea Sure Swim School, which is a fantastic initiative to try to get not only migrants but anyone to have a better understanding of the beach. I encourage migrants, as I do at citizenship ceremonies, to take the opportunity to become sea smart, ocean smart. It is a great way for them to understand and meet new people as well, so it is a fantastic way to get involved in the community.

In the time remaining, I would like to thank the Assistant Minister to the Premier for multicultural affairs, the Hon. Jing Lee. She does a fantastic amount of work helping us as a government to understand multiculturalism. She is at so many events, with such a fantastic wardrobe as well, which I think really makes each of the multicultural communities that she attends feel so very welcome.

It gives that conduit to politicians and demonstrates that we are accessible. We want to be their representatives as well. They should feel straightaway that they are part of our community and that their issues, challenges and aspirations are heard by us here in the government. In closing, I would like to express my support for this motion and my gratitude to the Marshall Liberal government for the work they have done in the multicultural space.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (17:53): I welcome the opportunity to speak today on the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020. Australia is a nation built on multiculturalism, from our First Nations people to the waves of new migrants over the decades who have travelled across the seas and the generations who now call Australia home.

My electorate of Torrens is truly a multicultural community, and I enjoy the presence of the families who have chosen to make South Australia the place where they will live, work, raise their family and make a valuable contribution to our community today and into the future. Like our Governor, Hieu Van Le, and his wife, Mrs Lan Le, they brought with them a suitcase full of dreams, and I hope that they will be realised.

There are many aspects to the role of a state member of parliament, and one that I truly enjoy is sharing the special day with our residents when they become Australian citizens. The welcoming citizenship ceremonies conducted by our councils are a real joy to be part of, and I thank our local government councils—Port Adelaide Enfield, Tea Tree Gully and Walkerville councils—for providing the opportunity for these celebrations.

It is the day that these people, new to Australia—some not so new; I have been at citizenship ceremonies where people have been here for 40-plus years, but generally new to Australia—pledge their loyalty to Australia, to its people whose democratic beliefs they share, whose rights and liberties they respect and whose laws they will uphold and obey.

Labor recognises and acknowledges the importance of multiculturalism in our society and is supportive of updating the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act. We believe, however, that amendments are needed to the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020 before us to make it effective, to improve it.

The amendments presented today by the shadow minister for multicultural affairs, the member for Ramsay, and the work done by the former shadow minister for multicultural affairs, the member for Badcoe, will considerably strengthen this bill. These amendments strengthen the role of the proposed South Australian multicultural commission by ensuring grassroots community representation and, therefore, will provide a diversity of views.

If supported, they will ensure that those appointed as members of the multicultural commission will have demonstrated experience in at least one of a number of areas, including sports, arts, media, workers rights, youth, aged care, health services, advocacy, multicultural services, language schools, regional South Australia and services for women. Further, experience in these areas is spread amongst all the members of the multicultural commission.

Labor is, has been and remains committed to cultivating people's interest in cultural practices and celebrations, and it continues to promote people's natural interest in emerging cultures through cross-cultural understanding, and this is so important to our wider community.

This leads me to a further amendment to this bill, one that ensures that the minister will provide the multicultural commission with such staff and resources as the multicultural commission may reasonably need for carrying out its functions under the act, and that the minister will prepare a report summarising the reports each state authority provides to the minister each year on giving effect to the charter.

Cultural awareness is a sign of an enlightened society. It is important that cultural celebrations, festivals and events are attracting the interest not only of the specific community but also of the wider South Australian and Australian communities. Labor supports celebrating and strengthening cultural diversity, a great contribution to the prosperity and cultural life of our state through community life, through work, through festivals and celebrations.

I stand here today proud to be part of an inclusive and cohesive multicultural society where cultural diversity is widely celebrated. Over the years, we have come a long way and I believe these amendments to the bill before us will assist in moving forward.

I would like to acknowledge the presence here today of the Chair of SAMEAC, Norman Schueler, who I know has spent his time here throughout the debate. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the many people I have met and the many friends I have made in multicultural communities across our state. Their friendship, their involvement and their contribution to our society and to our state of South Australia are greatly valued, and I thank them for the threads they weave in the rich tapestry that is South Australia, that is Australia.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Cowdrey.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Thursday 18 March 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

396 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3 February 2021). In relation to the Community Wastewater Scheme (CWMS) in Tea Tree Gully:

- (a) When does SA Water intend to start works on the CWMS transition?
- (b) Is the \$65 million announced by the state government adequate to transition all 4,700 households' residential infrastructure along with the street infrastructure that will need replacing?
- (c) Has the minister or his office ever directed SA Water not to deal with or seek the minister's permission first before dealing with certain members of parliament or City of Tea Tree Gully councillors for matters relating to the CWMS upgrade?
- (d) If SA Water chooses to use a pressure sewer option in this project who would own the infrastructure?
- (e) If SA Water uses a pressure vacuum sewer option, is it possible that households would be charged a service fee for this option?
- (f) Will SA Water be responsible for operating, maintaining and renewing the low-pressure sewer systems as required?
- (g) Will the customer receive an electricity rebate for the additional electricity cost of operating the system?
- (h) How much will SA Water save by implementing this hybrid solution compared to the cost of a gravity sewer system?
- (i) Will customers be expected to cover the cost of any required electrical upgrade?
- (j) Will SA Water be using the same service pricing principle for customers on gravity system and low-pressure sewer systems and will the customers be receiving the same minimum service level?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

- (a) Investigations into the existing network and planning for the delivery of the program is progressing well and a new sewer main was constructed at the first pilot site in December 2020, with customer connections to follow in early 2021.
- (b) SA Water is identifying priority catchments for conversion and developing associated costings. SA Water is awaiting feedback from the City of Tea Tree Gully regarding its contributions to the transition program and this impact on the funding required to complete the program.
- (c) SA Water has not refused to deal with any members of parliament or City of Tea Tree Gully councillors.

Longstanding and accepted protocols, consistent with usual government practices regarding SA Water and its dealings with members of parliament, have been the basis for interactions to date.

- (d) Technology options and associated ownership and maintenance arrangements are currently being investigated as part of the developing plan to transition customers. Preferred options for transitioning customers in priority catchments are yet to be identified.
- (e) As per (d).
- (f) As per (d).
- (g) As per (d).
- (h) As per (d).
- (i) The Marshall Liberal government has committed that existing CWMS customers will not be required to cover the costs associated with transitioning to SA Water.
- (j) Customers transitioned to SA Water will be subject to normal statewide pricing for sewer services. These services will be subject to service levels regulated by ESCOSA.

FERAL DEER AERIAL SHOOTING

402 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5 February 2021). When will feral deer aerial shooting take place in 2021, and has there been a reduction in the number of shoots from previous years?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

Aerial shooting operations specifically targeting feral deer control typically occur in the Limestone Coast region (SE).

There are two scheduled aerial shoots to occur in May and September of 2021, targeting feral deer in the SE. In 2020, three deer-focused aerial shoots were undertaken in the Limestone Coast. The operational time allocated for the two scheduled shoots in 2021 is equivalent to the three shoots undertaken during 2020. This will result in the 2021 program being delivered more efficiently, without compromising on-ground outcomes.

ST KILDA MANGROVES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (2 February 2021).

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

This is the subject of an investigation and as such I am unable to provide further detail at this stage.

BUCKLAND DRY CREEK

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 February 2021).

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I am advised:

In November 2019, SA Water advised Buckland Dry Creek (BDC) that the commissioning of the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme (NAIS) may result in a reduction in treated wastewater discharges in the Bolivar outfall channel over the 2019-20 and 2020-21 summer periods.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (3 February 2021).

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

The Marshall government is continuing to build what matters and the community has been calling out for better roads for years.

South Australia's roads were neglected by the former labor government, and we inherited a \$750 million road maintenance backlog when we came to government in 2018.

Some key metropolitan roads that will receive critical road maintenance over the next 12 months include:

- South Eastern Freeway
- Main North, Kings and McIntyre roads
- Port Road (Grand Junction Road to East Avenue)
- Fullarton Road (Glen Osmond Road to Carrick Hill, Rundle Street to The Parade)
- Golden Grove Road (North East Road to Park Lake Drive)
- Marion Road (Richmond Road to Anzac Highway, Henley Beach Road to Sir Donald Bradman Drive)
- Anzac Highway (Marion Road to Morphett Road)

The Marshall government will work with the federal government to finalise the regional roads that will receive critical road maintenance once the guidelines are released by the federal government.

Further, major works have commenced or been recently completed on the below:

- The \$354.3 million Regency Road to Pym Street upgrade along the north-south corridor supporting over 200 jobs per year.
- The Gawler rail electrification project supporting 250 jobs per year.
- The \$141 million Flinders Link project where we've delivered the newly extended Flinders line and built the new Tonsley train station which supported 55 jobs.
- We have around 200 jobs being created thanks to the Port Wakefield overpass project and Joy Baluch AM Bridge duplication project both currently underway in the state's Mid North.
- The \$21 million Managed Motorways project which extended the third lane of the South Eastern Freeway up to Stirling, creating around 35 jobs.
- We're also embarking on the \$35 million resurfacing of the South Eastern Freeway.
- The \$20 million Golden Grove Road project supporting 65 jobs and now the Golden Grove Road stage 2 project that's creating 75 more jobs.
- The \$33 million Golden Grove park and ride.

- \$12 million north-south freight route supporting 25 jobs per year.
- \$14 million access road for new Thomas Foods International facility supporting 40 jobs.
- \$6.5 million on Stuart Highway resurfacing.
- \$6 million on Adventure Way and Innamincka airport access road supporting 25 jobs.
- The first stage of sealing the Strzelecki Track – that's a \$135 million project.

I am advised by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport that the total spend as at the end of January 2021 for the Regional Road Infrastructure Stimulus Package is \$23.6 million.

PROCUREMENT, CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (3 February 2021).

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I have been advised:

1. In reference to dot point 4.2.3 the Department for Infrastructure and Transport was unable to provide Conflict of Interest forms for a technical services procurement; the Southern Metropolitan Upgrades Bundle of Works Engineering Survey.

2. No.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (3 February 2021).

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I have been advised:

The \$583 million for SAPTA can be broken down as follows:

- \$279 million relates to bus
- \$218 million relates to train
- \$50 million relates to tram
- \$36 million relates to other*

*operational expenses attributed to bus, train and tram public transport operations.