

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 5 May 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 the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Bills

HERITAGE PLACES (PROTECTION OF HERITAGE PLACES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr DULUK (Waite) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Heritage Places Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr DULUK (Waite) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I know you love and protect heritage, Mr Speaker, as all of us do in this house. We all appreciate and understand the significance, opportunity and importance of protecting heritage—not only the natural environment and the heritage built up over some 60,000 years of Indigenous culture in Australia but also our built heritage and the important role that built heritage plays in the fabric of our communities, our suburbs, our towns and our state.

There are many benefits to the preservation of heritage, from the aesthetics and character that historic places contribute to our suburbs to the immense economic and social benefits derived from built heritage. You only have to look at the old towns of many of the cities of Europe that attract hundreds of thousands of tourists every year, from Rome to Paris to Kraków to parts of old London, where people walk the streets admiring the centuries of built heritage and travel every year to do so, providing much economic benefit to those cities.

From illustrating the unique story of our state and nation to providing a special place for people in community groups to meet, the benefits of heritage are endless. We can see the endless benefit from the recent strengthening of heritage protection for the suburb of Colonel Light Gardens as a good example of our community's desire to protect unique and important built environs across Adelaide.

Fortunately, my electorate of Waite is full of examples that demonstrate these benefits, including Old Government House in Belair National Park, which provides a home to the Friends of Old Government House. On Monday's ANZAC Day holiday it set a new visitor daily record in the number of takings. I am led to believe they received some 130 visitors—62 afternoon teas and several tours. Not only does this building provide a purpose and social opportunity for the Friends of Old Government House but it also provides educational and economic benefits for the rest of the community, and this is just one example.

Previously, I spoke in this house about other places around my electorate that also provide these benefits, including Carrick Hill and the unique legacy that the Haywards have left to the people of South Australia, through not just wartime service and the Christmas Pageant but also the important environ of Carrick Hill. There is also Urrbrae House and the legacy of Peter Waite, Scotch College main house and Belair railway station, which is currently being used as part of the state's History Festival. Once again, I thank the Blackwood Action Group and their history subcommittee for the hard work of that committee. There is also the historic precinct and bakehouse in Coromandel Valley, just to name a few.

One that in particular has been an important debate in recent times, and indeed is the genesis for the introduction of this legislation before the house today, is the state heritage listed Waite Gatehouse located on the corner of Cross Road and Fullarton Road in Urrbrae. I am sure by now most are aware of the story of the gatehouse, and if they are not it means they have not been

listening to the contributions in this house. The building, which has been on the State Heritage Register since 1982, was under threat of being flattened to make way for the Cross Road-Fullarton Road intersection upgrade that, in time, if there is not a change of tack, will see increased freight traffic down Cross Road.

During the lengthy and intricate process of saving the gatehouse, led by so many members of the community, I and others came to the conclusion that the state heritage listing in and of itself was not enough to protect the gatehouse from bulldozers, road engineers and developers. In fact, maybe the only thing that would have saved the Waite Gatehouse from destruction was the member for Florey standing in front of the bulldozer at the time to ensure that it was not flattened. It is clear that being on the State Heritage Register is not enough to protect a building from demolition and loss of state heritage protection.

It was announced that the gatehouse will be saved, and I thank many in the government for working together with the community to ensure that. The building will be relocated, and its state heritage listing has not been enough to protect it from the powers that be. Indeed, there are still many concerns around the tender process, including details about how the building will be moved and rebuilt, the inability for the project to adopt new technology, such as those proposed by Mammoth Movers to move the gatehouse as a whole, guarantees of rebuilding like for like and a guarantee to preserve that heritage status. All of this is lacking at the moment and needs further clarity. All components of the protection of the gatehouse require more scrutiny. The processes are of concern to many in the community.

The legislation before the house will create a much-needed emphasis on preservation of both natural and built heritage throughout South Australia. Unfortunately, the gatehouse is not alone in the protection of its future. Currently, other well-known places, such as the Newmarket Hotel, are under threat as well as several lesser known places such as the Prospect Horse Tram Barn and the 1840 state heritage listed houses in Hahndorf. With the introduction of the new Planning and Design Code and the current attack on heritage throughout our state, I believe our community assets need an extra layer of protection. This is why I have introduced the Heritage Places (Protection of Heritage Places) Amendment Bill 2021.

This proposed legislation, an amendment to the Heritage Places Act 1993 which inserts a new part 4A, if supported by the parliament, will require both houses of parliament to approve any reduction of heritage significance or destruction, either partially or wholly, to any place listed on the State Heritage Register. The legislation carries a maximum penalty of \$120,000 for anyone found guilty of the offence. We need this to provide stronger protection to spaces of heritage significance, and this bill seeks to legislate these measures.

Think about the significant contribution other state heritage listed buildings provide to our state, whether that be the Thebby Theatre, the Adelaide Oval scoreboard, Her Majesty's Theatre, the Town Hall, Barr Smith Library, Edmund Wright House, just to name a few. Personally, any destruction or reduction to any of these buildings or any space of heritage listing should be of great concern to all of us. This warrants both houses of parliament, in my view, to consider and approve these decisions.

I would like to thank Deborah Morgan, chair of the National Trust of South Australia, and Emeritus Professor Warren Jones AO, convener of Protect our Heritage Alliance, for their contribution, input and support of this draft legislation, as well as the Mitcham Historical Society. If this legislation passes the parliament, as David Bevan said on radio this morning, finally, being on the heritage list will mean something. We must treat this seriously and enshrine these places in our history, or who knows the fate of our built environments for future generations? I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Ellis.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONSTITUTION OF COMMISSION)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:42): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a very simple bill. It has one clause, so there is not a lot to debate about this bill. While it is a simple bill, I think it is a very important bill which deals with a matter of great concern to people living in rural areas. Based on the feedback I have received from people in my own electorate, particularly when my electorate went as far as the Light River, but also in the electorate of Schubert for which I am the duty member—and this is a matter that has been raised with me on a number of occasions—it is now an opportunity to correct what I believe is an omission from the act.

This bill seeks to ensure that the South Australian Planning Commission has people on that commission with expertise in rural land use or agriculture. This is not a reflection on the existing membership. The existing membership I think are very talented people, but the rules that allow for people to be appointed to the commission do not include or require people with rural land use or agricultural skills to be part of that commission.

The existing commission has expertise across a broad range of disciplines, including planning, urban design or architecture—and certainly the new commission chair has that experience. I believe that Helen Dyer is an excellent choice for chair of the commission. She has a great deal of experience in both local government and consulting, and she understands the industry well.

There are people with expertise in economics, commerce or finance; development or building construction; the provision or management of infrastructure or transport systems; social or environmental policy or science; and local government, public administration or law. These are outlined in clause 18 of the PDI Act. All are relevant disciplines that should be represented on the commission.

An area that I think is omitted in the commission's skill set is people with an understanding of rural land use or agriculture, and certainly that is an important area. What is quite clear is the increasing importance of the capacity to have a very efficient agricultural system in this state. As the demand for food grows exponentially around the world, we need to be able to grow food in this state to make sure that we can feed our own population, but also make a contribution to feeding the world's population.

There are at the margins a lot of conflicts between urban development and rural land use. The reality also is that, when the policies are drawn up, there is a lack of expertise on the commission to ensure that the policies that are put in place have a full understanding of rural land use and agriculture. Also, it is important to have people understanding rural land use and agriculture because, within the primary industries sector itself there could be conflicts of land uses. Often, if they are not fully understood, what people think you can lump together as rural land uses are in conflict and do diminish one type of activity against the other.

I am sure people who live in rural areas have an understanding of that. For example, sometimes there is a conflict between viticulture and agriculture. Those sorts of things the commission may not understand because it needs people with expertise on the commission to understand that. We need to make sure that planning policies, when it comes to rural areas, are well understood, and having that sort of skill set on the commission would be very useful.

The position has been deliberately designed as a part-time commissioner, and this person will be required to sit as a commissioner and influence policy at those times when it is required. When you are dealing with urban development, of course it is not required, but once you start to look at the peri-urban, agricultural or rural areas it would be very helpful to make sure that there are people on the commission—who advise, who decide the policy, who advise ministers—who have that expertise and background.

At the moment, there is no legislative requirement to ensure that that expertise exists on the commission. There is no prohibition, but equally there is no positive statement to say that that experience and expertise should exist. One of the reasons this is required is that planning policy is, by its very nature, a vexed area of public policy and we need to get it right every time. Poor public policy in the area of planning and development can have long-term negative impacts on our community, our society and our economy.

As I said, based on the feedback I have received from a number of people whose livelihood is based on rural land use, I think this addition to the commission would be a worthy one and worthy of support. While I think that the current commission does a good job and is worthy of the positions, I think it should be expanded to include that experience. With those few comments, I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Duluk.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (BUSHFIRES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 March 2021.)

Mr DULUK (Waite) (10:49): In a brief summary of the debate that has been occurring over the previous weeks, I would like to thank the opposition and the member for Elizabeth for their support on this legislation. I would like to reflect on many of the comments of members opposite, who have been providing in-principle support for the spirit of the legislation and the genesis of this legislation. It is an important piece of legislation that I am about to ask the house to vote on. It is important to my community and especially to members of the CFS.

I would like to thank the Minister for Emergency Services for visiting the Sturt CFS Group stations at Belair, Blackwood, Eden Hills and Coromandel Valley, as well as the Sturt SES, with me on Friday to discuss many of the issues that are so important to our CFS volunteers. Also, in dealing with this issue, that has come about as a result of the Cherry Gardens fire, I thank those opposite for their kind words in the debate, even though they have indicated some reservations about the amendments. I thank the house for its indulgence.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Mr DULUK (Waite) (10:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BAROSSA RAIL CORRIDOR) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 March 2021.)

Mr BROWN (Playford) (10:51): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22
Noes 20
Majority 2

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.
 Koutsantonis, A.
 Mullighan, S.C.
 Picton, C.J.
 Wortley, D.

Close, S.E.
 Ellis, F.J.
 Malinauskas, P.
 Odenwalder, L.K.
 Stinson, J.M.

Cook, N.F.
 Hildyard, K.A.
 Michaels, A.
 Piccolo, A.
 Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)
 Marshall, S.S.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Power, C.
 Tarzia, V.A.
 Whetstone, T.J.

Cregan, D.
 Knoll, S.K.
 McBride, N.
 Pederick, A.S.
 Sanderson, R.
 Treloar, P.A.
 Wingard, C.L.

Gardner, J.A.W.
 Luethen, P.
 Murray, S.
 Pisoni, D.G.
 Speirs, D.J.
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

PAIRS

Gee, J.P.
 Cowdrey, M.J.

Chapman, V.A.

Hughes, E.J.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 March 2021.)

Mr BROWN (Playford) (10:58): On behalf of the member for Port Adelaide, I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried.

Mr BROWN: On behalf of the member for Port Adelaide, I move:

That the bill be withdrawn.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTERVENTION ORDERS AND PENALTIES) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 February 2021.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:03): I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bill, and I thank the member for Reynell, the shadow minister, for bringing this into the house. I do not say this sort of thing very often, and I hope no-one is listening, but I was quietly optimistic at the election of this government in that they appeared to be taking domestic violence seriously. I was buoyed by the fact that they were supporting Labor's idea to introduce a domestic violence disclosure scheme similar to that in the UK—or at least that is what we were proposing to be discussed.

Of course, that optimism has proved to be misplaced, as we see inaction from this Attorney-General and inaction from this government, so much so that the shadow minister and Labor have been forced to be the legislators in this area, bringing forward good policies. The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme was something I brought to this parliament a long time ago. As I said,

I was buoyed by the fact that the Attorney-General took it on board and progressed it to a certain extent.

The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, as members will know, is essentially in two parts: the right to ask and the right to know. It seems the emphasis has been on the former rather than the latter, while in the UK these things work hand in hand. The right to know, for those members who are not familiar with the scheme, gives police the power, in certain circumstances, to proactively warn a woman or a person in a relationship that their partner has a history of domestic violence and has certain flags.

The way that is constructed is different across different jurisdictions, but essentially it gives police proactively, in real time, the power to warn women that their partner may well be abusive. I was very disappointed that that was not included. I do read that the Attorney-General is looking at this now, and I assume the member for Elder is assisting her in that endeavour. We also hear talk of a register of domestic violence offenders. In my mind, they could very well be one and the same thing. I will wait to see the detail.

I was not a police officer for a particularly long time, but I myself, not to mention the thousands of police officers who are still working in very long and distinguished careers, went to probably hundreds of domestic violence situations of varying degrees. A concept like the right to know disclosure scheme would have been an important tool in visiting a house the police may never have visited before. It may be a victim who has never called the police before. It would immediately come up with some sort of flag and the police could choose, under certain circumstances, to proactively disclose that this person may well be a danger to that woman and then set in train whatever services she may need.

That is a bit of a digression, but I do want to put on the record that I am disappointed with the inaction of the government thus far. I hope that they do progress with the right to know. I will be interested to see what the legislation around some sort of register looks like. To me, it may be one and the same thing. Part of the problem has been—and I believe still is—that the labelling of domestic violence offences is different across agencies. It is not consistent even within SAPOL.

There have been great leaps forward, and now in the published statistics we see domestic violence offences that involve property damage separately listed, which is a good thing, but I think we still need to move towards a system where police can readily identify dangerous people quickly and, hopefully, under certain circumstances, disclose that danger to women.

This bill, however, is essentially an extension of what previous governments have done, in that it enhances the intervention order scheme. This is the next step in advancing that scheme. I was very proud to be part of the Weatherill government—indeed, the Rann government, I think—who introduced interim intervention orders so that police could remove a woman, or remove the danger from situations, proactively without recourse to a court in the first instance.

These interim intervention orders were altogether a good thing and used extensively by police. Police have, over the last 20 or so years, paid much more attention to the dangers of domestic violence, and their responses have by any measure become much better in terms of removing women from dangerous situations. This bill is an extension of that. It is the next step.

I am dismayed that the Attorney-General is not supporting this. It simply increases penalties. Importantly, it removes expiation notices. We read day after day of people breaching domestic violence orders. These people are given fines, which are often never paid. I think that a custodial sentence in many cases is far more appropriate, not only to protect women but also to send the message to the community that these sorts of behaviours are longer acceptable.

I support this bill. I urge the government to change its mind, and I urge the member for Elder to change her mind on this bill and support the member for Reynell. This is just one of a package of measures that the opposition is introducing or will introduce in order to combat the scourge of domestic violence, and I urge members to support this bill.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (11:09): I had planned to begin by indicating to the house that the government intends to support an amended version of this bill but, given the member for Elizabeth's words, I just want to say how utterly disappointing it is. When I came to this place, I received a really

clear message that domestic and family violence was an area in which there was bipartisan support. It was an area in which politicians and parliamentarians did not play politics. I think on this side of the house we have certainly honoured that, but I have been so disappointed—and yet again today—by those opposite, who do not honour that and are more interested in playing politics than really worrying about women's safety. Your words are very disappointing.

In any case, I do rise today to indicate to the house that the government intends to support an amended version of the bill. I want to acknowledge the member for Reynell, who has brought this bill to the house, and to thank her not only for that but for her genuine commitment and work outside this house to tackle domestic and family violence.

I was hoping to say that all sides of this house know the importance of doing what we can to keep more women and children safe. I think that is the case, but I there are some members who could do a better job in putting that first and foremost, rather than unnecessary scaremongering or making claims that are just not true.

In any case, I also want to acknowledge the recent, heartbreaking death of nine-month-old baby Kobi. Something like this does not just affect the people who know her, the family and friends, but impacts the whole community. I think it is fair to say we were all left devastated in that wake. Of course, this came only days after Kelly Wilkinson was killed in Queensland by her ex-partner, her body burned with her three children in the house.

This violence must stop. We must continue to try new measures, new initiatives and indeed new legislation and effect the change that will save lives. I have just come from a national task force that was called by Senator Anne Ruston, where attorneys-general and ministers responsible for overseeing police have come together and in no uncertain terms clearly expressed their commitment and desire to continue to work to ensure that women and their children can feel safe.

This has certainly been a priority of the Marshall Liberal government from day one and continues to be a priority. We are doing more than ever before to support and protect at-risk women and their children. We have committed a record \$21 million in funding, more than any previous government in South Australia. We are committed to ensuring women, their children and any person who experiences domestic and family violence or is at risk of it is well supported and that any measures we must make do actually result in effective change and outcomes.

I think that talks to the slightly delay in passing this legislation. I recognise, as I mentioned, the member for Reynell's good work in this space. On this side, we just want to make sure that we have done our due diligence to ensure that there are no unintended consequences, which we know is something that does occur when initially drafting legislation. In fact, the best legislation comes from a number of people and parties looking over it from all different angles, a number of stakeholders reviewing it and giving input to make sure there are no unintended consequences.

There will be a couple of amendments that we will propose just to be able to safeguard against that, but certainly we support the intention of the bill. Indeed, it already builds on the work that we have done in terms of amending the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act previously.

Yesterday, with the Attorney-General and the Minister for Human Services, we announced that here in South Australia we will continue our work exploring nation-leading reforms and further legislative amendments to build on the meaningful action we have already taken in this space. The reforms we are looking at are ambitious, but when it comes to preventing domestic and family violence it is vital we can continue to build on the extensive progress we have already made as a government and governments before us made too.

We know that collectively more needs to be done to stop the senseless deaths and lifelong impacts on victims and survivors. This includes changes not only in governance, policy and legislation but, most importantly, changes in culture. One of the things that was discussed earlier this morning was that sometimes the barriers are not in the legislative change—there is support on both sides of the house for that to occur—but in how that legislation is implemented and the cultural change that needs to occur out in the community to support it and really achieve the outcomes that we want it to achieve.

We know that collectively more needs to be done, as I mentioned, and it involves changing attitudes and approaches and not only working hard to ensure women and children and all South

Australians can feel safe but, crucially, stopping the violence before it starts. Certainly, that is why we have had a big focus on delivering a range of prevention and early intervention measures to discourage offending, ensuring that those perpetrators, those who do perpetrate violence, face harsh penalties and are supported with wraparound services to be able to change their behaviour.

Changes to this very legislation were brought to this parliament by the Marshall Liberal government and passed in this house in 2018. At the time, we also strengthened penalties for those who repeatedly breach intervention orders, who now face up to four years in gaol or fines of up to \$20,000. This legislation brought far steeper penalties than previously existed under any former government. We were serious about it serving as a strong deterrent to would-be perpetrators and ensuring that those who do break the law are punished for their actions.

Our Attorney-General has also led the way in South Australia in creating a new standalone criminal offence for strangulation. Evidence shows us that strangulation is a precursor for domestic violence homicides, and by creating a separate offence courts have greater discretion to treat this as a more serious offence. This legislation also empowers police to arrest domestic violence offenders under this offence.

We have got on with the job of doing more than ever before to keep South Australians safe, and if there is more that can be done to provide stronger deterrents to violence, such as what is provided in this bill, the government is supportive of that. To prevent and deter violence we have already committed funding for the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. Not only did we commit the funding; we did the work and we have rolled it out. I think that has been a great initiative in South Australia where people can get access to the information they need to be able to make more informed choices.

We are now looking at the 'your right to know' model, which would mandate proactive disclosures by police to those deemed to be at risk of domestic and family violence. I think it has served us well in some ways that we have done the work in terms of the right to ask. We have certainly been sure to collect the data and the evidence so that we can effectively evaluate that program and inform other initiatives like the 'your right to know' model and, importantly, share it with other jurisdictions. We want things that have worked well for South Australia to be rolled out all across the country where the other states might like to do so, because at the end of the day I think it is fair to say there is a strong commitment in Australia to ending domestic and family violence.

We are also exploring the development of a domestic violence offenders register, with a requirement for perpetrators to disclose this in certain circumstances. As I have mentioned, these new initiatives really just build on the incredible work that has already occurred to roll out a range of initiatives and tackle domestic and family violence.

We have invested \$1.86 million towards the national sexual violence prevention campaign Stop it at the Start, and I think that early indicators suggest that continues to be a success. I know that yesterday the Attorney-General outlined a range of other initiatives that we are looking at exploring as well as covering off on the work that is already underway.

I think it is important to acknowledge the incredible work that has been done in the past few years. To the organisations that have been involved in delivering those initiatives, to all the people in the sector and to those with lived experience who have shared their experience with us so we could do all we could to tackle domestic and family violence, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge them.

I am conscious of the time, so I will wrap up by just once again thanking the member for Reynell. I think it is fair to say that we have worked together previously to address this issue, and certainly on this side of the house we are absolutely committed to tackling domestic and family violence.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(11:19): I have no doubt whatsoever that all members who have risen to speak on this bill are completely committed to addressing domestic and family violence, as are all the other members in the chamber as well. I appreciate the fact that we have limited time today, so it has not provided the opportunity for all members who would have liked to make a positive contribution to do so.

I am very proud of our government and the work that we are doing in this area. I am very proud that we have an assistant minister with particular responsibility for domestic violence. I think that is the first time that has happened in a South Australian government. I also value the work that the opposition is trying to contribute to this very important area, and we have a bill here from the member for Reynell which is put forward for us to make a constructive change.

I am advised that the member for Reynell and the Attorney-General are very close to reaching an agreement on a government amendment to this private member's bill. Both the government and the opposition have come to a very sensible agreement today that the government will support this bill at the second reading stage so that it can go into committee today so that the good work that has happened between the Attorney-General, the member for Elder and the member for Reynell can continue.

The government will, of course, reserve its right on the bill's third reading and its final position once those discussions have finished and we have all had the opportunity in the committee stage to discuss this amendment and see exactly where we land. I am optimistic that we have a very positive way forward here.

We can have some healthy debates at times and a few disagreements here and there about the best way to address these issues. Of course, the Attorney-General has a greater responsibility than anybody else in this chamber to consider how well-meaning proposals might actually be applied and whether there might be some potentially unintended consequences from a legal perspective. While all those things are relevant, I am very optimistic that we will reach an agreement on that.

On behalf of the government, I say again that we will support this bill at the second reading stage, reserve our right for the third reading, and we will enter into the committee stage today so that we can collectively and constructively work through the amendment at the very next opportunity.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:22): In summing up, I first place on record my deepest condolences, love and support for the family of baby Kobi, her mum especially, and all who loved her. Our community remains in deep shock that Kobi was brutally murdered by her father, the very person whose fundamental role it was to protect this precious girl from harm. Our community, I have no doubt, will continue to wrap our collective arms around all who loved her.

As I did in my inaugural speech in this place and as I have done many times since, I wholeheartedly again place on record my steadfast commitment to do whatever I can to progress legislation to raise awareness to ensure that women and children in our community can live their lives free from violence.

I thank all the brave women who have made their voices heard in the past weeks and months. To those who cannot speak for one reason or another, thank you and stay strong. To all the children, families and friends of the 60-odd women who are murdered each year in Australia by partners or former partners, it is for you and the loved ones you mourn that I introduce this bill. It is for those who live in fear in their homes, at work, when they are out with the constant worry of what their ex-partner might try next, of what a particular breach may look like.

When I introduced this bill in June last year, it was done in the wake of the tragic murder of Hannah Clarke and her three beautiful children who were murdered by a man who had continually breached intervention orders. Today, we discuss this bill after, sadly, another Queensland woman, Kelly Wilkinson, a Gold Coast mother of three, was allegedly murdered in her backyard just a few weeks back by her violent former partner who also had a significant history of violence against women.

Enough is enough. While these are not isolated incidents, the sheer brutality and futility of these three murders have shocked our nation. It is abundantly clear that some repeat offenders have not got the message that violence against women and children is never, ever okay. In too many cases, we see offenders systematically breach orders as their violent and controlling behaviours escalate. Fines do not provide the necessary protection for women and children or rehabilitation for offenders. Sadly, history shows that those who contravene intervention orders are more likely to violently offend.

These new measures make it abundantly clear that if you breach an intervention order, you are likely to face a custodial sentence. Our community is rightly demanding action towards the prevention of violence, harassment and disrespect towards women. These new measures represent

clear action and make it abundantly clear that if you breach an intervention order you are likely to face a custodial sentence. Yes, they are severe, some may say harsh, but nowhere near as harsh as being murdered, maimed or assaulted by a partner or former partner. Put simply, the message in this bill is clear: if you do not want to have a sentence hanging over your head, do not subject women and children to violence, fear or intimidation.

I am hopeful these laws, combined with other foreshadowed legislative changes to other domestic violence laws, will help to keep South Australian women safer. We must continue to listen to the loud, angry and determined voices of South Australian women that were amplified last month. In passing this bill, we are indicating that we will listen, that we will all do whatever we can to ensure that there is not one more and that there is no more violence, no more excuses for those who continue to harass, abuse and harm women. Women and children deserve to feel safe and secure in our community, in their homes, places that should be places of comfort and sanctuary, and those who seek to deny them this basic right must start facing appropriate consequences. Through the passage of this bill, they will.

I sincerely thank my Labor colleagues for their steadfast support of this reform. I thank the government and particularly the member for Elder for her work in this space and for her words today. I thank the crossbenchers for their vital support of this important reform, and I am really pleased that we have been able to progress this together, that there has been a move from the original opposition.

Our South Australian community is demanding change and, rightly, everyone expects us in this place to do whatever is within our power to make it. Thank you again to all who have spoken. Thank you to Zita at the Women's Legal Service for her advice. Thank you to Uniting Communities and many other organisations for their work on this bill, and thank you to the many brave women who have spoken up about their experiences.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Motions

VETERANS ORGANISATIONS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:29): I move:

That this house—

- (a) signals its support for the South Australian veterans community; and
- (b) recognises the deep and important roles ex-service organisations play in providing advice, support and community for veterans in South Australia.

I think this is very apt at the moment—not that it is not apt at any time considering we have just had ANZAC Day, but I note that the member for Wright is moving a motion in that regard after this one. I want to note the two million Australians who have served or are serving our country, whether it be here or overseas, and the supreme sacrifice that has been paid by over 102,000 of those serving forces in the defence of our nation.

In regard to support for ex-service organisations that operate in South Australia, there is a substantial number of these organisations that provide services to veterans and their families at all stages of life following service. Several community and some commercial organisations also have programs available to veterans and their families as part of a suite of offerings to the South Australian community. These include support for employment, psychosocial support, alcohol and drug rehabilitation services, homelessness support and social inclusion programs.

I want to talk about the Returned and Services League (RSL) South Australia, which has a number of trained and experienced staff and volunteers who provide assistance to RSL members

currently serving and ex-service personnel with military entitlements, including wellbeing and lifestyle benefits, compensation, employment programs and advocacy matters.

In regard to advocacy, advocates advise personnel and their dependants on the lodgement of appeals to the Veterans' Review Board and the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. They also present cases on behalf of personnel and their dependants. They assist personnel in applying for Department of Veterans Affairs' pensions, military compensation, benefits and income supplementation.

I think this is absolutely vital for people who have served and feel that they do not have a strong enough voice or just feel that they have not been listened to. I really do want to acknowledge advocates and those who come to me, who are working with veterans of conflicts to get the recognition that they deserve. We saw some troubling scenes in the past, especially when our Vietnam veterans came back from Vietnam and were treated rather shabbily by many people.

I must say that I am disturbed by a lot of the commentary after the Brereton report into especially our special forces soldiers like Ben Roberts-Smith, a Victoria Cross winner. I have not served, so I say this as someone who looks at what happens from the outside. I listen to my brother, who served for 23 years and served in two conflict zones, and what he brings to me. War is an unreal place. Sadly, as we have seen over hundreds of years of conflict, and thousands of years of conflict around the world, civilians can get caught up and civilians can be killed or injured in war.

I really do respect all that our service men and women do, especially our special forces soldiers, who go where everyone else would fear to tread. As has happened to some, when they push down that door, whether it be in Afghanistan or Iraq or anywhere else in the world, it might be the last move they make on this earth as a living soul.

I think some of the reporting, to be frank, around these people and the service they have done for this community is absolutely disgusting. Yes, no-one should shield war crimes, if there are any, but people need to understand the valiant service, especially in the Special Air Service (SAS) or commandos. The high rotation rate of these service men and women—in these two forces I think it is all men—obviously has them in high-stress zones for a long time.

I have spoken in this place before about a warrant officer I thought was a pretty calm and cool cat, as I have described him. He got rotated for the third time into Iraq, and that was one trip too many. He managed to get past the psych officers. He went downhill after that, and it was very disturbing. It goes to show that people can reach their limits. For people who have served, obviously we pay tribute to the ones who have paid the supreme sacrifice. There are those who have come home with physical scars, but also there are the many, many veterans and serving people who suffer mental scars, that torment of things they have witnessed and what they have had to do to keep our community safe. So I do salute advocacy.

In regard to wellbeing, wellbeing officers assist clients with information about health and community services that may be available to them. They also gather information on local community services and how to access them as well as communicate with service providers.

In regard to some of the work with rehabilitation, the Military Rehabilitation and Compensation Scheme provides rehabilitation, treatment and compensation for Australian Defence Force members who suffer mental or physical injury or contract a disease as a result of service on or after 1 July 2004. Serving Australian Defence Force members who have been injured at work or have an illness or disease caused or aggravated by their military employment and who need assistance in submitting claims can contact the RSL.

Certainly, another fantastic support for returned men and women is the grocery vouchers. RSL sub-branches, with public support through donations and fundraising appeals, help the RSL to purchase supermarket vouchers for veterans finding it difficult to afford food and basic necessities. RSL Care South Australia, which is another branch of the RSL, provides residential aged care, retirement living and affordable housing to the South Australian community. I have met with the people from RSL Care, and I think they are doing a fantastic job.

They have been looking after a retirement village in Murray Bridge called Waterford Estate, which has many units and a nice setting very close to the river. They are doing a fantastic job. At the moment, they are looking at putting in aged care at the back of that property, and I wish them well in those endeavours. I think the appropriate information has been lodged with council, and hopefully

RSL Care can get that project underway so it can provide veterans and others with the appropriate support they need towards the end of their lives.

Another fantastic group in this nation is Legacy. Legacy supports the partners and children of veterans who have seen their loved ones leave our shores to serve in wars from World War I and World War II to Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan and Iraq. Many never made the journey home and others, as I have explained, have returned bearing the physical and mental scars of war. Legacy supports the families of those who may have died many years after serving our nation. All are equally deserving of our support for the sacrifices those families have made for their country.

Legacy is there to help a family or individual through the tough times and restore their confidence in the future. Legacy's work with veterans' families can mean that a child gets an education and a fair go, that a widow is not disadvantaged and alone, that a family is not torn apart by the effects of post-traumatic stress or other physiological injuries. Legacy's main work focuses on relieving hardship through financial assistance and claims help, providing a supportive network through social connection services, building resilience and independence through education and personal development programs.

I salute all these agencies that work with and alongside the government in support of service men and women who currently serve as well as those who have served. As I indicated, whether they have served here or overseas, it is all vital work in the defence of our nation, along with programs that we, as a government, have in place supporting veterans. This particularly includes the work we are doing in revitalising the Repatriation hospital at Daw Park, as well as the mental health support we put in for veterans and their families across the board.

We must keep striving to look after these people, as I explained, with the outcomes for people who have served right at the sharp end in the SAS and commando units. That is not to take anything away from any of those in the other arms of the Australian Defence Force, especially those on the sharp end who see things we do not want to witness and we do not want to see. They are put into positions where they have to make a decision in a split second—not a second but a split second—that can mean life or death.

It is not like the old days, when you had the military line-up and it was all quite plain who was who. We have seen it even as far back as the Boer War, when there were guerrilla detachments. Many Australians served in the Boer War in Africa, where guerrilla tactics were used, with the enemy using the cover of civilians, including women and children. It is not a simple process.

We must do all we can as a government and we must do all we can in supporting all these support services for our veterans. I acknowledge the vital work that they do for all of our veteran community. It is absolutely vital that we support all these people who, as I said, are either serving or have served, especially those who bear those scars, whether they be physical or mental. They totally deserve all that we can do for them because they have done one heck of a job for our state and our nation.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (11:45): I rise to support this motion. I echo a lot of the words we have just heard from the member for Hammond and thank him for bringing this very important motion to this place. As the shadow minister for veterans' affairs, I am very pleased to have the opportunity today to speak on this motion. Since becoming the shadow minister for veterans' affairs not so long ago, I have in that short time become acutely aware of the very valuable role that ex-service organisations play in the veterans community. I am sure my predecessor in this role, the member for Light, who is sitting behind me, will agree with me that the veterans community is a complex landscape.

There are a number of different ex-service organisations, all of which play really important roles. Many of those organisations have played those roles for a very long time, but of course many of them also intersect in terms of the services and support they offer. It is important that as elected members of parliament we take the time, as I have been doing over the last few months since coming into this role, to learn the details of what each ESO actually does, how the services and support they provide are different from those of other ESOs so that we can learn how we, as members of parliament, can best support them, not just here in this place but also in our local communities.

Members of the many ex-service organisations I have had the pleasure of meeting over the last few months are all, without exception, very passionate in their support of the veterans community. If there is a characteristic which ties together all those different ESOs, I think it is their passion for the cause. I have met some interesting individuals, some real characters in the veterans communities. They are the kinds of people you would not find in other walks of life.

They have been shaped by the incredible experiences that they have had in their own life when they were serving in the Australian Defence Force or shaped by the experiences of their family and loved ones in the past. On many occasions, they have lost people. If they have not lost loved ones, they are still trying to support loved ones who are dealing with myriad complex issues that come with being an ex-serving member of the Defence Force, whether they are issues around PTSD, trying to find employment or just generally re-engaging back into civilian life after spending many years outside it.

Those ex-service organisations are there for ex-serving personnel, usually at the most difficult times in their lives. As I said before, it is hard when freshly coming out of the Defence Force to transition back into civilian life, which is a difficult thing to do in any role or any job which takes you out of the normal movement of life in the community and puts you into an organisation like the Defence Force. But when you add on top of that having to deal with all the issues that come up around post-traumatic stress and the general mental health issues that come with being a member of the Defence Force, it often makes it even more complicated and traumatic to make that transition back. It is something I have heard firsthand from people who have transitioned back.

If they did not have the support of those ex-service organisations—groups like the Defence Force Welfare Association and the RSL, just to name a few—they have told me point-blank to my face that they would possibly not still be here today and would not have made the transition successfully at all. So we owe a great deal to these ex-service organisations and, as is so often the case in our society, they are volunteers.

One thing that has certainly struck me since being an elected member of this place is how many key roles in our community we take for granted that I am sure many people assume are done on a paid basis but are actually done by volunteers. They are roles in our hospitals, they are roles in our schools and they are also roles in our ex-service organisations. In many cases, they are doing incredibly complex and difficult work. The work of an advocate, for instance—someone who is representing a person who has recently transitioned out of the Defence Force to help them with their entitlements and to get the support they need to make that transition—is really difficult. In most cases, it is done by unpaid volunteers who do it for love and certainly not for money.

I would like to take this opportunity today to mention one advocate in particular, and that is Mr Jeff Yates OAM, who is a member of the Tea Tree Gully RSL and a resident of the seat of Wright as well. Jeff really is the absolute personification of a selfless volunteer. He has done it for many years. He was awarded the Order of Australia Medal way back in 1990 for his own service in the defence forces, and since transitioning out he has dedicated and devoted himself to helping other people. I have spoken to some of the veterans who have benefited from the assistance of Jeff over the years, and they could not speak more highly of him.

I was very pleased to be able to lend my own support in a small way to the nomination that was made for Jeff to be awarded the ANZAC of the year award in 2019, which he was awarded, for service to veterans and their families. I want to acknowledge Jeff and the many people like him, and what they do, and let them know, too, that we do not take them for granted. We know how lucky we are to have them doing the roles they are doing. I know that I speak on behalf of all the people they have helped from the veterans community over many years, and I thank them here now in this place for that service.

The member for Light, as the previous shadow minister for veterans' affairs, started a forum with ex-service organisations encouraging them to come together and talk about issues that they might have in common, or new issues in the veterans community that are popping up, and that is something that I have continued to do in my time as the shadow minister. I am very pleased to have seen the number of ESOs attending that forum grow, which only gives it a bit more critical mass, a bit more engagement. The issues and breadth of issues that we are discussing now are greater, and I am thankful to the member for Light for having started that, and I am very pleased to continue those forums now.

Tragically, of course, it is no secret that the number of veterans who take their own lives is much higher than the Australian average, particularly for those who have been medically discharged or diagnosed with PTSD—and that is many. The despair that those veterans and their families go through while dealing with those issues is really soul-destroying stuff. I have seen posts on Facebook groups that are there for the veterans community, where they inform the community of the passing of another veteran who has taken their life. You can see the effect it has on not just the veterans community but the family behind the person who took their own life. It really is like a shockwave through the community every time it happens.

I am pleased that the Prime Minister has now announced that we will have a royal commission, and those terms of reference are being drawn up. I think that we should in this place, the South Australian state parliament, acknowledge the work of South Australia's own Julie-Ann Finney, the mother of the late David Finney, who took his own life. The ferocious advocacy that Julie-Ann Finney has provided is in no small part responsible for our having this royal commission.

I am of course very pleased to support this motion today and will finish by encouraging all members of this place to continue the work they do in their own communities to make sure that those ex-service organisations can do the crucial work they do to support the veterans community every day.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:55): I rise to speak in favour of this motion moved by the member for Hammond and cannot stress enough its importance. Many of the privileges we enjoy today have only been made possible because of our veterans who have fought, and in many cases lost their lives while serving our country, during times of conflict. While it is impossible to repay the debt, it is incumbent upon us to continue to support and respect those who sacrificed so much.

Ex-service organisations are an important part of the lives of many veterans. In my own electorate, I know that many veterans are members of local service organisations, such as the Vietnam Veterans' Federation, Brighton RSL and the Marion RSL. These organisations play a vital role in caring for the health and wellbeing of the service and ex-service community. The RSL has five pillars: advocacy, services, mateship, commemoration and sustainability. The Marion and Brighton RSLs demonstrate each of these pillars with fierce passion and commitment, and I commend them for this.

I would now like to touch on the importance of commemoration. ANZAC Day is one of the most significant days of the year for both local veterans and many members of the wider community, particularly those who have lost loved ones to conflict. After ANZAC Day services could not go ahead in 2020 due to COVID-19, this year's ceremony felt even more important. I am pleased to say that the two RSL branches in my electorate were able to run successful COVID-safe ANZAC Day services.

I had the privilege of attending the Brighton RSL dawn service. Brighton RSL held the largest ceremony in the state, with more than 5,000 attending the service. We came together to remember those who fought for our country. While the ceremony could not take place at the Arch of Remembrance at Brighton jetty, the RSL were able to use technology to have photos of the arch on a large screen and a big canvas behind the ceremony at the Brighton football club.

It was a privilege to be able to lay a wreath at the service in remembrance of all the Australians involved in both distant and recent conflicts. The head prefects of Brighton Secondary School, Isabella Conner and Nicolas Bergoc, represented their school with pride while doing a reading for the service. The atmosphere was sombre and reverent, and I am sure many others felt that as well. I am personally moved each year by the dawn services in my community.

The other RSL in my electorate is the Marion RSL, and they were also able to go ahead with a service attended by many members of the Marion community. It was fantastic that so many people could come together and pay their respects to the ANZACs and to all service men and women on this day. The sense of community and camaraderie built through not only the dawn service but the efforts of the RSL itself is essential. It was great to have one of my staff members there representing me at that service as well. The service was officiated by Monsignor Bob Rice, who spoke about how

we can and must support each other in all forms and during trying times, just as the ANZAC soldiers did way back in the day.

I further commend the barbecue fundraising efforts of the Marion football club after the service. They really have joined wonderfully well with the Marion RSL, and it is great to see them support each other every year. Of course, the football club donated the proceeds to the Marion RSL.

I would like to take a moment to commend the Brighton RSL president, Jim Nicholson; vice-presidents Ian Petersen and Graham Bulger; secretary and treasurer, Trevor Whitelaw; and stalwart Rod Murray for the great job they do. Likewise, at the Marion RSL I commend president, Ken Parnell; vice-presidents Patrick Wilton and Darren Pusey; secretary, Rob Kreche; and treasurer, Bruce Wright.

Further, regarding the important work of the Vietnam Veterans' Federation in supporting veterans, I thank president, Mal Thiele; vice-president, Bob Ellis; treasurer, Robin Carbins; secretary Mike Hainsworth; and committee member Phil Scroop. I would also like to mention the ever-passionate Doc Ballantyne. Doc was an active campaigner to save the Repat hospital when the former Labor government sold off that facility. I know it brings a smile to Doc's face when he sees the great work that the Marshall Liberal government has done to reactivate and rebuild the Repat. Personally, I am also so proud of what we have done to save that hospital facility.

As a parliament, we need to remain committed to our veterans and recognise the support that these services provide is invaluable for those who return from conflict, bearing the physical, mental and emotional scars of war. Post COVID-19, one of the most critical lessons we learnt was about the importance of socialising and being part of a community. This is ever more important for our veterans moving into the future. I look forward to continuing to support these members and these organisations within my community.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:00): I rise to support this motion and commend the member for Hammond for bringing it to our attention. It is certainly one worthy of the support of this house. The work undertaken by the various ex-service organisations is to be highly commended and it is important that we acknowledge the work they do.

As the member for Wright quite rightly said, we often do not understand or appreciate as a general community that most of this work is actually performed by volunteers under very difficult circumstances. Often there is a lack of resources, often they are dealing with very complex matters in terms of the law and also complex matters in terms of the wellbeing of the veteran they are dealing with. They do it and they do it really well.

There are a whole range of returned and services organisations that provide a range of different services for different needs. It is also true that if it were not for these organisations—and I have a few in my own electorate, such as the local RSL club—our veterans and their families would certainly be poorer. The support they provide is often not only to the veteran but also to their family and children.

One of the things that we as a society seem not yet able to come to terms with is the sort of support that our veterans need. I say that because, as the member for Wright and other speakers have indicated, the number of ex-defence personnel or veterans who take their own life is disproportionately higher than the general population. That needs to be addressed. At this point, I would like to acknowledge the wonderful work undertaken by Julie-Ann Finney and other mothers and dads around this country to advocate for a royal commission so that we fully understand what is behind this appalling rate of suicide amongst our veterans.

It is sad that I have to stand here and say that these families have had to work very hard and tirelessly to get up this sort of inquiry. It seems to be a no-brainer that we should be doing this work to look into the lives of our veterans to see what the causes are of this horrendous suicide rate amongst our veterans. As the member for Hammond quite rightly said, our veterans are in high-stress zones for long periods of time and those of us who have not served cannot really understand that. That constant stress they are under has huge impacts on the mental health of our serving personnel particularly when they become ex-serving personnel because we do not seem to do the transition well.

We do not seem to be able to provide the support to the veterans and their families when they transition from military life or defence life to civilian life, and this sadly results in the high rate of

suicide. I recall one ex-serviceman mentioning to me that in his day, 'We do six weeks' training when we go in and we do six hours' work when we exit.' Clearly, that shows we do not do enough work with those personnel when they transition. As I said, the results are there for us to see.

One of the things that I think is very important that we as a society do is show our support for our veterans. One of the things we do that through, apart from day-to-day support and practical support, is to commemorate this service. It was sad in my own town of Gawler this year that there was not a traditional ANZAC Day service, where we get anywhere between 5,000 and 10,000 people attend. The lack of support given to the local RSL was sad and I think that, as a community, governments at any level and of any political persuasion need to step up in this area and do much better, as the member for Wright has quite rightly pointed out.

Most of these people, if not all of them, are volunteers. Most of our returned servicemen in the RSL are getting old, some of them having their own issues to deal with. Given all those circumstances, they still do a marvellous job. They do a marvellous job in supporting each other through peer support, but they do need our support as a community. I have no difficulty seeing my taxes go to support the work they perform, nor my taxes supporting commemorative services that give us a chance as a community to come together and show our support.

I would like to put on the record that the City of Playford does a wonderful job in supporting and having commemorative services. They have both a vigil service and an ANZAC dawn service. The city puts in quite a few resources to make those events happen and it is great to see the city doing that. I am not sure that is true of other councils in my region, and certainly I will be discussing that with them to ensure that next year and the years after that we provide the appropriate support for these commemorative services.

One of the things I would like to also touch upon, for those of us who do not move around a lot, and by that I mean move house a lot in terms of from state to state or from country to country, is that sometimes we do not understand the pressure that defence families are under. We do not often understand perhaps the impact on the children and the partners of continuously moving. I have lived in my community for many more years than I want to say publicly. I am fortunate: I know my community. I have childhood friends from schooldays, etc.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: When was that?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: A long time ago. I can actually say that my school does not exist anymore.

Mr Whetstone: You really are that old?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, I am, but I am in much better shape than some people across the table, too.

Mr Whetstone: How's your heart?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The ticker is going well. I am still here. I am still a candidate in the next election as well. Don't worry, I will be there to make sure that we win government next time.

Mr Whetstone: In your next life.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I think I have a better chance than you have, mate. Kids who grow up and their lives are dislocated a number of times have their own issues. As a society, we sometimes glamorise that life, but certainly some of the young people I have met in more recent times have made it very clear that that constant dislocation has had an impact on them because they do not have those childhood friends and they do not have those connections to community and it does weigh heavily on them because they lack those community networks that we all find very valuable in the communities we live in. We find that social interaction very important.

Interestingly, one of the students made a comment to me recently that often at school they are excluded from discussions because they have not been in that community a long time. They talk about things they are not party to and that makes them feel excluded. That is a challenge we need to understand. I know that if you are defence personnel you sign up and you make those sorts of choices, but equally we need to understand the impact if we do want people to sign up and we do want people to participate in our armed services. We need to make sure that we do support families.

As I said, this motion is worthy of our support and again I thank the member for Hammond for bringing it to us, but we also need to remember that we need to support those organisations that support our veterans and I think we can do that better.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:09): I also rise to speak on this highly commendable motion that has been brought forward by the member for Hammond to highlight such an important part of our community. I know this is an issue of real importance for the member for Hammond, so I thank him for bringing it to the house. Indeed, our community would be nothing without our veterans, and it is right and proper that we should always express our deep gratitude for them, for their service and for protecting our freedoms and our nation for over a century now since the creation of the Australian Defence Force.

Ex-service organisations are an integral part of our wider communities and provide an important space for our ex-service personnel. While these organisations have been at the front of our minds recently with the recent ANZAC Day commemorations just past, it is vital that we continue to recognise their work and support them all year round. I would like to make mention of some of the fantastic veteran outreach work that occurs in my community. This mainly happens through the Blackwood RSL, the Mitcham RSL, the Colonel Light Gardens RSL and the RAAF Association Mitcham Branch.

Each group is run by dedicated veterans and volunteers who commit their time and effort to ensuring local veterans have a welcoming place to support them in their life after serving the Australian people. Many of our World War II veterans who are still with us are now well into their 90s. Providing welfare and wellbeing for those veterans is so important. Residents at Myrtle Bank, on the edge of my community, certainly appreciate that.

Welfare and wellbeing across the board is such an important connection for these people. I am honoured to be the patron of the Blackwood RSL, and I regard it as an absolute privilege to be able to spend time there with local veterans and volunteers and hear their stories and continuously work with the volunteers to promote the good work of the RSL.

For all RSLs this year, ANZAC Day services presented a tough challenge in the world of COVID-19 restrictions. COVID-19 directions meant that local RSLs had further administrative steps to deal with and costs to incur when attempting to organise this year's services. With my office working closely with the Blackwood RSL for their dawn service arrangement, I know firsthand how difficult it was for every RSL across the state. There was a lot to organise: fencing, COVID management plans, QR codes, traffic management plans, road closures and detours, sign-in sheets and, in the case of the Blackwood RSL, finding 25 COVID marshals to volunteer their time at 5am.

All that hard work came to fruition when, at dawn on the morning of Sunday 25 April this year, thousands of local residents and veterans gathered together at the soldiers' memorial at the Blackwood roundabout to commemorate the ultimate sacrifice of those whose names are on the statue of the soldier and the service of our veteran community over the last 121 years. It was a solemn occasion, where many local ex-service organisations were represented along with local schools. A particularly moving part of the service was the contributions by local schoolchildren, who spoke about the importance of ANZAC Day and what the day meant to them.

My thanks go to all who volunteered their time to ensure the service was safe and met COVID restrictions and requirements. A big thankyou goes to the volunteers of the RSL, led by the president, Phil Cotton, in his first year as the president of the Blackwood RSL. Thanks also go to the Sturt SES volunteers, Blackwood Hire (to the Quirk family there, thank you very much), City of Mitcham, St John Ambulance, Blackwood Scout Group, Coromandel Community Centre, Blackwood Lions, Coromandel Valley Rotary Club and so many others, including local residents and members of other groups.

I had the privilege of laying a wreath at the Upper Sturt Soldiers Memorial Hall service later that day. Thank you to Dr John Halsey and the whole committee for a wonderful commemoration service, led by retired Colonel Moose Dunlop OAM. Whilst I was not able to attend the Mitcham RSL dawn service, which was a much smaller service this year, I was honoured that Mr Wally Beale OAM, a decorated World War II veteran, and Mr John Hatwell from the RAAF Association Mitcham Branch laid a wreath at the Mitcham RSL on my behalf and on behalf of the community of Waite. Big thanks

go to Dr Robert Black AM from the RAAF Association Mitcham Branch for his assistance in organising this.

As touched on by a few other members in this contribution today, the Repat hospital in my community plays a big part, an important role, in supporting veterans and their families and has done so for many years. Indeed, it was the veterans community who slept on the steps of parliament house night upon night, week upon week, and tens of thousands of South Australians signed a petition to ensure that the Repat did not close.

Unfortunately, the former Labor government did close the Repat, and I think that will forever be a great shame to that party and those under their watch who presided over the closure of the Repat. It is fantastic to see at the moment the Liberal government reactivating the Repat with a lot of work from the community. It is fantastic to see the progress of that reactivation.

We will see the new Dementia Care Facility unveiled, and that will create a lot of jobs at the moment. More importantly, in terms of supporting veterans is the opening of the newly refurbished wards for patient care and the opening of the Veteran Wellbeing Centre in the old SPF Hall, which has been so important not only to ANZAC commemorations at the Repat but also to the Vietnam community, especially the Vietnam veterans community.

I want to thank people such as Tich Tyson who does so much work with the Plympton veterans wellbeing centre to support veterans in our community. As so many other members have said, it is important that we support our veterans. We ask them to go above and beyond the call of duty to protect our nation. I support the motion before the house.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (12:16):

I would also like to speak in support of this motion, which has two parts: it signals its support for the South Australian veterans community and also recognises the deep and important roles that ex-service organisations play in providing advice, support and community for veterans in South Australia. That really is an important point, and in the electorate of Morphett there are some fantastic organisations that dedicate themselves to the support of veterans.

One of those, of course, is the Plympton Glenelg RSL based just off Marion Road. It is the unification of two RSLs and was initially founded in 1919 after World War I by a World War I veteran, Bob McGhee, who also went on to fight in World War II. In this area, the Plympton Glenelg RSL has a long history of supporting veterans in our community on ANZAC Day, and they are very prominent at Moseley Square.

When I was Mayor of Holdfast Bay, the Glenelg council should be commended, together with the federal government, for supporting what is a beautiful monument in Glenelg. It is in the shape of a setting sun, and we are so accustomed to seeing the setting sun over the horizon there. It appeals to those who were at Gallipoli, of course, and it represents the rising of the sun and includes the words, 'At the going down of the sun we will remember them.' It is there every day of the year for people to remember all the soldiers who sacrificed for their country. Of course, on ANZAC Day we do remember that, and the Plympton Glenelg RSL does a fantastic job.

This year we were very fortunate to be able to conduct a ceremony, which was a lot smaller than usual. Usually, there is a crowd upwards of 5,000 who come to Moseley Square. This time it was a much smaller affair around the monument—it was invite only—but of course passers-by could observe the ceremony as well. Tich Tyson was instrumental in organising the ceremony, and he was the MC on the day. It was fantastic to be able to lay a wreath on behalf of the grateful community of Morphett.

Also in attendance on the morning was the Holdfast Bay deputy mayor, Bec Abley, and a representative from Nicolle Flint's office, who is the federal member for the area, so you could see all three levels of government there to recognise the sacrifices that were made. Also there, interestingly, was Ms Christine Rothenhauser, who was the former Honorary French Consul for South Australia. It was really interesting talking to her. She laid a wreath with the French tricolour.

She spoke of her ancestors fighting on the World War I battlefield of Verdun, which was just a horrific battle where both German and French soldiers were involved in basically a war of attrition and so many died. She said that many of her family members were victims of that terrible battle. She

also paid homage to the sacrifice that the ANZACs made on the battlefields of France, and they still remember the sacrifices to this very day. I thank them and, importantly, thank their president, Bill Hignett, of the Glenelg Plympton RSL.

It should be noted that they are very entrenched in the community. Not far down the road from the RSL club itself is the Plympton Bulldogs football club, and on the day the footy club had a special guernsey made to commemorate ANZAC Day. Of course, the Plympton Bulldogs team colours are black and red stripes, and in the place of the red stripes were red poppies. It was really magnificent.

After the ANZAC Day service, I went back to the clubrooms in the morning, and at the presentation ceremony in front of all the members the president and the captain of the Plympton Bulldogs football club presented one of their guernseys to the RSL club. I commend the football club for doing that. There was junior sport on the day, which was of course very respectful of the veterans. Societies opened up for sport on these days after the ceremonies.

I went along and watched the under-13 boys play. They played a terrific match. All the boys lined up for a minute's silence. I think that was a thrill for them. They commented that it was great to be able to play football on ANZAC Day and commemorate the veterans. They see it on the TV on what has become a significant occasion, and they felt a big part of it as well, bringing that history to the next generation. They certainly played a very good brand of football that day, so congratulations to the Plympton Bulldogs football club.

I would like to talk also about another great organisation in the local area that looks to support the veterans. That organisation is based at Glenelg North, which is a suburb that was once part of Morphett and is coming back to Morphett in the 2022 election. They are at Kibby Reserve, off Kibby Avenue in Glenelg North, which is named after a famous ANZAC Adelaide war hero, William Kibby. He won the Victoria Cross for what were courageous actions, putting himself in harm's way on the battlefield of El Alamein in Egypt in 1942, the first time the German army was defeated. Australians had a huge part to play in that.

William Kibby rushed against a machine gun nest, not once but on multiple days during that battle. Ultimately, he was the last soldier standing in his battalion. He rushed against the enemy. Basically, they had won the day and he was killed right at the end of that action but still helped to achieve victory. At the Kibby Reserve, not only is the reserve named after him but a veterans organisation has been set up there, the William Kibby VC Veterans Shed. That is run by a fantastic and tireless worker, Barry Heffernan.

Barry was one of the first people I met in my role in public service, when I was first elected to Holdfast Bay council. He loves having a brew, so he reached out to me and asked to have a coffee and explain his vision, which was to set up this veterans' shed for veterans. Of course, there were men's sheds already operational and this was the very first veterans' shed that was set up to help veterans heal from trauma and with health issues, getting them together and sharing experiences.

Barry is certainly a talker, but he is also a doer. The shed has no government funding. The council gave support for some land for them to set up the shed. They went about raising money to be able to create that shed and have been operating there since October 2011. They provide fantastic support for veterans, both men and women. It is not just a men's shed; it is also for women, and increasingly Barry has found the need to provide that support to women as well.

Of course, Barry acknowledges that he might not be the best person to help in terms of women dealing with trauma, but he can certainly put them on to a similar group who have come through this veterans' shed to be able to share their experiences. He really credits that with saving lives. It saves veterans who find themselves with no alternative but to consider suicide.

By having this fraternity and shared experience, these veterans are able to navigate their way through this. I certainly commend Barry Heffernan and also Graham Rose, who is down there. They are often at the Mitre 10 in Glenelg North doing a sausage sizzle and trying to raise funds. As I said, there is no government funding for it, so that is a terrific exercise and undertaking by their shed.

To finish, I had the opportunity to go down to the Torrens Parade Ground last week to help launch a fantastic initiative by Operation Unity. Bill Bates is going to be walking 10,000 steps a day over the next 366 days to raise funds for veterans to put them into Operation K9, which is therapy

dogs to assist with veterans and their post-traumatic stress. They also support Legacy—another organisation to help veterans—and Trojan's Trek, which allows veterans to go on walks in the northern Flinders Ranges and be able to share experiences. I commend the member for Hammond for bringing this important motion to the house so we can recognise our veterans and the organisations that support them.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:26): I, too, rise to commend the member for Hammond's excellent motion. I would like to also pay tribute to the contribution that many of our veterans have made to give us the freedoms and the democracy we have in this modern world. Our Returned and Services League clubs right across South Australia, and particularly in the electorate of Chaffey, continue to do a fantastic job. Not only do they rally around returned servicemen and their families but they continue to reach out to give support and garner support for those who are looking for some level of assistance in the much different world that we live in today.

Many of those returned servicemen have been affected by the battlefields and by their war-torn experience. We must also acknowledge the great contribution they made to return home, which should never be forgotten. Of course, those who paid the ultimate price are also what this motion is about. It is about acknowledging those who gave their lives for our freedoms today, and we should be eternally grateful.

In the electorate of Chaffey, RSLs are prominent around many of the Riverland towns and many of those RSL clubs are very active. Two of the most active clubs—I say this with respect—are the Waikerie RSL and the Loxton RSL. They have museums, and the passionate, dedicated volunteers continue to collect artefacts, memorabilia, medals and historic items to put on display to showcase what those returned servicemen are prepared to put into custodianship in those museums.

If we look around the electorate, we have Bob Deidre at Swan Reach, Rob Manuel at Loxton, Paul Croft at Waikerie, John Forrester at Morgan, Jim Rolf—a real character—at Baramba, Chris Ware at Berri, Peter Higgs at Renmark and Kym Parry at Blanchetown. They are great presidents or representatives of those RSLs. Of course, we cannot forget Legacy. That is a great institution for support of returned servicemen, wives and partners, and gives them the support they need after the horrific era that people had to go through.

Of course, many of the sub-branches were unable to celebrate their centenary last year due to COVID. COVID-19 really did throw the world into turmoil, especially when it came to our being able to celebrate and acknowledge ANZAC Day. I think now we are seeing a lot of those sub-branches that are coming out and celebrating.

Recently I attended the Loxton RSL—the 101-year celebration—which was very fortunate to have His Excellency Hieu Van Le and his wife, Lan, there. They are dedicated people, too, to come out to the cause and as a sign of respect. They were ably assisted by Howard Hendrick. Howard Hendrick OAM is an absolute legend. He is a Riverland legend, a returned servicemen. He is 97, born in 1923. He was the son of a soldier who returned and set up a soldier settlement block in Renmark, and he has a great story to tell.

One of the stories in his memoir is about how he completed 30 missions in Europe. He was a pilot of not only Lancasters but also Halifaxes, and he completed 30 missions into Europe with the same crew. That says volumes—to go into battle with a crew and come home 30 times shows just how successful he was and how brave he and his crew were to do the great work that they did.

He was also awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. The reason I know this is that two weeks previously I was at his book launch—the launch of his book called *Full Circle*. It was just a great story. It is a great read, and for any of those of you who are into the stories of conflict and war Howard Hendrick's story is just something that is a joy to read.

What I must say is that also at the Loxton RSL centenary, or the 101 celebration, we were very lucky to have Colonel Steve Larkins. Steve is from the Virtual War Memorial in the nation's War Memorial. The virtual war memorials are gathering data so that those stories are easily accessible, easily gathered and made public so that people can understand what their family ties are with conflict, who are those people within their regions who served the country.

It really is something that is gaining momentum and huge popularity, particularly with giving acknowledgement to those returned servicemen, those who died who were never recognised, those who returned and were able to tell a story. It really is a great part of acknowledging our veterans and their community.

What I must also remind people is that we have just been through ANZAC Day. I think we are going to run out of time for everyone to speak on our second motion, but I will talk a little bit about ANZAC Day because it is a day of great pride, particularly in my electorate up in the Riverland and the Mallee. I think it was very especially memorable this year, after last year with the restrictions that were put on ANZAC Day. What we have seen this year is it has given everyone the ability to come back out, celebrate, stand around a campfire in some instances, where most people in the city do not actually have that opportunity.

In the electorate, I was given a task to get around to as many of those dawn services, the morning services or the late morning services, to acknowledge. I would say that it was a busy day. It was a proud day for me to be able to stand tall, particularly at *The Last Post*, to acknowledge and show some respect to those veterans and their communities.

Deputy Speaker, as you would well know the tyranny of distance does present challenges. On ANZAC Day, I left home at 3.20 am, and I headed to Mantung. Mantung is a small community in the Mallee, population 21. It certainly is a drawcard for many of our veterans and the supporters and their families. We saw over 150 people at the Mantung hall for the dawn service. I would like to thank Lou Westbrook and Neil Slyne for their great work for that service but also Susi Evans and Leanne Parker for keeping that service in order and making it run as smoothly as it did.

After Mantung, I headed to Waikerie where I attended a morning service, which was very well attended. The numbers were probably as good as they have ever been. Then I got back on the highway and headed up to a service at Renmark where many hundreds of locals paid their respects, and that was the second service of the day. The dawn service had been run, but I was able to get there for the late morning service.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who assisted me in laying wreaths where I could not attend. Some of those dawn services were at Swan Reach, Loxton, Morgan, Barmera, Blanchetown and Moorook. It certainly was a great day and I was very proud to go along to talk to some of those returned servicemen and, in particular back at the Renmark RSL, to have a beer, a snag and just listen to some stories. Again, those stories never seem to fall into a conversation where you would say, 'I have heard that story before,' because there is always another story to listen to, and they are always willing to engage.

I think it is great to see so many of our young out and about paying their respects. It really is something that I think should be part of history forever. I would like to acknowledge all our veterans, those who are still with us, those who have passed and those who have served. I returned at 3pm, some 12 hours later, having clocked up some 750 ks for the day. It was a great honour to be able to get out to acknowledge our returned veterans and their communities.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, it seems like the town of Mantung might be about the same size as the town of Edillilie.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:36): I rise to support the member for Hammond's motion and to speak a little bit about some services in my electorate. I want to pay tribute to Bob Sandow, the RSL President and his committee for an amazing ANZAC Day service. It culminated in the mid-morning march down the main street where there were at least 5,000 or 6,000 people lining the streets as the march went through. He had organised for the RAAF to fly a plane from Adelaide very low down our main street and coordinated the timing of that flight with the mid-morning march. It was a truly remarkable experience for all involved, and of course the RAAF was celebrating 100 years of service.

I also want to talk about Sergeant Stephen Wyte and his endeavours to support veterans. He is doing this with Laurie Mann as well by running a fundraiser at the Mount Gambier Attamurra golf course. I want to talk a little bit about Stephen Wyte. He has written to me seeking support and it is quite timely that it comes in with the member for Hammond's motion. Of course, this is on top of the member for MacKillop speaking yesterday in his grievance about the township of Robe and the very tight-knit community there. They are offering their houses to returned servicemen to come down to

Robe, stay for three or four days, watch the ANZAC Day football and participate in the ANZAC Day services. It is just a wonderful gesture from that community to support our veterans.

Stephen Wyte is certainly doing his part to not only raise awareness but raise funds for veterans and the establishment of a veterans' service hub. I will go through his letter which I think is quite apt. It states:

My name is Sergeant Stephen Wyte and I served 14 years in the Australian Army as a Soldier. I served in both the Army Reserves and the Australian Regular Army. My main employment was as a Rigger Parachute in the Royal Australian Army Ordnance Corps. As a Rigger Parachute, we were responsible for packing and maintaining the Army's parachute fleet and also had to be volunteers for parachute operations. In 2016, I discharged from the Australian Regular Army and next year I will be discharged from the Army Stand-by Reserves.

Australian Defence Veterans are people who have proudly served Australia and the Australian community in any of the three services; the Royal Australian Navy, the Australian Army and the Royal Australian Airforce. A Veteran is one whom has served not only during wartime or conflicts, but during peace keeping operations, natural disasters, and times of peace. Serving in the Defence Force is not just a job, it is an honour.

Unfortunately, this service often results in personal sacrifice and can come at a steep cost to Veterans, their families and loved ones. The personal costs often include physical and mental injuries taking a huge toll on both the Veteran and their support networks, impacting their quality of life and employment possibilities even leading to suicide.

I myself was injured in a parachuting accident in 2008 resulting in my medical evacuation from the parachuting exercise. I am still dealing with the conditions from this and other events or incidents which continue to have daily impact on my life both mentally and physically.

The Limestone Coast Veterans' Services Hub (LCVSH) is a group of veteran volunteers who see it as their social responsibility to assist Veterans and their families in the South East of South Australia and across our Victorian border in their own time. They draw on a strong sense of mateship and comradeship among those of us who have served our nation. That strong bond of mateship is the motivation that drives them as volunteers to assist Veterans and families in need

Their mission is to support Veterans with their wellbeing needs and advocating on their behalf with the Department of Veterans Affairs. The [support group] will be holding a Veterans Friendly Community Charity Golf Day as a fund raiser to finance the new Veterans Outreach Program. The program aims to support Veterans and their families, ensuring our younger veterans do not think they have been forgotten; and they do not feel isolated or are experiencing hardship in our community.

I feel it is vitally important that Veterans know they are supported, they feel welcomed and engaged in their community; that each Veteran knows their service is recognised. I feel the support shown by the community this ANZAC Day demonstrates this sentiment. The Veterans Outreach Program will also support Veterans and their family's with assistance for rehabilitation into the community, increasing their quality of life...

We are seeking your help [as the member for Mount Gambier] with the operation of this Charity Golf Day. All donations are supported and care of the Plympton RSL alongside the Plympton Veterans Centre, which is a charity listed on the Charity Register and regulated by the Australian Charities and Not for Profits...

Mount Gambier and indeed the Limestone Coast is a fantastic place to reside and raise a family. I relocated [here] three years ago as I recognised what the area has to offer myself and my daughter. We would like all Veterans to know they are an important part of the Mount Gambier and Limestone Coast community and we welcome them and their families or support networks.

Stephen Wyte

I thank Stephen for sending that to my office and taking the very important step of not just supporting veterans but raising money and engaging with the business community of our electorate to have that holistic approach, so congratulations to Stephen on that.

Briefly, I would like to acknowledge the entire community of the RSL, with Bob Sandow as the president; Peter Bruhn as vice-president; Leigh Newton as treasurer; Margie Winterfield, who is a good, close personal friend of mine; Ian Summers; Malcolm Driscoll; Dieter Merkel; Kelvin McRae; and Kelly Copeland. They do an amazing job for our community.

I would say that our services, whether it is Remembrance Day or ANZAC Day, are some of the best in the state, certainly by number as well as coordination and impact on the community, particularly the next generation coming through. Without such a strong committee, that type of impact and professionalism would not be what they are today. According to official records, I am sure we only had about 900 at the dawn service, all spread apart. Of course, the unofficial record would be much greater than that.

With those words, I commend the member for Hammond, who is not only a fantastic member but also a fantastic South Australian and Australian. His support for veterans needs to be acknowledged and certainly the passion he brings to this place. I am very happy to support a great member and a great motion.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:45): I rise to add my voice in recognising the significant role our service organisations play in providing advice, support and community for veterans in South Australia. In doing so, I also acknowledge the contribution and the sacrifice made by Australian Defence Force personnel and their families—those who have served, those who are no longer with us and those currently serving.

I recently had the pleasure of attending the Royal Society for the Blind Operation K9 graduation in Gilles Plains at their training centre across the road from my electorate office. This event celebrated the passing out of the Royal Society for the Blind assistance dogs to spend their working lives assisting veterans who have been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. It is a day of celebration and sharing of experiences from those provided with an RSB assistance dog. It was truly inspiring to hear firsthand from the recipients on the day as to how an assistance dog will significantly improve their quality of life for years to come.

When an Operation K9 dog senses their owner's trigger, it is trained to perform a specific task to help alleviate the symptoms. This may be by making eye or body contact to comfort their owner and divert their attention. This brings the veteran suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder back to the present moment. For someone with PTSD, what may seem a small problem to others, like misplacing their keys or looking for an object like their wallet, can be the tipping point that triggers an episode. If a veteran is experiencing night terrors, the dog can assist in turning on the light.

The RSB Operation K9 program, funded by Veterans SA, is delivering results and assisting people in our communities who need support. Clinical measures show that genuine results are being achieved, and it is a combination of the RSB's vast experience and the quality of the dogs and the training carried out here at Gilles Plains in South Australia, in my electorate of Torrens, that is making a real difference.

On this particular day, eight veterans and their assistance dogs, along with their puppy educators, their boarders and feeding volunteers, formed the graduating class of 2020. It was an amazing experience for me and my colleague, the member for Wright, to meet some of these veterans. In particular, I recall meeting Sam and his assistance dog Xena and listening to the emotional story of his journey while serving overseas with the Australian Defence Force.

I would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge and thank the Royal Society for the Blind for the amazing work they do in our local community, especially through what has been a very difficult time for many during the COVID-19 pandemic. I would also like to thank all the people involved in the graduating teams—those involved in the assistance dog program, in puppy education and the bed-and-breakfast boarding—for their dedication and commitment that really makes a difference to our community. Of course, I also thank all the other organisations that assist our veterans who have served our country so well.

Finally, I would like to also mention Gilles Plains and Hampstead RSL and their successful ANZAC Day service. With COVID-19 restrictions, there were a whole lot of things that had to be put in place, and they managed that very well. We had a beautiful service. I know that for many it was just really good to be able to get out and to attend those services.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:50): I would like to thank the member for Hammond for bringing this motion to the house and also signal my support to the South Australian veteran community and the organisations that support them, in particular the RSL and Legacy and The Road Home. I am sure there are other organisations as well that do a wonderful, important job looking after both veterans and their families.

Of course, we have had ANZAC Day just recently, so a special tribute goes to the RSL clubs and the work that they do and the volunteers who organise what were quite large events this year. I attended the Walkerville memorial, where there were hundreds of people. We had large screens set up so that there could be better social distancing, using the park adjacent to the memorial gardens. Prospect also had their traditional gunfire breakfast after their memorial service, and of course there is the Torrens Parade Ground that hosts the march every year. There is also the Light Horsemen,

which I have been going to ever since becoming a member of parliament. This year we did not have the horses. However, we still had a wonderful tribute towards the former servicemen and their horses.

I would also like to make a special mention of Rena Pascoe, who was one of the first female members to join the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) during World War II. I have had a good chat and spent many, many hours with Rena, hearing about her. She was spray-painting the camouflage on the aeroplanes during the World War II effort. In fact, she was born in the same year that the RAAF was started, which was 1921.

She was very much looking forward to celebrating this year as a special guest. It was incredibly sad to lose Rena last year at the age of 99 and about a half. She did not get to make it, and she was really, really was looking forward to that. Next week, it would have been Rena's 100th birthday on 12 May. We have a special memorial that I have been invited by the family to attend in recognition, so it is very timely that this motion is coming to the house.

I would also like to put on the record a wonderful poem that was written by Jeff Cook at Minlaton. It is a poem that I read out on ANZAC Day, with his permission, and I would love to read it into *Hansard* because I think it is such a wonderful poem about ANZACs and the dawn service and other veterans. This was written by Jeff Cook:

They came from every walk of life, enlisting by the score
And offered up their very lives, to fight on foreign shore
They learned to use a rifle and to wield a bayonet,
In circumstances that survivors never could forget
Many even brought their horses to offer them as well
A reminder of all they'd left—p'raps homesickness to quell
For each one left a family—wife and children, parents too
None knew what future lay in store, but they'd do what they could do
They sailed off to a living hell to shoot at foreign foe
Fought seasickness and bullybeef with mates they'd yet to know,
But when they reached the beach-head, they still were far from shore
And were attacked while in the water, dying by the score.
Eight thousand died at ANZAC Cove and the legend was begun
Of the brave heroic ANZACS and their battles lost and won
The name and fame spread far and wide, of their courage and their skill
Of their stamina and their recklessness, and the name is with us still.
Though it still reflects the bravery that was earned in the first World War
It has a meaning of its own for it's come to mean much more
So ANZAC Day is how we now pay tribute to all those
From every war and every fight, in foreign lands with foreign foes
From the Boer War; World Wars One and Two; Korea; Vietnam;
Peace-keeping forces everywhere, and now Afghanistan
We honour all who served or serve, every single one who went
To fight for right and uphold the peace, while living in a tent.
In stinking sweaty jungles, or gale-driven desert sands
Crossing snake-infested swamps, or land-mine covered lands
In a submarine or jet fighter, or sailing stormy seas
We all owe a debt of gratitude to our people such as these.
Nursing in a makeshift hospital, or maybe feeding all the troops

Working in supply chains, or juggling bureaucratic hoops
They're not all on the front line, but they all play their part
Knowing thousands may depend on them, though perhaps a world apart
And so we gather here at dawn, and each year the number grows
As people recognise the debt that each one of us owes
There is no way no matter what, we can't repay that debt
But let's be thankful every day, lest we should just forget
Lest We Forget!

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:55): I rise to support the excellent motion moved by the member for Hammond. Honouring our veterans and thanking them for their service is a cornerstone of the Australian story.

In particular, I would like to highlight the commitment of my local community to ANZAC Day commemorations, in addition to the commitment of Returned and Services League sub-branches in my electorate, as we recognise the roles ex-service organisations play in providing advice, support and community for veterans. We almost take RSLs for granted as a building block of Australian and South Australian society, and their social and cultural influence was only researched in depth relatively recently.

Most historians have described the RSLs as organisations that rallied the troops on the home front during wartime; however, Associate Professor Martin Crotty, writing in the *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, suggests that the RSL has been more than meets the eye since its 1916 inception. He says the institution has an honourable history of advocating for returned soldiers' needs and interests, as well as leading the charge to have ANZAC Day recognised as a national holiday in 1927. As former RSL President W.K. Bolton said in 1918, the soldiers who fought valiantly in Gallipoli worthily upheld 'the honour, the credit and the prestige' of Australia and everything we stand for.

The RSL has been and continues to be one of the key pillars of South Australian society. Despite the height of the pandemic coinciding with last year's ANZAC Day, I remain proud of South Australians' commitment to remembering those who have served. I put to this house that initiatives to Light up the Dawn with ANZAC Day commemorations on people's driveways got even more people participating in the ANZAC spirit than ever before.

Because of time, I will just wrap up today on this motion by acknowledging the Salisbury RSL sub-branch and the Tea Tree Gully RSL sub-branch and their committees for everything they do to keep our community committed, everything they do to invite our communities in, and for the lengths they went to this year to make sure we could commemorate the people who have served. Lest we forget.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:58): I would like to acknowledge all the heartfelt contributions from right across the chamber, whether from the opposition, the crossbench or members of the government. It is very important that we give full acknowledgement of our veteran community as well as the service organisations that have assisted our veteran community in the past, that assist them now and that will assist them into the future.

I commend this motion, but I also want to acknowledge the next motion by the member for Wright. I will work with him if there is anything we can do, working together, with party rooms and the crossbench, to bring that motion honouring our ANZACs and all our service men and women for their service to this country over many years. I will do my best to make sure we get vital debate around their service in light of what they have done in the defence of this country.

Again, I thank everyone for their kind words in relation to our service men and women and the service organisations.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

*Bills***UNEXPLAINED WEALTH (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL***Message from Governor*

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

*Petitions***BRIGHTON ROAD**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 112 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.

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING BILL

Mr ELLIS (Narungga): Presented a petition signed by 789 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the house to pass voluntary assisted dying laws.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw honourable members' attention to the presence in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon of Mr Joe Scalzi, former member for Hartley—welcome, Mr Scalzi—and of Robert Cameron of Bar Chambers, who is my guest here this afternoon. I also draw members' attention to the presence this afternoon of students and a teacher from Westminster School, who are the guests today of the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Welcome to you.

*Ministerial Statement***NATIONBUILDER**

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I table the Privacy Committee's report into the alleged collection of personal data by the government using NationBuilder software, which I received yesterday afternoon. Of concern were links posted in government press releases and on some government websites that redirected users through the NationBuilder platform and whether data was captured in doing so.

This government takes very seriously any misuse of personal information, either directly or inadvertently. Information was sought from all state government chief executives as to whether links redirecting to NationBuilder have been removed, whether the state government procured the platform and whether any personal information was being collected from SA government websites through NationBuilder or any other website tracking applications. All agencies advised the Privacy Committee they had deleted the relevant documents links and would discontinue the practice of copying links from press releases that caused the redirection. NationBuilder also—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —advised—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: NationBuilder also advised that in the circumstances outlined not only did they not collect any data but they lacked the technical capability to do so. Interestingly, the report also noted that no formal complaints relating to the use of NationBuilder had been received by the committee at the time of preparing the report. The committee concluded:

1. Based on available information, neither NationBuilder nor state government agencies have collected personal information from website redirections.
2. The risks have been mitigated—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —due to the removal of the links that redirected through NationBuilder and through discontinuing the copying of links from press releases.

3. Based on the information provided by state government agencies, there is no breach of the Information Privacy Principles and therefore no further action is required by the committee.

The report indicated it would be forwarded to the Ombudsman, having had regard to the previous public statements. This report will also be published on the State Records website, I understand, this afternoon.

Despite the hysterical claims of the opposition as being the biggest scandal in South Australian history, the Privacy Committee has confirmed what the Premier has said from the outset: we never did it. I table the report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right, members on my left! The member for West Torrens will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Hammond, the member for Playford and the member for Kaurana.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:09): I bring up the 35th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr TRELOAR: I bring up the 36th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation. Report received and read.

Question Time

JOBS GROWTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please explain to the house why, despite South Australia having one of the best health responses anywhere in the world to COVID, thanks to Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier, we have the worst performing labour market in the country? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: According to the most recent labour force statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, every single state in the country has grown the number of jobs over the last 12 months with one exception—South Australia. Victoria has grown the total number of jobs by 2,000, New South Wales has grown the total number of jobs by 2,700, Tasmania has grown the total

number of jobs by 2,800, Western Australia by 28,100 and Queensland by 62,800. South Australia during the same period over the last 12 months has lost 10,500 jobs.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. This is an important question. It goes to the heart of our recovery plan here in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition is quite right: we have had an excellent health response to the COVID-19 global pandemic, and that has been attributed to a large number of people. The Leader of the Opposition speaks about Professor Nicola Spurrier, of course, and he does so quite rightly, and also Commissioner Grant Stevens.

They lead very dedicated teams across SA Health, across SA Police, but there has also been an incredible partnership with the people of South Australia. People have had to make sacrifices. These are individual sacrifices, business sacrifices, but the collective sacrifices have kept our state safe and our economy strong, and our economy is strong in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition loves to cherrypick statistics. It is one of his core competencies, in fact. Unfortunately, it is not a particularly useful one. If we look at the last three months, South Australia has done well. Our unemployment rate has gone down from 7.1 per cent to 6.3 per cent.

An honourable member: You don't like that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: More than 6,000 jobs have been created in South Australia, and while those opposite continually want to talk our state down we on this side have a plan to create more jobs.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And part of that, of course, is the economic response that we had in last year's budget where we put \$4 billion worth of stimulus on the table—stimulus and support to businesses, to individuals, to our economy overall. That is why we are seeing results, like our unemployment rate coming down from 7.1 per cent to 6.3 per cent for the first quarter of this year.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And whilst those opposite want to talk down our state, we are just getting on with the business of delivering more jobs here in our state. I am very proud of the work that this government has done. I particularly want to highlight the work of the Minister for Innovation and Skills. When we came to government we were in a real freefall in terms of skills in South Australia. One of the first things that we did was to reform the Training and Skills Board in South Australia, the industries skills boards in South Australia, and focus on developing skills, apprenticeships and traineeships that lead to job outcomes. I think to date we have created more than 33,000 new apprentices and trainees here in South Australia.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Up to 37 now.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Up to 37,000 and the number keeps increasing. Let me compare and contrast that with what was happening under the previous government. We had a complete and utter freefall—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and a diminution of those people who were prepared to sign up an apprentice or a trainee in this state. What we have seen since with business confidence, consumer confidence, investor confidence at decade-high levels is companies willing to take on and provide jobs for the next generation. That is one plank, but there are so many others, and, of course, we are working with the federal government. I think that we are fortunate to live in a country where

we have been able to provide support for businesses and for individuals—a bridge, if you like—to get over the problems that we are facing as a globe at the moment in response to the coronavirus.

We won't be distracted. We won't be deterred by the negativity opposite. If you could bottle that negativity, it would be a great energy source. You would be able to fuel a lot of hot air coming from those opposite, but we are not going to be distracted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We've got a plan. I would love to hear what the plan from the opposition is. We are just 10 months away from the next election and they haven't announced a policy yet. It is the laziest opposition in the history of South Australia. Not only is it lazy but it is completely and utterly incompetent too. I am looking forward to maybe one or two commitments before the next election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right and members on my left! I just remind all members that a particularly disagreeable form of interjection is an exchange between individual members from one side of the chamber to the other. That will cease.

Before I call the leader, I call to order the Minister for Trade and Investment. I call to order the member for Wright and the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. I warn the member for Playford. I call to order the Minister for Innovation and Skills and the Minister for Education. I call to order and warn the member for Lee. I call to order the Premier, and I call to order the deputy leader and I call to order and warn the leader.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain to the house and the people of South Australia why the Victorian economy continues to outperform South Australia's despite it being locked down for nearly four months? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Victorian economy outperforms the South Australian economy on the most recent labour force data, with a lower unemployment rate and more jobs created since the beginning of the pandemic and with higher state final demand growth in the most recent quarter and higher gross state product growth in the most recent financial year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): I am not wishing to compare myself with Victoria; I am wishing to make sure that we do everything we can to grow and prosper our state and that is exactly and precisely what is occurring.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is exactly and precisely what is occurring. Whilst those opposite hate the fact that this is what is occurring, this is precisely what is occurring. When we take a look at one of the key indicators that we should be considering in South Australia at the moment, the net interstate migration, the figures here are showing a very, very positive turnaround over and above what we saw under the previous government.

On a quarterly basis, under those opposite, they were driving capital and young people out of our state. Most often, we had between 1,000 and 1,500 net interstate migration under the previous government. In fact, in the last year of that pitiful government that preceded our government, they had 5,600 net migration out of this state. That's disgraceful. They had no positive policies to address the exodus—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —out of this state of capital. Young people were not given a future. By contrast, when we came to government, we said we would perform in this area and we said that we would, in the first four years, turn off the tap of that exodus of capital and young people out of this state. I am very pleased to report to the house today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that this occurred within our first two years in government. In fact, when we look at the quarterly statistics in March this year—before COVID we had gone from the terrible and pitiful quarterly performance from those opposite of about 1,000 to 1,500 leaving the state to just over 100. So you see, sir, the people of South Australia were feeling more confident about being in this state before COVID. During COVID, that has accelerated even further and we now have a net migration to South Australia. This is the first time this has occurred in this state since before the State Bank crisis.

We are doing everything we can to provide opportunity for the next generation, jobs for the next generation, hope for the next generation and jobs around future industries. We are always going to be hugely respectful to our important traditional sectors like agriculture, mining and manufacturing, construction, and tourism in South Australia. These are extraordinarily important sectors for our economy but we are unashamedly focused also on developing jobs in future industries like defence, space, cyber, machine learning and hydrogen, with a real policy for hydrogen and not a 1¼-page press release.

Where is the detail? It was so flimsy—1¼ pages is now a policy from the Labor Party. What a hopeless, lazy, incompetent opposition that we have in South Australia. It is an absolute and utter disgrace that they have not put policies out to the people of South Australia ahead of the next election. When we raised this in the previous answer, the Leader of the Opposition piped up and said, 'We've got a policy. It's the hydrogen policy'—1¼ pages. I think the member for West Torrens is upstairs now, writing out some policies. He is up in the dream factory writing out some more. He has probably done two or three pages. That's nine or 10 policies for the Labor Party. He will be down here quick smart to present the people of South Australia with some new options for the future.

But the people of South Australia will not be deceived again. They know exactly and precisely what they would get if that hopeless opposition ever returned to the treasury bench. They remember Transforming Health. Those opposite have amnesia, but the people of South Australia haven't forgotten and they know who the health minister was at the time of the last election.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I am just going to remind all members that there is a general degree of disorder at the commencement of question time. I would just indicate a general warning. The level of interjection needs to cease so that at least I am in a position to hear the member who has the call to ask the question and so that the minister endeavouring to answer the question can be heard in silence. Is the leader seeking the call?

STATE ECONOMY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier hopefully answer the question and explain to the people of South Australia why the most recent ABS state final demand data shows that South Australia has the lowest growth in the nation? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics data shows quite clearly that South Australia recorded the lowest state final demand growth in the December quarter of 0.6 per cent, which of course was the lowest in the nation.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. The cherry picker has done it again. He is referring to a quarter where he knows—he unequivocally knows—that we were facing a very serious situation in November last year with the Parafield cluster. We moved very decisively, but there were ramifications in terms of state final demand in that quarter. He knows that, the people of South Australia know that.

In fact, the people of South Australia are backing what we are doing in terms of our prompt response to the COVID-19 pandemic. They are backing that because they know that ultimately it is the best for our state and it is ultimately the best for our nation as well. The people of South Australia can't be deceived. The people of South Australia see what's happening in other jurisdictions and the people of South Australia see what's happening in other countries around the world, and it is heartbreaking. It is absolutely heartbreaking.

We have seen the situation in Europe, we have seen the situation in the UK, we have seen the situation in the US and of course we are now seeing the devastation rolling out in India at the moment. So the people know that you do need to take decisive action when you are presented with community transmission because this is a dangerous pandemic and it can have exponential growth over a very short period of time. You cannot take your eye off the ball when it comes to the pandemic, so we made that extraordinarily tough decision to put South Australia into a lockdown situation for six days when we had—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is hard to concentrate with the constant chorus of negativity that is coming from those opposite, sir. It is like they are willing South Australia to do poorly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They can't stand the fact that South Australia is doing well at the moment, and we see this time and time again. Consumer confidence is at decade-high levels, investor confidence is at decade-high levels. These statistics are killing those opposite, absolutely killing those opposite. Take a look at the National Australia Bank quarterly survey—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which looks at that sentiment in small business in South Australia—sky high—because the people of South Australia know that they've got a government which is backing them. Since coming to government, we have removed all payroll tax for small business in South Australia. They don't pay a cent. We have provided other payroll tax concessions to other businesses in South Australia affected adversely by the pandemic. At every opportunity, we in South Australia are doing whatever we can to back people, but not only—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —backing businesses that are currently here but getting on the front foot and going out and attracting businesses into South Australia. I want to commend the Minister for Trade and Investment for the work that he and his agency have done to bring companies into South Australia. Wasn't it a great day when Accenture, one of the largest global consulting firms said, 'We want to set up operations in South Australia'? And there is plenty more to come. We absolutely love the fact that Google said, 'This is a place where we want to have an office that can support businesses and enable them to actually grow in South Australia'—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —using their platform, yet all we hear from those opposite is constant, constant negativity. We see an excellent performance and a bounce in terms of what we are doing in the film sector at the moment. Again, I commend the work of the Minister for Innovation and Skills. He and I got on a plane, we went over to Los Angeles, we pitched, and all we got from those opposite was, 'How much was the taxi?'

Let me tell you, that business coming to South Australia has created enormous economic activity for our state and enormous jobs. I think we predicted 580 jobs; over 800 jobs were created from that. But, more than that, it gave us the opportunity to actually go back to Los Angeles, go back to Hollywood, and say to the largest film companies in the world, 'South Australia has the skills, the capability to deliver on Hollywood blockbusters.' I'm excited about the future. I know there is a lot of negativity over there, but I am excited and the people of South Australia are excited, and there is plenty more to do.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for King, I call to order the member for Chaffey, I warn the member for Wright, I call to order the member Ramsay, I warn the deputy leader and I warn, for a second time, the leader. The members for Playford and Lee will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

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

ROAD MAINTENANCE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is creating jobs and keeping South Australia moving through the delivery of the state's single biggest injection of funding into roadwork maintenance?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:30): I thank the member for the question. I know she is very passionate about improving roads in her local community and, in fact, right across the state. This is another great opportunity for me to talk about the \$16.7 billion infrastructure spend we have across South Australia—

Mr Whetstone: How much?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Chaffey asked me how much: it's \$16.7 billion, a significant investment, bigger than this state has ever seen, over the next four years, and we are very proud of that. Of course, this does dovetail with the fact that we were left with a \$750 million road maintenance backlog from those opposite, so there is work to do.

That's why in the last budget we invested \$100 million into road maintenance across South Australia, in the city and in the regions as well. Partnered with the federal government, that is a spend of \$268 million on some really important road safety and maintenance projects. As part of this \$100 million allocation, there are a number of metropolitan roads that we have been improving: Port Road, Fullarton Road, Marion Road, Greenhill Road and Anzac Highway, just to name a few.

The Marshall government is spending \$7.6 billion on roads and public transport infrastructure over the next four years, with more than \$1 billion to fix key regional roads, including the Eyre Highway, the Augusta Highway, the Princes Highway, the Sturt Highway, the Barrier Highway—and there are more as well. There will be more than \$700 million on key metropolitan intersections

to bust congestion, and allow families to get home and spend more time with their families, and to reduce travel times and improve safety as well.

This record investment is not only to futureproof South Australian roads but it is also to stimulate the economy and generate jobs—thousands and thousands of jobs—which we really appreciate. I know that every time I go out and see the people out there in the field working on these projects they are over the moon about the jobs we are creating.

With this quantum of infrastructure spend, of course there is the big end and the small end as well. If you can believe it, we have created jobs in the traffic management area, and I know they have been working very closely with the Minister for Skills as well in terms of upskilling people in this space. This is an important industry because, with that \$16.7 billion of infrastructure spend, that is a lot of projects, and we want to keep people safe, especially on the roadside.

Pedestrians and roadworkers need to stay safe during these works, and during these roadworks we also have lane closures and speed signs going out to manage the risks inherent in roadworks—but we also want to keep traffic flowing. It is a complex blend, but these people do an outstanding job in this area. We want to avoid delays at every turn and make sure that our temporary road management signs are not left out unnecessarily. We made this commitment because we have so much work on the go.

All roads under the care and control of the highways commissioner—unfortunately, this doesn't apply to local council roads—state government roads, have new regulations that they have to follow. This has been in operation since 5 April to help industry stay safe on these sites. These regulations came into place, and originally there was a fine of between \$20,000 for a first offence and \$50,000 for a subsequent, second offence. We worked with industry and put in place an expiation system, which was greatly appreciated.

The traffic control people who are out there doing this wonderful work can't leave these signs out when there are no roadworks happening. We made that really clear. However, we do have to be aware that sometimes there is bitumen that is being bedded down or steel plates you cannot see, so we ask people to take care in and around these traffic works.

The Traffic Management Association and the RAA applauded these new regulations, and it has also been great for the freight industry. The South Australian Freight Council gave some very, very positive feedback on this. So we are going to get on, deliver those roadworks; we know that it will create inconvenience. We are doing everything we can to reduce that inconvenience. If you have any issues you would like to follow up, contact the Traffic Management Centre. But we are continuing to build what matters for South Australia.

JOBS GROWTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): My question is to the Premier again. Can the Premier explain to the house why in each and every year under his government jobs growth has fallen in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: ABS labour force data shows that annual jobs growth in the year to March 2018 was 2.3 per cent, falling to 1.8 per cent in March 2019, falling further to 0.5 per cent in the year to March 2020 and is now minus 1.2 per cent in the year to March 2021. Jobs growth has been falling long before COVID.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35): I am not familiar with the statistics that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. But when we look at the single touch data which has just recently been published by the ABS—this is a series which is published on a fortnightly basis—it gives us a great insight into what is going on right around the country on a very rapid basis. The most recent statistics which have come out which represent the fortnight up to 13 March show that South Australia did fall in that fortnight by 1.7 per cent, and that was better than the national fall, which was 1.8 per cent, which I think is a reflection of what may have been happening in that week relative to what was happening in the week before.

But if we look over the comparison between the same period last year, South Australia has had the second largest jobs growth of all states at 12.6 per cent. So if you are comparing that fortnight

with the fortnight to 12 months ago, then we were up 12.6 with the second highest jobs growth in the nation. We have also had the second largest total wages growth of all states, at 10.4 per cent.

The Leader of the Opposition repeatedly wants to cherrypick negative statistics. I don't know why he does this. I don't know what his motivation for this is. Actually, South Australia is doing well.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But it goes to the question as to his motivation. Why does he want to undermine—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The leader is a very angry person today. I am not quite sure what's going on. He hasn't got his mate from West Torrens here. He is up in the dream factory. He will be back down soon once he has done his penance.

But the reality is these statistics from the ABS show that South Australia has had the second highest jobs growth since the same time last year and the second highest total wages. In other words, our jobs are up 12.6 per cent and our wages are up 10.4 per cent. But the Leader of the Opposition wants to—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —compare one fortnight with a preceding fortnight and catastrophise and say this is an absolute disaster. The people of South Australia know that things are moving in the right direction, and the reason I can tell that is because when we look at consumer confidence, when we look at investor confidence, when we look at business confidence, they are at decade highs.

So, despite the constant negativity, people can make up their own mind, and they actually say that they are grateful to have a sensible government in place which is going to listen to science, listen to the evidence, frame our response to the pandemic, keep our state safe and our economy strong. When we look at those statistics, actually wages have grown over the last 12 months. Jobs have grown over the last 12 months and that's because we have had a sensible and commensurate response to the situation that has unfolded across the world over the last 14 to 16 months; \$4 billion worth of support for COVID-related support and stimulus went into our most recent budget.

We have been supporting businesses, whether it be through cash grants, whether it be through projects which bring forward economic activity to create jobs. We have a total infrastructure build in South Australia at the moment at \$16.7 billion. That is supporting so many jobs in this state at the moment. I want to congratulate the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and the entire cabinet on the work that they have done to roll out that comprehensive policy.

What I can say, though, is that there is much more work to be done, but that work is not going to be enhanced by the constant negativity and talking down of our state that we have seen from the opposition. People want this state to do well. People want this state to prosper. They want more jobs for the future. That doesn't come from negativity; it comes from policies. We still haven't seen any.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Cheltenham, I warn the member for Kaurana, I warn the member for Ramsay and I call to order the Deputy Premier.

SINGLE TOUCH PAYROLL

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's concern with cherrypicking and regular reference to the Single Touch Payroll data from the ABS, is the Premier aware of the Australian Bureau of Statistics' disclaimer about that Single Touch Payroll data? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Australian Bureau of Statistics itself sets out in its methodology for your Single Touch Payroll data, and I quote:

Weekly Payroll Jobs and Wages in Australia are experimental [statistics], compiled in near real time and published fortnightly. This information provides a complementary insight to Labour Force statistics on employment, which provide a more comprehensive view of the Labour market.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:41): I thank the Leader of the Opposition, Einstein over there, for pointing out the bleeding obvious. Of course there is a disclaimer. There is a disclaimer on every single statistic which comes out from the ABS statistics. The labour force statistics themselves are a survey. They are actually a survey of 1,700 people in South Australia, conducted over a fortnight every month, with 400 new people going on and 400 others going off. There are disclaimers with all these statistics.

If the Leader of the Opposition says, 'The number one and the only thing that we should look at is the labour force statistics,' well, let's do it. Let's take a look at the labour force statistics over the previous term of the Labor government. Do you know what they averaged? The unemployment rate over the four years of the previous government—the last four years of that terrible, terrible, pitiful 16 years that they were in government, sitting on the treasury bench—the average, was 6.8. The average of this government so far has been 6.4, and we have had a pandemic to deal with. There was no pandemic—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —yet their unemployment rate was higher. They're the statistics that they want us to use. I am happy to look at those statistics. They are helpful. They are insightful. They show us how incompetent that government was. They weren't dealing with a global pandemic. They weren't dealing with the complexity that the world has had to face, yet they had a higher unemployment rate when they were in government. We are not taking any lessons from those opposite. That would not be helpful for this state. They had 16 years—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and their record is there for all to see: a mass exodus of capital and young people out of this state, high unemployment, young people giving up hope in South Australia. Well, no more! We put a comprehensive policy in place to focus on new jobs in future industries, as well as supporting jobs in traditional sectors across South Australia. We have been lowering the cost of doing business in South Australia, making it more attractive for businesses to invest in trainees and apprentices.

We have put downward pressure on their electricity prices, we have slashed their water prices, we have slashed their emergency services levy bills and we have taken away payroll tax for every single small business in South Australia. That's what we have been doing. We are not saying that the job is done; there is a lot of work to be done. That is why we have a \$16.7 billion infrastructure build program in South Australia, supporting tens and tens of thousands of employees in South Australia, and it is important to do.

But we also are now seeing the green shoots of private sector investment into this state. It was fantastic on the weekend to be down in Victor Harbor, where we now see that Discovery Parks are making a \$40 million investment into that area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are seeing businesses in South Australia pushing ahead with programs that have been stalled for years and years under those opposite and their constant whingeing, whining, carping, complaining and incredible world-class negativity. Well, enough is enough. People want positivity. They want this state to do well. We want this state to do well, and we won't be deterred by that constant negativity; in fact, we use it as a motivator. We do know their negativity. We lean in harder. We try harder to support jobs, to support our economy and to continue to move our great state in the right direction.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Davenport, I warn the member for Cheltenham.

BIZWEEK

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:45): My question is directed to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. I ask the minister whether he could please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is working with small businesses to create jobs for South Australians.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:45): I thank the member for Davenport. Like so many people on this side of the chamber, he has real small business experience in the small business sector, unlike those opposite, where you will struggle to find anybody who has even worked in the private sector let alone their own business. The contrast between the two is extraordinary.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: South Australia's 143,000 small businesses form the backbone of our economy and are key drivers of the state's economic growth and employment. South Australia's small businesses are amongst the most confident in the nation. The Marshall government is creating a competitive, dynamic economy to provide new job opportunities, foster entrepreneurship and strengthen the future of our state here in South Australia. It is supporting small businesses, particularly in the regions, to adapt, evolve and grow—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —to create jobs for South Australians. Last week, the Marshall government delivered Bizweek, a program of targeted events held across the state and online designed to support our small business community to adapt, to evolve and to grow. Events took place across regional and metropolitan areas of South Australia, including Port Pirie, Kangaroo Island, the Adelaide Hills. We were out at REDARC at Lonsdale. We were at Bickford's at Salisbury. We were at Sfera's convention centre in Modbury and my old stomping ground, the Parafield Gardens community centre, where I had my first job, when I was at school, collecting glasses for \$1 an hour.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Too much!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Too much—I was very slow. I was still learning. The program was tailored to include practical skills development for businesses, including specific sessions on building business resilience with mental health and resilience training on how businesses can learn from setbacks, ensuring the small business community remains able to support jobs and the growth our economy.

The week focused on assisting businesses to adapt, evolve and grow as South Australia continues to recover from COVID-19 and, importantly, shining a clear light on the various incentives and support programs that are available to small business. The program spanned 26 unique events over four days, attracting 2½ thousand registrations in person and online on the department's virtual hub.

Some of the most popular sessions included Bizweek business forum, digital marketing fundamentals, government support for business growth and planning, adapting business growth and, of course, skills and training for your staff. This was a very popular session. A number of those sessions were very well attended. Of course, we spoke about the subsidies being offered by the

federal government at the moment—a 50 per cent subsidy on wages for the first 12 months for any apprentice or trainee that is employed up until 30 September this year, for the first 12 months of their salary, capped at \$28,000—plus the additional incentives that the state government is offering, including a \$200 a week discount for the first six months of being a host employer of a group training apprentice.

Comments from attendees at the events have been overwhelmingly positive. This is one example of some of the feedback we received. The attendee said:

This session opened my eyes and made me think about different things I can do to make my business stand out.

This has been reinforced by some of the other sessions I have attended.

Thanks for putting on Bizweek.

I've really appreciated the quality of the speakers and their willingness to help me as a small business owner.

It was an outstanding success. I congratulate the small businesses of South Australia on getting through this very difficult period.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I warn for the second time the member for Cheltenham. I warn for a second time the member for Wright.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain to the house and the people of South Australia why in each and every year of his government, economic growth has fallen in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Australian Bureau of Statistics national accounts figures show annual economic growth in South Australia was 2.4 per cent in the year 2017-18, falling to 1.1 per cent—more than halving—in 2018-19, and falling further to minus 1.4 per cent in 2019-20.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Economic growth is a very important statistic that we need to be focused on, and we in this government are. This is one of the reasons why we commissioned the work to create a growth state. This was our agenda: to grow the overall size of our economy when we came to government.

Under those opposite, South Australia was underperforming. In fact, if you look at the 16 years of their government I think that the economic growth in South Australia was hovering at around about 1 per cent on average. This meant that every time the national statistics came out we were getting further and further behind the peloton, and we said, 'This should not be occurring.'

What we have done since coming to government is to make sure that we are focused on supporting our traditional sectors but also look at nine key areas to continue to grow our state and to grow jobs in South Australia. Even despite the fact that we have had to deal with the coronavirus, we have continued to release all our strategies for those nine areas. They were developed in consultation with the sectors, all designed to grow our economy. We are pleased we have progressed here.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition points to statistics. Again, the cherrypicker at large is doing his work. The state final demand rose 0.6 per cent in the December quarter. We know that this followed the previous quarter growth of—are you ready for this?—6.7 per cent. Just to return to the point that we were talking about before, under those opposite what we have seen is a very low growth rate over an extended period of time—not cherrypicked statistics.

Despite the coronavirus, when those opposite were telling us that we were going to be heading towards another 100,000 unemployed people in South Australia unless we did this, that and the other thing, the reality is we managed that. We managed to get as many people through the pandemic as possible and, as I was saying before, there are more people employed now in the most recent fortnightly statistics than there were 12 months ago, and we have had the second highest growth rate here in the state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was quite interested in the Leader of the Opposition's request for me to refer to the disclaimer, so I quickly took a look at his extensive hydrogen policy because I thought: would there be a disclaimer on that? The disclaimer was nearly as long as the policy. And, sir, for your help and instruction, I am pleased to read the disclaimer:

None of Frontier Economics Pty Ltd (including the directors and employees) make any representation or warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of this report. Nor shall they have any liability (whether arising from negligence or otherwise) for any representations (express or implied) or information contained in, or for any omissions from, the report or any written or oral communications transmitted in the course of the project.

Oh my goodness! Usually when you put out a policy you want to get an endorsement. That's not an endorsement. Here are your advisers running a mile—running a mile from your cobbled together only policy that you are going to be taking to the next election so far. This is the laziest opposition, most incompetent opposition we have seen in this state. Still 10 months from an election, they've got 1¼ pages and not even their advisers want to back their policy.

The SPEAKER: Leader.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hurtle Vale! The leader has the call.

BUSINESS INVESTMENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): That's okay, Mr Speaker, we like it when he's like this. My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why business investment in South Australia is the lowest in the nation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I am happy to explain yet again.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The most recent CommSec State of the States report shows new plant and equipment investment by business in South Australia is down 7 per cent over the last 12 months—again, unfortunately, the worst result in the nation.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54): The cherrypicker is at it again. We have had some skill shortages in South Australia. I don't know whether they extend to the cherry sector, but if they do I am reliably informed by the member for Chaffey that we do have a shortage of cherrypickers in South Australia. I don't know that there is a cherrypickers' association of South Australia, but I'm going to ring them up and I'm going to say that we've got some very, very skilled cherrypickers here in South Australia. We need to deploy them to work on something that is going to be productive for our state.

Confidence is doing extraordinarily well. The BankSA State Monitor survey results for February show business confidence reached—are you ready for this?—the highest level since 2005, increasing by 4.3 points to reach 129.9 points. Did Business SA and their survey get it completely wrong? Did the Leader of the Opposition get it right? I don't think so, but let's see if there are any other corroborating pieces of evidence in terms of confidence in South Australia.

What we see is consumer confidence. Again, BankSA State Monitor survey results for February show consumer confidence at the highest levels in over 10 years, increasing by 9.2 per cent to 124.9 per cent. So why the constant negativity? Why this constant referral back to 2017-18 when the Leader of the Opposition was in that cabinet? What was so exciting about that time? That's the time, of course, that he closed the Repat—one of the most disgraceful chapters in the history of this state. That was a disgrace. That wasn't a period to be proud of. That was a period where you should hang your head in shame.

We know that there are still many challenges that our state faces. We know that there are many programs that still need to be rolled out to make sure that we can get the full effect and benefit of those programs. That's why we have not just stimulus here in one year or stimulus related to a two or three-month period but that stimulus goes over a four-year period. Next month, I look forward to

welcoming the Hon. Rob Lucas from another place down to this great chamber, sir, and I'm sure you will welcome him here to present the next budget because this will be a very important budget—an important budget for our state.

We have weathered the storm of the coronavirus pandemic, but we cannot be complacent. It is not over. We can see what is happening in other parts of the world at the moment. We can't be complacent. We also need to make sure that we can get the best economic bounce out of this as possible. I genuinely think that there is a silver lining to this otherwise dark cloud of the coronavirus.

I do think that people now regard South Australia as the safest state in the safest country on this planet. I do think that previous ideas that you could only be successful if you were operating from the 88th floor of a high-rise in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Singapore, Hong Kong, London or New York have been challenged. The whole world has learnt to work from home through necessity. This is an opportunity for us in South Australia. This is an opportunity for us to re-present South Australia and that is what's happening.

You get companies like Accenture, one of the largest consulting companies in the world, now choosing to set up home in South Australia. You get companies like Google and Amazon coming—

Mr Malinauskas: The opportunity exists and you are wasting it.

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to South Australia. You see investors here at the moment for SouthStart. There is a buzz of activity and positivity about the future in South Australia. We are not out of the challenge yet. There is more work to be done, but South Australia is heading in the right direction under this government.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. How many jobs does the minister expect to be created in the next four years through the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:58): I thank the deputy leader for that question. I don't have an exact figure on job creation in front of me, but I do believe it's in the region of several hundred jobs as that large infrastructure project is rolled out and the horticultural industry in that part of the state is expanded.

That project was commenced under the previous government. It had a significant federal contribution and is progressively being worked through. I understand that SA Water is in commercial-in-confidence negotiations with a number of proponents at the moment which will see the rapid expansion of the NAIS project.

PRISON INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is creating jobs through construction at the Northfield prison site?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:00): I thank the member for Flinders for his question. I am very excited to provide the house with an update on the very important Better Prisons Program and in particular the construction that is currently underway at the Yatala Labour Prison.

Recently, I took the time to visit that site with the Minister for Infrastructure, and I thank him for his involvement in this area. I don't need to remind those on this side of the house that, as a government, we are making the most significant investment in prison infrastructure in over a generation. We know that stage 2 of the Better Prisons Yatala expansion project is underway. A new 270-bed secure accommodation facility, a new commercial kitchen and also a new visitor admissions centre are beginning to take shape thanks to the hard work of many men and women already on site.

Not only is the government building what matters but we are also creating jobs in the process. On this particular site, some 400 jobs will be created during the construction phase. We are investing over \$140 million in this particular project. Our prison facilities by those opposite were left in some areas outdated, ageing and in some cases not fit for purpose. Those on the other side were certainly

not as focused on rehabilitation or reducing reoffending as we are. Some were only interested in racking, packing and stacking offenders. We have obviously moved on since then. We are focused on building what matters, investing in what matters and also creating jobs for the state.

The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure joined me just a short time ago to see firsthand the significant work that is underway at the Yatala site. Stage 1 of the construction project was completed late last year, with the Northern Metropolitan Business Centre and Learning Academy named after Mr James Hugo. Many in this house would remember Mr James Hugo and the huge legacy he left in this portfolio area. Also, the Staff Wellbeing Centre is named after a former long-time Yatala staff member, Mr Dennis Watkins.

These early works will complement the additional expansion, allowing for dedicated business support for the Adelaide Women's Prison, the Yatala Labour Prison and also the Adelaide Pre-Release Centre. In addition to the construction that is already underway at Northfield, our government has several other key investments across our Correctional Services sector.

We have invested \$15 million in a new digital records management system for the Department for Correctional Services. The iSAFE project will enable the department to improve its end-to-end case management process and also in turn enhance community safety. It will improve the quality of intelligence management, resulting in more effective protective security, and not only enable greater rehabilitation but also reduce recidivism rates, which is very important, through not only effective case management but also information sharing with other justice agencies.

We have also invested a further \$12 million to transition the electronic security systems from analogue to digital across the Northfield prison site. South Australia, of course, has the lowest recidivism rate in the nation, at 42.3 cent, which is something all our Correctional Services personnel should be very proud of. There is always more work to be done, and we will continue to deliver improvements to our Correctional Services system to bring that rate down even further.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. How much of the current capacity of the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme (NAIS) is currently contracted to water users?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:03): It is around about three gigalitres of the capacity as formally contracted, and then there is a range of other—as I mentioned in my first answer—commercial-in-confidence negotiations going on.

I understand that SA Water's modelling suggests that it usually takes an analysis of similar systems elsewhere. It usually takes around about five years to deliver these to full capacity, and that was the case with the Virginia system, which was installed over 20 years ago. So we expect full distribution of that water, or a full signing up of the capacity of NAIS, to be completed about five years after the commencement of negotiations. For interest, the project commenced construction around the time the government changed in March 2018.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Are all currently contracted customers paying the publicly listed charges for their contributions?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:04): I am not aware, and I am not sure I am able to discuss the commercial arrangements with regard to each of the contracts that SA Water has signed on for the three gigalitres of water that has been subscribed to so far.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Has the minister had any representations made by potential customers relating to the excessive cost of water for the scheme?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:05): There is no doubt that there has been some concern amongst some irrigators, particularly those associated with the old Virginian scheme, about the cost of water that is provided by NAIS. However, we are under fairly strict requirements under the National Water Initiative when it comes to water pricing and how that is structured.

The fact that we have signed up three gigalitres and have extensive discussions underway for other contracts suggests to me that the pricing of this water is competitive. I am as confident as I can be, notwithstanding economic conditions and changes into the future, that that trajectory towards the full subscription of NAIS water will continue over the coming couple of years.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Is the price of water from the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme, including the initial capital contribution required, competitive when compared to other recycled water schemes across Australia?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:06): It's not for me to make a judgment as to whether it is competitive or not because that is, in my view, for the market to decide and to drive. Clearly, three gigalitres of water have already been signed up to and people have been willing to pay the prescribed rates for that. I understand that SA Water are contacted on a weekly basis by potential buyers of that water and, as I mentioned, there are a number of commercial negotiations in their advanced stages, so I would suggest that the trajectory is evidence that the price of this water is competitive.

ABORIGINAL ART AND CULTURES GALLERY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:07): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier read the disclaimer from the report commissioned by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet conducted by PwC regarding the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The disclaimer published by PwC at the end of their report says:

Notice to any reader of the attached report

This Report has been prepared by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) and PricewaterhouseCoopers Indigenous Consulting Pty Limited (PIC) in accordance with the Official Order entered into by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) and PwC dated 23 January 2019 (Official Order) issued under the Audit and Financial Advisory Services Panel Contract between the State Procurement Board and PwC dated 28 November 2012, as extended from time to time.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Okay so far.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's okay so far. It goes on:

The information, statements, statistics, material and commentary (together the 'Information') used in this Report have been prepared by PwC/PIC from publicly available material, from information provided by DPC and from discussions held with a range of stakeholders (as agreed with DPC). PwC/PIC have relied upon the accuracy, currency and completeness of the Information provided to it by DPC and the stakeholders and takes no responsibility for the accuracy, currency, reliability or correctness of the Information and acknowledges that changes in circumstances after the time of publication may impact on the accuracy of the Information. The Information may change without notice and PwC/PIC is not in any way liable for the accuracy of any information used or relied upon by a third party.

Furthermore PwC/PIC has not independently validated or verified the Information provided to it for the purpose of the Report and the content of this Report does not in any way constitute an audit or assurance of any of the Information contained herein.

Think before you speak!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens, members on my right! Before I call on the Premier, I warn the member for Chaffey, I warn the Minister for Innovation and Skills, I warn the Minister for Education.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:10): Never leave this parliament. We love the member for West Torrens being on the frontbench of the opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and long may that continue. With support like that, what hope has the Leader of the Opposition ever got in South Australia? The point that he made is directly in contrast to the point made by his leader sitting two seats away.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We know the Labor Party is opposed to the new gallery. We don't know why they are opposed to the new gallery. What we know is that they are constantly talking it down. We believe that it will be transformational. We believe that is a very important Aboriginal art and cultures centre, a place that people will be able to visit for decades and decades to come.

We are not relying on one piece of advice. In fact, we've worked very hard to assemble a huge amount of advice for the development of this, I think, globally significant space. This will be able to showcase 65,000 years of Aboriginal stories and songlines. We've got incredible collections in our Art Gallery, we've got incredible collections in our SA Museum—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and in our State Library. More than that, we've got the ability to develop ongoing collections which can showcase this incredible legacy, this extraordinary opportunity.

We put \$200 million into the budget for this centre and all we've heard from those opposite is negativity. The reality is this will be, I think, a great showcase for the oldest living civilisation on this earth, and to prepare for that we have very significantly upgraded the storage facilities we have in South Australia.

The most recent budget provided more than \$80 million to address the legacy that we inherited from those opposite, where we had these incredibly valuable artefacts stored in a completely unacceptable situation down in the western suburbs. When it rained, members of the staff at the South Australian Museum had to go down and put plastic sheets over priceless objects. It was absolutely disgraceful. It was the same with the Art Gallery, and it's been the same with some of our other collecting institutions in South Australia.

People donate objects to this state in perpetuity so that we can preserve them and so that we can also display them to tell the stories of our state, yet they were in an appalling situation under those opposite. We have addressed that. We put \$200 million into the budget to create something which I think will be an inspiration for the next generation. I think it will help us to change the narrative in South Australia, an opportunity for us to celebrate the wonderful achievements of Aboriginal Australians.

Whilst those opposite carp and complain—and laugh, which is so disrespectful, so incredibly disrespectful—we on this side of the house are very proud of the wonderful culture, multiple cultures that we have in South Australia, and we want to back it.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Waite, the member for West Torrens can leave for the remainder of question time in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

SPORTS VOUCHERS

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Sport and Recreation. Minister, what measures will you take to ensure that sporting and recreational activities undertaken by the Scouts and Girl Guides are supported by the state government's \$100 Sports Vouchers scheme? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

Mr DULUK: Last week I met with Scouts SA's Chief Commissioner, Jan Turbill, at Belair Scouts, who brought to my attention the fact that under the current scheme their organisations and members are not eligible for the government's reimbursement. These important community groups provide a sense of belonging, teach our youth many life skills and get their members outside participating in sport and recreation—similar social benefits that sports clubs provide the community.

Due to the nature of the commitment, Scouts and Girl Guides are, for some families, a full-time commitment, and these families may not have the same opportunity as sporting families to access this participation-initiated voucher.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:15): I thank the member for his question about our Sports Vouchers program. I am very happy to talk about this, because it has been incredibly successful.

When we came to government, we took the previous \$50 voucher and expanded it to \$100 for primary school-age children. Of course, that lowers the cost of living for families, and we are very keen to be doing that. We came into government and said, 'More jobs, lower costs and better services,' and this is one of those lower costs initiatives.

Can I just say that whenever I am around this place I will come around a corner and the member for King will be there wanting to talk to me about this program. She is a huge advocate for this program, and how important it has been in her electorate. I want to commend her for that and recognise the money we are putting into this program.

If I go back to when Labor were in government, they had some 58,000 sports vouchers in their last year, some \$2.9 million spent on this project. When we came in, we put the significant increase in to make sure that people got the full benefit and, as I said, money went back into the pockets of families and it got their young people playing sport. In 2019, that put 74,600 vouchers, some \$7.2 million, back into the pockets of South Australians.

We saw the value of this and so we expanded it. With the Sports Vouchers program we included swimming lessons, we added dance into the mix as well, and that just grew the number of participants. It has been a huge success across the board, as well as making it more affordable for families to get their young children playing sport.

We have put some \$390 million in total into sport here in South Australia. That is improving infrastructure that was allowed to fall into rack and ruin under those opposite, community sports infrastructure in all the electorates right across our state—improving that infrastructure, partnering with local government, local sporting organisations and the clubs themselves. This has been a massive win and it has been truly appreciated.

Along with that we have also put into mid-level sporting infrastructure more district and regional sporting infrastructure, and then elite level sporting infrastructure as well, to help us get games in the Women's World Cup, to help attract international superstars to South Australia with the Adelaide International and the Day at the Drive. To have the world's best tennis players playing here has been so well received. When I go to those sporting clubs, at the grassroots where we are investing now you hear them talking about those big stars, those big names, and they want to emulate that.

Our project has been incredibly successful. Some \$30 million was budgeted for our Sports Vouchers program over the four years, and this has all hinged around the Game On body of work we did. We did our infrastructure plan and we are delivering against that; as I said, \$390 million is going into sport in total, and in the last budget \$214 million, which the community appreciates.

Our Game On project is about getting people more active. We know that if we can get everyone doing 150 minutes of exercise per week we can reduce the health budget significantly, and that will be a great win for South Australia. So we are very focused on getting people active, getting them out there playing sports and being active. That has been a huge success.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: On that side, they make jokes and they laugh because they don't care about sport. They don't care about the community, but we do. We care about getting people active, getting them active in our community. We have our programs in place—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —they have been highly successful, and we will keep rolling out those programs. We will keep getting people active in South Australia, and we will do everything we can to reduce that health budget.

Again, I commend the member for King for her advocacy for this program, because since we increased the investment the number of people who have got involved in sports, the number of people who have claimed these vouchers—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The question was very specific about how the Sports Vouchers program would be used to support the Scouts.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Number 97—can you count that high? I didn't think so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey is warned for a second time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The minister has not answered the member for Waite's question. I ask you to direct him to an answer, sir.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the point of order. The minister is addressing the substance of the question. I do draw the minister's attention to the more particular subject matter of the question. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We were talking about the sports vouchers and I was talking about the great success of those sports vouchers. In fact, the sports vouchers policy is exactly the same as it was under Labor when Scouts couldn't get it there anyway. So they couldn't do it under Labor but now they want it—and now it's more money. We are doubling the amount of money that goes into families so that they can reduce the cost of living. Like it was under Labor, it's exactly the same under this one. It's just double. It's just more money. I can tell you that people in Lee appreciate it. You can ring them all and ask them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left and members on my right!

VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:20): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will South Australians see an increase in victims of crime compensation payments following increases to the victims of crime levy? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: As I understand it, in January 2021 the government increased the victims of crime levy from \$60 to \$90 per summary offence, which will collect approximately an extra \$9 million a year. How will this be spent? What funding increases will be seen in the domestic violence area and other areas such as the Victim Support Service, which looks after victims of all types of crime?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:21): I thank the member for the question because yesterday I outlined very significant draw on the Victims of Crime Fund arising out of our commitments to deal with the scourge of domestic and family violence. I outlined in that that not only was there an application for some programs but, very significantly, that the ex gratia payments that are approved by me as Attorney-General have significantly increased by millions of dollars per year.

Ms Bedford: How many?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to go back and look at the *Hansard* yesterday, but there is a whole list of those programs for which there is an allocation of a very substantial increase in money from them. So, yes, I do think that there is going to be a significant shift in relation to the benefits to victims from that fund, but I urge the member to have a look at that very long list.

I didn't touch on the detail of it yesterday but \$200,000, for example, is going from a fund that starts next month for the application of one-to-one counselling for children who are victims themselves of family and domestic violence or are pregnant or are parenting between the age of 12 and 24. The idea of using this money for these children who are victims themselves is to make sure that we do everything we can to address intergenerational behaviour and conduct which might be repeated to the next generation.

So, yes, I am very proud of the application of the funds. Very significant amounts, as you will see from yesterday, have been applied. We are going into some new initiatives with that money. It is designed for and statutorily protected to be available for victims, and that's precisely what's happening with it.

VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:23): Supplementary, Mr Speaker: with respect to the Victim Support Service, Attorney, what support is available for someone applying for compensation payments—for instance, where they have been rendered unconscious by a coward punch but have to prove it was the punch that caused their injury?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:23): The member might not be aware but the Victim Support Service doesn't provide legal advice. It did under the previous government but we found there was a project that they were providing but in fact that is now being provided by the Legal Services Commission because it's not actually able to be provided under a social work contract. It has to be under a legal aid contract. In any event, we have remedied some of those matters.

But the Victim Support Service provides for significant other services to victims and we applaud the work they do. The victims who need legal advice who aren't in a position to be able to afford to have access to advice in relation to a claim can approach the Legal Services Commission, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement or the community legal centres, all of which are under a \$149 million new legal agreement with the commonwealth for the provision of their funding. If they seek to have advice in relation to support during court assistance, then they can seek that through a program with the Legal Services Commission.

If they are seeking funding to assist in relation to the need to do a victim impact statement, that advice is available through the Commissioner for Victims' Rights, Bronwyn Killmier's office, and of course that is part of the Attorney-General's Department. If there is another other specific service that you are seeking to advise for that imaginary example that you have provided, I am happy to get that further information for you.

VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24): Further supplementary: this isn't an imaginary circumstance. This person has been asked to prove it was the coward punch that caused their injury. Where does this person go to get that sort of proof?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:25): I think I have outlined that, but I am happy to get some further information to ascertain whether there has been any other advice sought. But largely, in relation to a claim arising out of the conduct by another in relation to a civil matter—it may be a civil matter. If it's a compensation matter arising out of a claim against the Victims of Crime Fund, then generally that requires that there be either a convicted party or an offender unknown, and that can be in some circumstances available. It is only available for personal injuries. If there is some other aspect that I can assist the member with, I am happy to take the detail.

HOUSING SA

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:25): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister please respond to my letter of 4 February 2021 regarding the availability of housing and how Housing SA is assisting those with high lead levels in Port Pirie? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I requested:

- Current number of vacant and occupied Housing SA properties in Port Pirie with a breakdown of High/Med/Low lead risk area
- Number of applicants on the waiting list for Port Pirie and each category with criteria
- Approximate wait times for offer of a Housing SA property
- Estimated amount of outstanding responsive maintenance requests
- List of the 5 properties where SA Housing is trialling an upgrade to property features to reduce potential lead impact

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:26): I think I am correct in recalling the question and also that recently I signed a response for it to come back to the parliament. As I am sure the member appreciates, there is a lot of information that was sought in that and I recall it being a fairly long answer, but I know I signed it in the last few days.

SEX EDUCATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:27): My question is to the Minister for Education. How will South Australia's Keeping Safe child protection curriculum, which falls in line with the federal government's Respect Matters program, assist young people to learn about consent, contraception and pregnancy? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: An article on Sunday 25 April, entitled 'Schools' sex ed needs to shape up', highlights that sex education falls short in Australian schools. Online sex education provider 'Normal' surveyed 1,000 Australians of all ages and found that schools did not teach at least half of those currently aged under 24, particularly boys, about consent, contraception or even how pregnancy works.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:28): I thank the member for the question. This is a very important issue. The member may or may not be aware that the Keeping Safe child protection curriculum is not just something that has come about as a result of the Australian government's Respect Matters body of work, which is a much more recent body of work, but the Keeping Safe child protection curriculum has been mandatory in all government schools for quite some years now.

Indeed, all Catholic schools in South Australia and a number of independent schools, as well as the Northern Territory, have taken up the Keeping Safe child protection curriculum. Certain sectors elsewhere around Australia, and indeed dozens of schools internationally, are also licensing from the Department for Education our Keeping Safe child protection curriculum. It aligns with the Australian Curriculum, so when the Australian Curriculum deals with matters of this nature certainly

the Keeping Safe curriculum aligns to it, but the Keeping Safe curriculum does predate it in many respects.

Indeed, as the years have flown on, the Keeping Safe curriculum has been updated as well. It deals directly and explicitly with consent in the nature of the material at the year 9 and year 10 level. In the early years, indeed going back to children as young as three, it deals with children's bodies in a different way. It is indeed a comprehensive curriculum, one that the educators and the academics who worked on it can be rightly proud of. I commend the previous government for supporting its development. This government is very proud of the work it has done.

In the last couple of years, we have brought in-house in the Department for Education the training program for teachers because, of course, as I think the member referenced in her question, it's not just what is in the curriculum but also the delivery of the curriculum. This is a matter that has been raised previously. Delivery of the curriculum requires competent and thorough training.

More than 31,000 teachers have been trained in the program since its inception, but of course we want to make sure that all our teachers in all our schools have the confidence to deliver the curriculum effectively in the way that it was designed to be delivered. That training is now done within the Department for Education. I commend absolutely those public servants who have been doing that work—a couple of them, one in particular—for a number of years now at a very, very high level, with an outstanding level of success and thoroughness in the teachers they support.

I believe that every student in our South Australian schools should be undertaking this curriculum. That's why it's mandatory for it to be taught. We will continue to look at ways that we can quality assure, if you like, the delivery of the program in our schools, and we are always looking for ways to enhance that. Can I say, the content of our curriculum, I have every confidence here in South Australia, stacks up well. I would go further: I am very confident that it leads the nation in relation to this. Many other jurisdictions around the world identify that. Certainly many schools around the world have identified that work that's being done in South Australia and chosen to take it for delivery in their schools too.

We will continue to work on revisions in the years to come. There are resources that have been produced by other governments and other jurisdictions that of course can potentially be adapted and integrated into the delivery of the program. Curriculums aren't a script, if you like, to be read out. They are something that is integrated into the learning that is done in schools. I commend all the teachers and our South Australian schools who have been working so hard in this area for many years. I think sometimes they are unheralded in some ways. The work they are doing in this area is truly world class and the work that the curriculum writers and the trainers who have been supporting those teachers is equally world class.

Ministerial Statement

HOMELESSNESS ALLIANCES

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:32): I table a ministerial statement by the Hon. Michelle Lensink in another place, entitled South Australian Homelessness Alliances.

Grievance Debate

COVID-19 ECONOMIC RESPONSE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:32): There is no doubt that our esteemed public servants Chief Public Health Officer, Nicola Spurrier, and Commissioner of Police, Grant Stevens, have successfully steered our state through the COVID-19 pandemic. The Premier took the prescient decision to remove himself from the process and ensure that he was not part of the Transition Committee that made decisions about how our state would respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and, as a result, we have had the best health response to COVID-19 in the country. But, remarkably, we also have seen the worst economic response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the recession that it has caused our state from this state government.

There is no doubt that our state's economy is currently the worst performing in the nation. We are the only state in the nation to have lost jobs since the beginning of the pandemic—the only state. We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. We have the longest wait for South Australians who are looking for work to find a job; six months is the median time taken. Our young

people suffer the highest youth unemployment rate in the nation. Our population has the lowest proportion of working age adults either in work or looking for work—that is, we have the lowest participation rate in the nation.

Last financial year, we not only suffered a recession—our first in nearly 30 years—but our economic growth rate was the worst in the country. South Australia is one of the few places in the country where private business investment is going backwards while the rest of the country is surging forward. If business in South Australia are not choosing to invest, to expand their operations, their plant and equipment and their productivity, then how can we expect them to employ more South Australians?

Our state's share of national exports continues to fall, and trade imposts from China will only make this worse. In the most recent CommSec State of the States report, South Australia has dropped two places in the state rankings. While the government is currently championing the one-off COVID-inspired return of expats to South Australia, expert economists—including Darryl Gobbett and Deloitte Access Economics' Chris Richardson—warn that this temporary influx will reverse as soon as international borders reopen.

It is clear that while our state has benefited from having the best health response to the pandemic, the Liberal government's economic response to the pandemic has been the worst in the country. At every turn, the Premier and Treasurer's response has been too little too late. For the first six months of the pandemic, we had the lowest stimulus spend in the country—less in actual terms than Tasmania.

There are still hundreds of millions of dollars of promised stimulus funding that have been committed but not yet spent. It is incredible that Victoria was locked down for nearly four months but their economic performance outstrips our own. The reason for all of this is that the Premier and his government are asleep at the wheel. We have had 14 months to respond to the economic crisis that besets South Australia, yet we are the last in the nation.

It is not a recent phenomenon. Every year this government has been in, annual economic growth has fallen before and during the pandemic. Every year this government has been in, annual jobs growth has fallen before and during the pandemic. With the end of the federal government's JobKeeper scheme and the state government's slow stimulus rollout, small business remains hobbled by restrictions with no further help from the government.

We have had 12 months to prepare for a vaccine rollout, and we are the worst in the nation. With no community transmission and virtually no flu season, we have the worst hospital ramping in our hospitals that we have ever seen. In the middle of a pandemic, the Premier and the Treasurer have spent more than a year picking a fight with ambulance officers that has literally cost South Australians their lives. Finally, today they have capitulated to the ambulance officers.

Major infrastructure projects, which could be in construction and employing thousands of South Australians, remain delayed under this minister and his chief executive. The government is beset by crises. The Premier's response is to deny that there is a problem. There is always an obscure statistic at hand to deny the facts. There is always a pile of dirt, a golden shovel and some high-vis in a city alleyway somewhere to try to convince us that he is doing something.

The fact is that if the Premier cannot admit that there is a problem then we know that he will not be getting to work doing something about it. While the Premier continues to live in denial, the rest of our state suffers. It is time for this government to finally act.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:37): I rise on a point of order of a breach of the sessional orders in relation to questions I have asked of the Premier that have been unanswered after the requisite 30 days: Nos 430, 431, 432 and 434. I wonder if you could raise that breach of the sessional orders with the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Those questions, 430, 431, 432 and 434, are noted and I will endeavour to obtain further information for the member.

*Grievance Debate***SCHERER, MR G.**

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:38): Can I compliment you, sir, on the calm and comprehensive way in which you deliberate these matters—very well done.

I rise today to honour a great man and friend from my electorate of Hartley—the late George Scherer. I am also delighted that today his wife of 44 years, Vivette Scherer, has joined us in the gallery to hear his much-deserved tribute. George's whole life was about dedication to his family and service to his local community. I first met George back in 2012 and we remained firm friends from that time forward.

George was always the first to offer assistance, lend a wise and friendly ear and offer sage advice on local issues. His wife, Vivette, or Viv as we know her, remembers being invited to dinner by a teacher friend back in 1976 and being told, 'By the way, there will be a scholarly friend of my husband there as well.' This is where Viv and George met and, as they say, the rest is history. They were married by Reverend Walter Stafford on 18 December 1976 in the then Gartrell Memorial Methodist Church in Rose Park.

When Viv first met George, he was tenured as a lecturer at Adelaide Teachers College, lecturing in the sociology of education and history. He had studied at Adelaide University. George continued lecturing at Adelaide Teachers College and tutored at Adelaide University. During that time, his contract at Adelaide Teachers College had finished and there was no more funding to keep him on; however, the students and staff wanted him and somehow he gained an extra year there. He studied law at night while juggling working, law lectures and tutorials.

After that year, George went back teaching at a school in Elizabeth and then Gilles Plains High School. During this time, Viv and George's first daughter, Katrina, was born in 1981. George gained his law degree in 1984. He could have done his honours in law but chose to work for his family. He wanted a new start as a lawyer. Their second daughter, Suzanne, was born in 1984.

George's first legal job was in motor vehicle accidents. About a year later, he got the job as a lawyer for Business and Consumer Affairs. Because of his role, he was chosen as the South Australian delegate for uniform credit legislation. He travelled around Australia for meetings trying to get consensus on how to reform credit laws. In this role, he had an opportunity to make laws for the better. He improved the prepaid funeral laws. He made selling land safer by making sure that there was disclosure of anything potentially harmful.

In 1993, George and Viv moved to Tranmere. A few years later, he gained the job of principal regulation and access officer at the Office of the Technical Regulator for the state government of South Australia. This was in energy markets and programs. He loved his job, and he met many interesting people, experts in their field, such as in the electrical, plumbing and fire areas.

Twice the family suffered from major health setbacks. In 1996, Viv became very ill and George looked after her, ensuring that all her care needs were taken care of. In 2003, the family was again challenged when his daughter Katrina developed stage 4 cancer, but George once again did everything in his power to save his daughter and eventually she got through the disease. Several years on, in July 2016 George was offered a package and he retired at the age of 68. This allowed him to further indulge his passion for community service.

George, Viv and the family were heavily involved in their local Pilgrim Lutheran Church, just up the road from where they lived. George loved helping people. He was treasurer for Athelstone Kindergarten and then parent representative at Athelstone Primary School, Magill Primary School and Norwood Morialta High School while the children were at school. Of course, without saying so, he was a member of the Liberal Party for many years.

For a good deal of his life he loved dealing with politics and helping out and was elected to a number of committees. He read widely and had a bird's-eye view of the world. He was on the Lutheran Constitution Committee of the South Australian District for several years and he wrote the constitution for the Gums Land Care Group and was also their secretary.

During his life, he travelled about 20 times to Germany to be with his mother and later to look after her. On one of his trips to Hamburg with Viv, he met up with Daryl Maddern, who was his

commonwealth counterpart for uniform credit legislation, and he invited George to catch the train from Hamburg to Paris to sit in on an OECD meeting.

Possibly the greatest joy for him and the whole family was when little William was born on 18 August 2020 to Katrina and Michael. George was a proud Opa. George loved his last Christmas and said it was the most joyous Christmas with Michael and baby William. Vivette thanks God for the blessing of having been married to George for 44 years. May he rest in peace.

LENNON, MR B.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:43): I rise today to reflect on the life of a local Salisbury legend Brian 'Mick' Lennon. Mick passed away on Sunday 18 April 2021 and will be missed incredibly deeply by so many in our community. Occasionally in life we come across people who are larger than life and full of joy and full of enthusiasm and Mick was one of those people. His sense of community was so strong and he dedicated his life to the betterment of others.

Perhaps he is best known as the twice past president of the Salisbury RSL. Mick was dedicated to sharing the history of our service men and women with future generations. Mick proactively engaged with primary and secondary schools across northern Adelaide, taking out volunteers to run presentations about Australian veterans' history and sharing his enormous collection of memorabilia with the younger generation.

In collaboration with schools, Mick would attend excursions with high school students to the city taking them on tours of war memorial sites to explain their significance. Persuasion was Mick's second name, and he charmed and cajoled any and every political leader he came across regardless of party to gain support for his projects.

He was a member of the National Servicemen's Association of Australia (Para Districts). He believed that collaboration was the best strength we had, and he invited that group and the local branch of the Royal Australian Air Force Association to join the RSL ranks to bring shared financial membership and resources to benefit all three organisations.

Mick also liaised with the Salisbury Bowling Club to hold a bowling tournament every year for Veterans' Health Week. He liaised with the City of Salisbury, the private sector and state and federal governments to host one of the largest ANZAC Day dawn services in the state for the commemoration of the centenary of World War I in 2018. More than 10,000 people gathered to watch the dawn service at the Salisbury memorial, which was broadcast on a super screen for the community. The event garnered the City of Salisbury an Australia Day award.

Over the years Mick contributed to several projects at the RSL, including having the western wall painted by local art students and the installation of a statue of an ANZAC, which casts a shadow of a soldier on the building at dawn and dusk. He most recently commissioned a piece of stunning work of art on Park Terrace on the eastern side of the building, which commemorates the sons of Salisbury who lost their lives in service during World War I. The workers made the building a landmark and it garnered much media attention.

In 2014, Mick liaised with the Northern Adelaide State Secondary Schools Alliance to select participants in a study tour to France to commemorate the centenary of World War I. The Western Front study tour allowed 10 young people to do their own research about the 69 soldiers who served from the area of Salisbury. Mick was not just dedicated to veterans affairs, he was president of the Para District branch of the National Service Association and a foundation member, he was a northern area coordinator for Neighbourhood Watch Salisbury for 26 years and a life member of the Lions Club of Salisbury. Mick himself received a City of Salisbury Australia Day award in 1998.

I first met him as a very new candidate for Labor in 2011, but you knew very quickly that Mick would ask you absolutely anything at any time in front of anyone, but actually we developed a deep friendship. I have to say that I was absolutely delighted when Mick gave me the honour of being in an advertisement with him to support my candidature and endorse me as the member for Ramsay.

Mick was born and bred in the Salisbury area, and he never ventured far from that area that was close to his heart. Mick's lovely wife, Jenifer, was a constant support and always by his side, and our thoughts are with her during this difficult time. Mick was a wealth of knowledge, a local

historian and a wonderful storyteller. More than 400 people attended his memorial service and he will clearly be missed. Vale to a Salisbury legend, Mick Lennon.

GIBSON ELECTORATE

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:48): I am pleased to report that in April I officially opened the Brighton Oval sporting complex along with the federal member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, and the Mayor of the City of Holdfast Bay, Amanda Wilson.

As we celebrated the completion of the \$13.7 million project, we were reminded how local public spaces like this bring people together. The official opening was a real community event, with a jumping castle for kids, a barbecue for their parents and sports activities for everyone. There was even a chance to 'meet the machines', with an historical police car, fire engines and garbage trucks on display, and didn't the kids love that.

It was great to see the kids also using the Gladys Mathwin Memorial Playspace, a playground at the heart of this sporting precinct. On top of supporting local sports, this upgrade really does encourage people to live a more active life with a beautiful space to exercise and unwind. It is just perfect for families. This whole project would not have been possible without the help of local champions who worked alongside the state government.

I would like to acknowledge a few of those local champions who are also leaders of the sports clubs who call this venue their home. They include current presidents Jason Webb, Travis Kalleske, Scott Phillips and Kevin Bailie and past presidents Wayne Londema and Kym Steer. Thank you for your contribution to this project. I am thoroughly excited to see this oval used by our local community now and long into the future.

My electorate is home to many creative minds, including the thespians of St Jude's Players. St Jude's is a community theatre group made up of volunteers. Much to the delight of the local audiences, this group runs three full-length productions each year, ranging from comedies to tragedies to musicals.

With COVID-19 restrictions stopping production last year, it was great to see them back in action as I attended their first play for 2021, Alan Ayckbourn's dark comedy *GamePlan*. This was an outstanding performance, wonderfully acted and expertly produced. My wife and I thoroughly enjoyed the evening. It is always nice to get a little bit of time with her, but to be at a local production was even more special.

As I said, this is a community group run by volunteers, and I just want to recognise a few of those volunteers who live in my electorate. They do everything from building the set to managing the lighting, and it is first class. St Jude's committee is chaired by John Thompson, who is a fantastic ambassador for St Jude's and the arts community overall. Other local volunteers on the committee include Mary-Jane Minear, Don Oakley, Maria Davis, Leigh Wheatley and Maxine Bowles. Thank you to each and every one of you for making these plays possible year after year. You really do a fantastic job bringing storytelling, entertainment and joy to so many people in our community.

Mary-Jane Minear, who volunteers as the treasurer and booking officer, continues her family's long association with St Jude's. Her father, Harold Minear, was a successful journalist, advertising executive and writer. While being in love with the theatre, Harold was awarded the Adelaide Critics Circle Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009 for his long service to amateur theatre. He was well known and highly respected and he absolutely loved being involved with St Jude's Players. The St Jude's Players have many more exciting plays scheduled later this year, including Patsy Thomas's play *The Ghost Train*, which runs in July. I encourage everyone to grab a seat and watch the St Jude's Players—you will not regret it.

I rise today to speak about inspiring individuals and strong community groups in my electorate. It is always incredibly encouraging to see our younger community members tackle projects with creativity and drive. Grace Lam of Somerton Park is the embodiment of these character traits.

Grace is a remarkable 19-year-old woman who has started her own business, called Grace's Handmade Cards. I encourage you to have a look at her website. She is a skilled artist who sells a number of beautiful products, from her signature handmade cards to hand-poured candles, tote bags

and etched wine glasses just to name a few. I have one of those etched wine glasses in my cupboard at home.

When Grace left school, she decided to pursue her artistic interests by starting her business, supported by her mum, Monica Kwan. Since then, she has been hugely successful. Last year, she sold 500 candles and donated 10 per cent of the proceeds to Tutti Arts. Grace's interest in making cards with her own designs goes back to 2018, when she helped with a fundraiser for Tutti Arts. Let me just briefly recognise Tutti Arts here as well. As a local organisation, they support the development of artists with a disability. Their positive impact is largely thanks to artistic director, Pat Rix; general manager, Linda Williams; and president, Andrew Downing.

In just a short time, Grace has received widespread recognition for what she does. I am pleased to report that Grace is a finalist in this year's Carclew Creative Achievement Award, which is given to a young South Australian using their creativity to make a positive impact in their field. Winners will be announced at a gala dinner on 21 May. I wish Grace all the best and hope that she knows her local community supports her immensely.

Time expired.

MAIN SOUTH ROAD DUPLICATION

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:53): I rise to talk about something that is a real bugbear for the people in the electorate of Mawson. People around Aldinga, Sellicks and Willunga, further down at Myponga, Yankalilla and Normanville, and right down to Cape Jervis and indeed Kangaroo Island, are particularly upset about this issue.

Back in about June or July 2017, the Labor government announced funding for the duplication of Main South Road between Seaford and Sellicks Beach. This was listed by the RAA as one of the most dangerous roads. In some surveys, it was the most dangerous road in South Australia. We went out with a commitment to spend hundreds of millions of dollars.

In fact, in the first four years, which finishes on 30 June of this year, so just a few weeks away, we should have spent \$100 million on that duplication process. To date, nothing has been spent on it apart from the printing of some brochures, which were incorrect, that were hand delivered to houses all through Willunga, McLaren Vale, McLaren Flat, Aldinga, Sellicks and Port Willunga back in late March.

The government went down there unannounced. Of course, they did not let me know they were coming to the electorate despite the longstanding tradition that ministers do inform local members when they are coming to their electorate. This mob do not. I wrote to the Premier about it in the first year and he said, 'That's wrong, we'll fix it,' and then he comes down there and does not even tell me he is coming. We do not see much of him, but he likes it that way. They sneak in. You do not get to see the Liberals unless you pay money to go to their fundraisers. That is how this mob operates.

No money has been spent. They have realised that the pressure is building as we head towards the election next year, so now they have gone out and in a pretty callous, terrible way, they have pitted the people of Aldinga and Sellicks against the people of McLaren Vale and Willunga with these two options. They have pinched money out of our original project and now they are saying, 'You can go for option A or option B. Which one is it going to be?'

I have to say that the people of our area think that both options that they have served up are extremely below the standard—a long way below the standard—that is acceptable in terms of modern infrastructure builds. They want to put a roundabout at the intersection of Main South Road, Tatachilla Road and Maslin Beach Road, which is at the bottom of a gully. It is a treacherous, most dangerous intersection. We have been down there with Peter Malinauskas and Tom Koutsantonis many times and we have stood there with our hearts in our mouths as we have witnessed near crashes time and time again.

The Liberals were invited along by the Aldinga Bay Residents Association for a forum, so both sides were invited along. Labor was invited along and the Liberals were invited along, including the Liberal candidate for the seat of Mawson. This forum was meant to be at 7 o'clock for a 7.30 start and, at 4.15, the Liberals advised the organisers, the residents' association, that they were not going

to turn up. I was there with our transport spokesperson, the member for West Torrens, and our leader, Peter Malinauskas, and there were no Liberals there.

There were a couple of senior members of the local Liberal Party in the audience, but they were too scared to put their hand up and say who they were. There is no doubt that a message was sent back to the candidate that if you want to represent people you have to turn up, listen to what they want and do not demand they pay \$70 to come along to a Liberal Party fundraiser, which is the only opportunity they get to meet the candidate.

The people are angry. They have been duded by the same political party that gave them the one-way expressway. The Liberals have never done anything for the south. It is the forgotten south whenever the Liberals are in government. We had to get in and fix their stupid one-way expressway. We had to extend the rail line from Noarlunga down to Seaford and electrify it, and we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars at Darlington to improve the flow through to the northern suburbs and the city for people in the south.

The Liberal government have done absolutely nothing except pinch money off projects in the south, and they tried to give us a PFAS dump in our award-winning food and tourism area that is worth \$840 million a year to our local economy and lots of jobs. They wanted to give us PFAS but they will not give us any infrastructure. The people are unhappy, and that is the message to the Premier, the transport minister and all the other Liberals who do not care about the south.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson's time has expired. I further draw the member's attention and take the opportunity to remind all members of standing order 123. The member for King.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:59): Thank you, Mr Speaker, for this opportunity today to speak about veterans and ANZAC Day 2021. Again in the lead-up to ANZAC Day 2021, it became evident that traditional ways in which we have paid our respects in the past were not going to be possible in every location, but they were a step closer.

I wish to thank the organisers of all the events for their tremendous efforts to make decisions on how they could hold their event and keep our community safe. I would like to thank the Returned and Services League of Australia and its respective branches for coming up with different ways that ANZAC Day could be commemorated.

On the Friday before ANZAC Day, it was an honour to be invited to lay a wreath on behalf of our King community at Estia Health Golden Grove, and I thank the manager, Tracey, for organising this memorable service. Thank you for providing all residents with the opportunity to participate and proudly display their medals, their ribbons and the unit citations they had earned. It was very special to see over 70 residents wearing the red poppy, symbolising peace, death and the sleep of the fallen service men and women. Thank you to Reverend Jonathan Button for leading a most beautiful service.

Thank you to the Tea Tree Gully RSL sub-branch, led by Malcolm Fergusson and Wayne Langford, for holding a smaller Saturday night service at the Tea Tree Gully Memorial Garden. It was an honour to lay a gift of ANZAC storybooks on behalf of people in King, and I look forward to local students having the opportunity to read these books. Additionally, we were blessed to listen to *The Last Post* played live on a bugle by local Greenwith resident David Gardiner.

On Sunday morning, I attended the dawn service organised by the One Tree Hill Progress Association. This was also a service with restricted numbers inside the One Tree Hill Institute, and I thank Steve Huckstepp and the committee for organising this commemoration event. The Air Force, Navy and Army were represented as special guests in the proceedings.

The catafalque party gave this service a special feel, and it was touching that local legend Fred Riley was called upon to lay a wreath on behalf of the whole One Tree Hill community. Again, it was an honour to lay a wreath on behalf of everyone living in King. It was wonderful to see that 19 One Tree Hill Scouts were also present, participating in this special commemoration.

After this dawn service, I had the honour of attending and speaking at the Ferns Lifestyle Village commemoration service at Salisbury East. I commend the residents and the committee for

honouring their veterans and holding their traditional ANZAC service outside. The weather was perfect for the service this year, and I thank Joyce for the invitation.

The special service was followed up by generous cooked breakfast, with great company from across the village. It was a real honour to lay a wreath and again donate ANZAC books on behalf of people living in King. I was also grateful to be invited and be able to attend the Pegasus Pony Club commemoration. Sylvia Usher has been holding this ANZAC service and moment for over 35 years now at the club.

I wish to thank the Salisbury RSL sub-branch for holding a special commemoration again this year. I have been told that Graham Reynolds did a great job as MC for the Salisbury RSL sub-branch ANZAC Day dawn service, and I would like to make special mention of the president, Donald Prider; the vice-president, Robert Howard; the treasurer, Jody Goss; and secretary, Michele Howard. Congratulations to all involved at the Salisbury RSL for hosting this commemoration.

Lastly, I also wish to pay my respects to Salisbury community legend Mick Lennon, who recently passed. Mick was an icon of the Salisbury region and a very nice man. I thank him for all he did to serve the community and help others. Mick was a former president of the Salisbury RSL, a strong supporter of the Salisbury Business Association, Salisbury Citizen of the year and a life member of Lions@Salisbury. I crossed paths with Mick in the last few years as he also visited the residents of Estia Health Golden Grove, and arranged morning teas and special guests. I formally pass on my sincerest condolences to Mick's family and friends for their very sad loss. Lest we forget.

Thank you to everyone in the northern community for their efforts and for helping us gather to recognise the sacrifices that have been made for us so that we can live in peace today. Lest we forget.

WATERVALE BOWLING CLUB

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:04): Today, I would like to talk about the opening of the new greens at the Watervale Bowling Club recently.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: A very good club, isn't it? Yes. For many years, this club's greens had the reputation of being the heaviest or the slowest in the Mid North. They certainly were not the favourite greens to bowl on for many clubs and were never suitable for regional or state events. Very few finals were played at Watervale, which meant that the club missed out on very valuable fundraising and income for the club itself.

The committee knew that something had to be done about that, therefore they looked at the opportunity of applying for a grant for an artificial surface. However, this was in the vicinity of \$160,000 which, even with a successful grant, would have been well and truly out of the club's reach. The club then investigated other opportunities which resulted in the club utilising Tifdwarf grass which was better suited than the existing Santa Ana turf that they already had. They applied for a grant and were successful in getting \$25,000 from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. They were also successful in achieving a grant of \$4,500 from the Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council. The whole project cost about \$33,000. The rest of the money came from the club itself.

That was the very easy part. The club had to remove the existing turf in squares of approximately 300 millimetres by 300 millimetres, which worked out to be about 10,000 squares which had to be lifted up. This was carried out over three different Sundays with a lot of sore bodies after the final square had been removed. Clippings from the Torrensville Bowling Club on South Road were laid by club members working with the contractor to sow the new greens.

Once the clippings were put out, the growing process began. However, the hot weather arrived over the next three to four days with the temperature in the high 30s to low 40s. The committee members tried to keep the moisture up. No matter how much they tried, they just could not keep the moisture up, but they persevered. At the end of the hot weather, there were high winds that ripped up the grow mat and spread it around most of the rink which required the group themselves to try to peg it back down, but the winds kept picking it up. To overcome this, the members found themselves numerous bricks and pavers to help hold the net down. This is not the best way to start a new green.

For that season, there was no bowls at Watervale. However, they thought that the 2020-21 season would be okay to play, but the greens had not progressed as quickly as they had hoped. Basically, there were no games played at Watervale for that whole season. Since that first game in early February this year, there has been a tremendous improvement in how the greens are rolling.

With the right maintenance program over the winter months and through the early spring, these greens at Watervale will be in fantastic condition for the 2021-22 season. There is no doubt that all club members will be looking forward to a full season at home. However, after all these traumatic incidents, the greens have turned out to be a very good surface for bowls to be played on. The opening of the greens and the season were a great success, with the exception of the first bowl I had to put down. The first one went a bit too far down; the green was just a bit too fast.

An honourable member: Blame the green!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I blame the green. The second one was perfect, just about right on, but you could only count the first one. However, what has happened so far just goes to show the dedication, value and persistence of volunteers. From what started out as an original discussion, establishing a new green facility sounded easy. It sounded easy when it first involved the laying of the clippings with the mat. However, Mother Nature in this case intervened and, as mentioned earlier, despite the challenges, these volunteers and members have my greatest admiration for the dedication, persistence and loyalty they had for their club at Watervale.

The Watervale Bowling Club, like other clubs in my electorate, could not survive without its sponsors, of which I am one, and their volunteers and community assistance. One of the things I will miss with the redistribution is the camaraderie and being able to visit clubs like the bowling clubs across the current electorate of Frome. Again, I congratulate everybody. I cannot say thanks enough for the volunteers out there who assist in getting these clubs to where they are today.

YORKETOWN HOSPITAL

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (16:09): I rise in joyous celebration today for the electorate of Narungga and the people particularly on the southern part of Yorke Peninsula. It is a joyous celebration about an election commitment promised and an election commitment delivered. One of my enduring memories of the 2018 election campaign was a packed Yorketown Town Hall decrying the removal of surgical services from Yorketown Hospital. There must have been over 600 people in this hall. It was full from floor to ceiling, and all were extraordinarily passionate that they needed their local health services retained.

As I said, it was a full town hall. A petition was launched and available for signing upon entry to the hall, and it was eventually presented to this place carrying almost 2,050 signatures. So it was a tremendous honour recently to attend a small low-key event, which defied the significance of the occasion, to mark the opening of a brand-new surgery procedure room at Yorketown Hospital. It is a tremendous honour to have delivered a brand-new surgery theatre procedure room so that surgery can recommence, and I can report that locals are absolutely overjoyed that a number of lists have already been completed this year.

It cannot be overstated how important it is to keep regional health facilities up to standard and well maintained so that such services can continue. So often, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you would well know, city-based decision-makers do not appropriately appreciate the distances between towns and services. While Yorke Peninsula might look small when they survey it on a map, some 30,000 people live there and it is 230 kilometres long, so when services are removed it means a great deal of travelling for families who have to go hours for alternative solutions.

As I said, this was a major commitment that I fought terribly hard to get in the lead-up to the election, which was to upgrade the theatre with a brand-new decontamination unit and procedure room, upgraded drying cabinets and air conditioning, and compliance upgrades, which now all means more efficient and safer care closer to home for the people of southern Yorke Peninsula.

I can report that, since becoming the member for Narungga, regional health services and the importance of improving and maintaining them have been the number one topic that I have been contacted about, and it is the one that I feel most compelled to make a real difference in for my constituents in the towns and communities in which we live.

Whole populations rely on the delivery of appropriate levels of health services, and regions that cannot provide reliable and adequate health services and hospitals will die, because it is an undisputed fact that the families, retirees, the elderly—all age groups—will not choose to live in an area where they cannot confidently access the health services they need. People will move to where they can see they will receive care when they need it, and with such population shifts come subsequent small business closures, job losses, school closures, loss of services across the board and domino economic and social consequences.

No, rural people do not expect to be able to access all specialities close to home, but they do expect to have a relatively near accident and emergency facility, have a GP to go to and be able to have relatively minor surgical procedures done without the need to travel hundreds of kilometres. As I have said, the local people down on the southern part of Yorke Peninsula are overjoyed that Yorketown Hospital has experienced this upgrade and that the election commitment that we promised leading up to 2018 has been delivered.

However, it is an ongoing battle across the state for rural services, and rural people appear constantly on guard against getting more cuts all the time. Whilst not in Narungga, Balaklava hospital is now facing the same fight as Yorketown did back in 2017, having just lost their theatre and being fed the line that it is because the demand is not there and that it is not being used enough. Because the facility has not been maintained to appropriate standards in order for services to be provided there, it is declared a risk.

It is about closing services by stealth, withdrawing what is on offer and threatening the economic viability of rural doctors and, by extension, service delivery to patients. So it was pleasing to reverse this decision that Transforming Health would have had on Yorketown Hospital. I am thrilled that it has been and to be speaking here today in commendation of all the local people who fought for the restoration, who attended meetings, signed petitions, met with my predecessor Steven Griffiths and me and spurred on the support and noise to reach this outcome.

I would particularly like to pay homage to the Friends of Yorketown Hospital, who do a terrific job fundraising and supporting that hospital and the people who work in it. It is a win for the people and, whilst the wait has been long, it has been worth it. Inroads into the huge backlog of maintenance in country hospitals are being made, and I applaud these efforts. I will now continue to advocate for a new accident and emergency space at Yorketown, which is struggling to function in the space that currently exists. Thankfully, restoration of procedures like colonoscopies being available at Yorketown is now off the to-do list and has been met warmly by local residents.

Bills

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (ELECTRICITY SUPPLY EMERGENCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(16:16): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(16:17): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The national energy market is transforming. With this transformation, it is essential that last resort powers exist to ensure a timely and efficient response to an electricity supply emergency.

Currently the powers to manage an electricity supply emergency straddle two legislative instruments, the Emergency Management Act 2004 and the Essential Services Act 1981.

A more efficient and timely process for declaring an electricity supply emergency is contained in the Emergency Management Act. Electricity supply emergencies can be sudden and can rapidly evolve. The Emergency Management Act is therefore the preferable Act for last resort powers to manage an electricity supply emergency.

The Emergency Management (Electricity Supply Emergencies) Amendment Bill 2021 provides a timely and efficient framework to ensure that, in times of electricity supply emergency, the minister responsible for energy has appropriate powers of direction to protect the needs of the South Australian community.

Unlike the Essential Services Act, which allows directions to be given to a specified person, class of person or members of the public generally in a period of emergency, under the Emergency Management Act there is currently a limited list of market participants that can be directed in an electricity supply emergency.

The Bill refers to the parties that can be directed as designated persons. This replaces the previously used term, market participant, to overcome stakeholder confusion. The market participant term has a defined meaning in the National Electricity Rules which differs from the definition and use of this term under the Emergency Management Act.

The transformation of the national energy market has resulted in the introduction of new roles and responsibilities associated with the supply and use of electricity. An important feature of the Bill is that it provides for an expanded list of persons the minister can direct under the Act in an electricity supply emergency so as to capture all persons associated with the national energy market.

To ensure persons in traditional national energy market roles are directable, the Bill prescribes a person who engages in the transmission or distribution of electricity and an end user as designated persons. The Bill also adds a metering coordinator and third party service provider to the list of designated persons that can be directed in an electricity supply emergency.

During the introduction of competition in metering, the new role of metering coordinator evolved and was defined in the national energy frameworks. The metering coordinator has overall responsibility for metering services at a customer's connection point.

The role of a third party energy service provider is a new and evolving role. As technology becomes smarter, third party energy service providers are helping consumers to make use of smart controls to manage when their devices use electricity and reduce consumer costs. Customers are increasingly trusting these providers to remotely control their devices to maximise value and return from the customers investment in this technology.

In some circumstances, part of the activities conducted by a business will cause it to come within the designated person definition. The intention of the framework is that the minister can direct a designated person in relation to the activities which cause the person to come within the designated person definition.

During an electricity supply emergency, the minister may need to issue a direction to a class of designated persons to ensure a timely response to the emergency. The Bill clarifies that a direction to a class of designated persons may be made by the Minister and the process for notifying such a direction.

The Bill seeks to clarify the nature of directions that can be made by the minister. To ensure the efficient coordination of emergency response, the Bill makes clear that the minister can direct a designated person to direct another person it has lawful authority to direct. A designated person may also choose to fulfil a direction by directing another person it has lawful authority to direct.

The emergency framework includes provisions to mitigate the potential of conflicting directions to a person. Directions to designated persons must be limited to directions the minister thinks are reasonably necessary to respond to the electricity supply emergency, the minister is required to consult prior to issuing directions (to the extent that it is reasonably practicable in the circumstances) and the minister is required to take reasonable steps to avoid unduly interfering with the operation of the national electricity market, National Electricity Law and National Electricity Rules.

There is an urgent need to enact these powers. During the first waves of COVID-19 internationally it was identified that restrictions associated with managing the pandemic can significantly reduce demand on the power system. World-leading modelling by the Australian Energy Market Operator exposed that under extreme conditions low demand conditions pose a risk to the security of electricity supply.

Temporary powers, due to expire on 31 May 2021, were enacted in the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020 to provide appropriate last resort powers to manage this risk. The Bill contemplates the passage of the amendments to the Emergency Management Act prior to the expiry of the temporary powers, expiring the relevant provisions if they are not previously expired.

The Bill represents essential last resort powers for a modern energy system which is balancing bulk and distributed clean electricity supplies with consumer's electricity needs. Timely last resort emergency powers will assist mitigate disruption of electricity supply to customers in an electricity supply emergency.

I commend this Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Emergency Management Act 2004*

3—Amendment of section 27A—Interpretation

Certain definitions are inserted for the purposes of the measure. The definition of *market participant* is deleted and a definition of *designated person* is inserted instead for the purposes of the measure.

4—Amendment of section 27C—Minister's power to give directions

The amendment to section 27(1) is partly consequential and partly to clarify that directions may be given to a class of designated persons (not just particular designated persons).

Section 27(2)(b) is substituted so that it provides that the Minister is authorised to give directions that require a designated person to give any directions of a kind that the designated person may lawfully give (which may include, for example, requiring a designated person to give directions to, or to exercise authority over, another person or body, whether or not that other person or body is also a designated person).

A subsection (2a) is inserted to specify certain requirements that may be contained in a direction to a market participant.

A subsection (2b) is inserted to clarify certain matters relating to the Minister's power to give directions for the avoidance of doubt.

Substituted subsection (4) clarifies that consultation on a proposed direction only relates to directions proposed to be given to particular designated persons (and not classes of designated persons).

A capacity to exempt persons from a direction given to a class of designated persons is inserted.

5—Amendment of section 27E—Obligation to preserve confidentiality

This amendment is consequential.

6—Amendment of section 27F—Manner of giving directions or requirements

Proposed subsection (1) provides that a direction under section 27C relating to a class of designated persons must be given by notice published on a website determined by the Minister.

The other amendment is consequential.

Schedule 1—Expiry of provisions of *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020*

Schedule 1 provides that certain provisions of the *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020* expire on the commencement of Part 2 of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

UNCLAIMED MONEY BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:18): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to make provision for the publication of information about, and the repayment of, unclaimed money, to provide for the payment of unclaimed money into the Consolidated Account, to make related amendments to various acts, to repeal the Unclaimed Moneys Act 1891 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker, I rise to introduce the Unclaimed Money Bill 2021.

This bill repeals and replaces the Unclaimed Moneys Act 1891. It modernises and simplifies administration of unclaimed money in South Australia, as agreed to as part of the Commonwealth Project Agreement for Small Business Regulatory Reform, with additional reforms proposed by the Department of Treasury and Finance.

As part of the Commonwealth Project Agreement for Small Business Regulatory Reform, the government committed to a number of measures aimed at collectively reducing the regulatory burden of complying with the act on small business. The commonwealth has agreed to provide an estimated financial contribution to South Australia of \$0.6m upon successful delivery of the agreed measures.

The bill also proposes additional measures identified by the Department of Treasury and Finance as measures to improve the administration of unclaimed money.

The first measure committed to an increase in the threshold of unclaimed money that can be lodged by business with the Department of Treasury and Finance. Currently business must lodge unclaimed money greater than ten dollars with the Department of Treasury and Finance. This threshold will increase from 10 dollars to 50 dollars, enabling business to adopt a pragmatic approach to the management of multiple low value amounts of unclaimed money.

The second and third measures committed to are the removal of the requirement for business to advertise unclaimed money in the South Australian government *Gazette* prior to having to lodge it with the Department of Treasury and Finance, and no longer having to hold the money for nine years, prior to transferring it to the Department of Treasury and Finance.

Currently, after holding unclaimed money for a period of seven years, a business is required to publish a register of unclaimed money in the South Australian government *Gazette*, during the January of the seventh year of having held the money. Business must continue to advertise their unclaimed money register in the gazette for an additional two years, and after having held the money for nine years in total, may then transfer the money to the Department of Treasury and Finance. There is a cost borne by business for advertising in the *Gazette*, which is levied per name in the register.

Under the proposed bill, business will now be able to provide unclaimed money directly to the Department of Treasury and Finance, after having held the money for seven years without needing to advertise in the government *Gazette*. Once the unclaimed money has been transferred to the department, the information provided will be made available on the Department of Treasury and Finance unclaimed money database.

The bill also proposes to provide business with the option to publish the unclaimed money it holds on its own website or in the Department of Treasury and Finance unclaimed money database, including the records of amounts not yet eligible for transfer to the Department of Treasury and Finance. This change will provide business with an additional avenue to locate claimants in addition to providing claimants with centralised searching capacity.

The database is freely available on the Department of Treasury and Finance website for members of the public to access and there will be no cost to business for lodging money with the department.

The bill introduces a 25-year cap on the ability to make a claim for unclaimed money, with a five-year transition period upon commencement of the act. Whilst currently there is no time limit on claims, there are a large number of low value unclaimed money amounts held by the department which date back to 1946. Reducing the number of entries in the unclaimed money database will assist in simplifying administration through optimising the performance of the unclaimed money database.

Further, in line with the new fifty-dollar lodgement threshold for business, the bill also includes a 50 dollar minimum claim limit. Again, a five year transition period will be provided for any existing claims less than fifty dollars. Given that it is currently estimated to cost more in administrative costs to process claims which are fifty dollars or less in value, than the actual value of the claim, this change will likely to also reduce administrative costs.

Other minor changes include the removal of the requirement for the public to pay a fee of twenty cents to access a business' register of unclaimed money. Penalties to be imposed where business fail to keep a register have been standardised with other legislation and there is now also a provision for the treasurer to delegate his/her power under the act.

As a matter of house-keeping, the bill adopts terminology consistent with contemporary business practice, with the language of the act having been modernised.

In preparation of this bill, the Department of Treasury and Finance has consulted with both business and the public.

Upon passing of the bill, the Department of Treasury and Finance will commence a review of its unclaimed money database to provide an improved user experience for both business and claimants.

I seek opposition support for this bill which will seek to improve the administration of unclaimed money in South Australia for businesses, claimants and the government.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause sets out definitions required for the purposes of the measure.

Unclaimed money is defined to mean any sum of money (including, but not limited to, principal, interest, dividends, bonuses and profits) that—

- has come into the possession of a corporation by virtue of a transaction with the owner of the money occurring in South Australia; and
- has been held by the corporation for at least 5 years; and
- in respect of which there has been no claim by the owner against the corporation.

4—Register of unclaimed money

This clause requires corporations to maintain a register of unclaimed money. A register is to be in a form determined by the Treasurer and made available on the corporation's website or on a website approved by the Minister. The public must have access to the website free of charge. A corporation must, by 31 January each year, enter into the register the particulars determined by the Treasurer relating to unclaimed money exceeding the prescribed amount held by the corporation as at 1 January in that year.

The following corporations are not required to maintain a register:

- a corporation established on a non-profit basis;
- an ADI;
- a superannuation provider within the meaning of the Superannuation (Unclaimed Money and Lost Members) Act 1999 of the Commonwealth;
- a corporation of a prescribed kind.

5—Unclaimed money to be paid to Treasurer

Under this clause, unclaimed money that has not been paid by a corporation to the owner of the money before the second anniversary of the day on which notice of the unclaimed money first appeared on a register of unclaimed money must be paid by the corporation to the Treasurer within 4 months after that anniversary. Any such money paid to the Treasurer is to be credited to the consolidated account.

6—Other money may be paid to Treasurer

A person in possession of money of an amount not less than the prescribed amount may, if the person has been in possession of the money for more than one year, and if the owner of the money can't be found, pay the money to the Treasurer. Money paid to the Treasurer under this clause is to be credited to the Consolidated Account.

7—Treasurer may pay money to lawful claimant

This clause sets out the procedure by which the Treasurer may pay money that has been paid to the Treasurer under the Act to a person who claims to be the owner of the money.

8—Treasurer's power to require information

Under this clause, the Treasurer may, at any time, examine accounts of a corporation relating to unclaimed money referred to in the corporation's register of unclaimed money. The Treasurer may require a person to provide information and also require that the information be verified by the person by statutory declaration.

9—Exemptions

This clause authorises the Treasurer to exempt a specified person, or class of persons, from the application of the Act or particular provisions of the Act. An exemption may be absolute or subject to conditions.

10—Delegation

This clause authorises the Treasurer to delegate a power or function under the Act—

- to a particular person or body; or
- to the person for the time being holding or acting in a particular office or position.

11—Continuing offence

This clause provides for the imposition of additional penalties where a person is convicted of an offence against a provision of the Act in respect of an act or omission that is continuing.

12—Regulations

This clause authorises the making of regulations that are necessary or expedient for the purposes of the measure.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and repeal Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Correctional Services Act 1982

2—Amendment of section 31—Prisoner allowances and other money

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 3—Amendment of Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007

3—Amendment of section 20—Disposal of vehicles

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 4—Amendment of Emergency Services Funding Act 1998

4—Amendment of section 20—Sale of land for non-payment of levy

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 5—Amendment of Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017

5—Amendment of section 42—Power to dispose of uncollected seized vehicles

The amendments made by this clause are consequential.

Part 6—Amendment of Ground Water (Qualco-Sunlands) Control Act 2000

6—Amendment of section 59—Sale of land for non-payment

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 7—Amendment of Irrigation Act 2009

7—Amendment of section 52—Sale of land for non-payment of charges

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 8—Amendment of Landscape South Australia Act 2019

8—Amendment of section 86—Sale of land for non-payment of a levy

9—Amendment of section 158—Effect of cancellation of water management authorisations

The amendments made by these clauses are consequential.

Part 9—Amendment of *Local Government Act 1999*

10—Amendment of section 184—Sale of land for non-payment of rates

11—Amendment of Schedule 1B—Building upgrade agreements

The amendments made by these clauses are consequential.

Part 10—Amendment of Native Vegetation Act 1991

12—Amendment of section 33I—Sale of land for non-payment

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 11—Amendment of Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 2009

13—Amendment of section 54—Sale of land for non-payment of charges

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 12—Amendment of South Australian Water Corporation Act 1994

14—Amendment of section 18D—Power to sell land

The amendment made by this clause is consequential.

Part 13—Repeal of Unclaimed Moneys Act 1891

15—Repeal of Act

This clause repeals the *Unclaimed Moneys Act 1891*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

OATHS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:19): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Oaths Act 1936 and to repeal the Evidence (Affidavits) Act 1928. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill amend the *Oaths Act 1936* to permanently expand the category of persons who can take statutory declarations, to further consolidate the laws governing who can take affidavits and to provide for a Code of Practice to be followed by declarants, deponents and witnesses when making and taking both statutory declarations and affidavits.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the *COVID-19 Emergency Response (Section 16) Regulations 2020* were made under the *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020* to expand the category of persons who can take statutory declarations. This was expanded to include those persons who can witness Advance Care Directives made pursuant to the *Advance Care Directives Act 2013*, which in turn were based on the persons authorised under the Commonwealth *Statutory Declarations Act 1959*.

This expansion was due to concerns about limited availability of Justices of the Peace during the pandemic and to bring South Australian into line with the majority of other jurisdictions, in which the range of authorised persons was already broader. The temporary expansion has been welcomed and there is benefit to the community in making the expansion permanent.

Mr Speaker, the Bill amendments will have the effect of:

- increasing the ease with which South Australians can make statutory declarations;
- clarifying and simplifying the law relating to the making of statutory declarations and affidavits; and
- safeguarding the integrity of the process.

In this way the Bill will contribute to a key priority of the Government's Justice Agenda in 'Keeping the Law and Our Policies Current and Relevant'.

The proposed expanded list includes persons licensed or registered to practise in particular professions, members of particular professional bodies, employees of particular government organisations and persons with five or more years of continual service in specified employment. It can be expected that each of these persons will have attained a sufficient level of education to enable them to properly understand and execute the task to be undertaken and will likely be persons of good character who can be entrusted with that task.

Aligning the list of who can take statutory declarations with that under the Commonwealth Statutory Declarations Act (as currently pursuant to the Section 16 Regulations) would remove any confusion there may be amongst South Australians as to who may take State statutory declarations, wherein currently declarations made pursuant to State legislation must be declared before one group of persons, while declarations made pursuant to Commonwealth legislation must be declared before another.

In addition to permanently expanding the class of persons authorised to take statutory declarations, the Bill will remove the requirement that a police officer be proclaimed pursuant to s 33 of the Oaths Act in order to witness affidavits or statutory declarations.

This change arose from a submission from the Deputy Commissioner of Police, who argued that the requirement for police officers to be proclaimed under the Oaths Act before being able to take affidavits and statutory declarations is unnecessarily onerous and also gives rise to concerns about inadvertent publication of the names of police working in covert or surveillance areas.

The Deputy Commissioner argued that there ought to be an automatic method of approval, concurrent with SAPOL ensuring that officers complete the appropriate training.

The Bill will allow all police officers, other than probationary constables, to take statutory declarations or affidavits. It is intended that this change be accompanied by a requirement making confirmation of appointment as a police officer dependent upon satisfactory completion of the course relating to the taking of affidavits, or by prohibiting, through SAPOL General Orders, the taking of affidavits without having first completed the course. This will have

benefits for everyday policing, as often it will be preferable for witness statements in the form of affidavits to be taken contemporaneously by police when attending the scene of a crime. In some cases, if a statement is not taken from a victim at the initial police attendance, it may be very difficult to obtain later and will jeopardise the prosecution (for example, in the case of many instances of offences of domestic violence).

Consequent on the permanent expansion of the class of persons authorised to stake statutory declarations, the Bill would insert an immunity provision in the Oaths Act, equivalent to section 15 of the *Justices of the Peace Act 2005*, which provides that a person authorised to take statutory declarations 'incurs no civil or criminal liability for an honest act or omission in carrying out or purportedly carrying out functions under the Act'.

Most of the expanded categories of persons authorised to take statutory declarations, namely those listed currently in the 'Section 16 Regulations' under the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act, are to be included in regulations rather than in the Oaths Act itself. This is to more easily accommodate changes to the names of professional bodies and to the equivalent Commonwealth list of authorised persons, to which the expanded list is intended to conform.

It is proposed that registered conveyancers be included as a separate category in the Act to those persons listed in the regulations. Registered conveyancers are permitted to take statutory declarations in Western Australia, Victoria, Queensland and the Northern Territory. They are also currently permitted to take some statutory declarations under the South Australian *Real Property Act 1898*. As with the other core authorised persons to be included in Schedule 1 clause 1 of the Act, conveyancers will be required to take statutory declarations in the ordinary course of their employment, therefore it is appropriate that they be listed in the Act rather than the regulations.

Currently, no one Act prescribes who may take an affidavit in South Australia. Rather, the relevant provisions are contained in: the Oaths Act, the *Evidence (Affidavits) Act 1928* and the *Notaries Public Act 1996*. The Bill would consolidate the list of persons authorised to take affidavits into the Oaths Act and consequently repeal the Evidence (Affidavits) Act.

Mr Speaker, the Bill provides for offences of falsely holding oneself out as an authorised witness, and witnessing a statutory declaration or affidavit if not authorised to do so, as contained in the equivalent legislation in a number of jurisdictions, including Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia.

To safeguard the integrity of the processes for making and taking statutory declarations and affidavits, the Bill provides for a Code of Practice to be gazetted under the Act, intended as a step by step 'how-to' guide to making and taking affidavits and statutory declarations. The Code is intended to be based on relevant parts of the existing Justice of the Peace Handbook. The need for clear guidance as to the procedure to follow is all the greater if a more expansive list of authorised witnesses is to be adopted.

As in Western Australia, Victoria and the Northern Territory, the Bill inserts a 'saving' provisions to ensure that an oath, affirmation, statutory declaration or affidavit is not invalid merely because of an inadvertent and minor non-compliance with a requirement imposed under this Act that does not materially affect the nature of the oath, affirmation, statutory declaration or affidavit.

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

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Oaths Act 1936*

4—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title to ensure that provision is made for affidavits.

5—Substitution of section 25

This clause substitutes section 25.

25—Taking statutory declarations

Proposed section 25 sets out the manner in which a declaration may be made and provides for the persons before whom a declaration may be made.

6—Amendment of section 27—False declaration

This clause makes a related amendment to ensure there is a reference to the requirements of section 25 (as inserted by clause 5).

7—Substitution of heading to Part 4

This clause substitutes the Part 4 heading.

8—Insertion of section 27A

This clause inserts proposed section 27A.

27A—Taking affidavits

Proposed section 27A sets out the requirements that must be complied with when taking an affidavit and provides for the persons authorised to take affidavits.

9—Amendment of section 28—Commissioners for taking affidavits etc

This clause amends section 28 to substitute a reference to a Commissioner with a reference to a person specified in Schedule 1 clause 2.

10—Substitution of section 30

This clause substitutes section 30 of the principal Act.

30—False statement by affidavit

This clause creates an offence of intentionally making a false statement in an affidavit.

11—Substitution of Part 5

This clause substitutes Part 5 of the Act.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

32—Minor non-compliance does not affect validity

This clause provides that an oath, affirmation, statutory declaration or affidavit is not invalid merely because of an inadvertent and minor non-compliance with a requirement imposed under this Act that does not materially affect the nature of the oath, affirmation, statutory declaration or affidavit (as the case requires).

33—Codes of practice

This clause provides for a code of practice in relation to statutory declarations and a code of practice in relation to affidavits.

34—Requirements of other Acts taken to be complied with

This clause provides that if another Act requires that a declaration must be made before a specified class of person or authority or an instrument must be signed or executed in the presence of, or attested by, a specified class of person or authority, the requirement will be taken to have been complied with if the declaration is made before, or the instrument is signed or executed in the presence of or attested by (as the case requires), a person specified in Schedule 1 clause 1.

35—Offence of taking affidavit, affirmation or declaration without authority

This clause creates an offence for knowingly taking an affidavit, affirmation or declaration without being authorised to do so.

It also provides that a person who is not authorised to take an affidavit, affirmation or declaration must not represent that the person is authorised to do so.

36—Immunity

Proposed section 36 provides that a person authorised under Schedule 1 incurs no civil or criminal liability for an honest act or omission in carrying out or purportedly carrying out functions under this Act.

37—Regulations

This clause facilitates the making of regulations by the Governor.

Schedule 1—Authorisation of persons

Schedule 1 clause 1 sets out the persons before whom a statutory declaration may be made for the purposes of proposed section 25(2).

Schedule 1 clause 2 sets out the persons authorised to take an affidavit for the purposes of section 27A(3).

Schedule 1—Repeal of *Evidence (Affidavits) Act 1928*

1—Repeal of *Evidence (Affidavits) Act 1928*

This clause repeals the *Evidence (Affidavits) Act 1928*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE (EXPIRY) (NO 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May 2021.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (16:22): I rise to speak in relation to the COVID-19 Emergency Response (Expiry) (No. 2) Amendment Bill 2021. I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. This bill seeks again to extend the temporary emergency powers, particularly those in relation to directions given by the State Coordinator, until 17 December. This is yet another extension piece of legislation that we have before us. It is a very brief piece of legislation, fitting neatly onto one page, essentially to extend the date of the COVID legislation expiry until 17 September.

This COVID legislation covers a variety of different areas, but one of the most significant parts is that it provides additional clarity and perhaps extension of powers in relation to the powers of the State Coordinator in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure that the powers of directions of the State Coordinator, who is police commissioner Grant Stevens, can be applied to people generally across the state.

This has obviously been a critical part in making sure that the police commissioner, in providing his role as essentially running the state's response to COVID-19, has the ability to do things such as close borders, stop gatherings, close businesses, introduce QR codes and the like, which, prior to the start of 2020 we would never have thought necessary or relevant, but we are in different times when these powers are required.

The government have obviously used the Emergency Management Act since the beginning of the pandemic in terms of how they have structured the response to COVID-19. In fact, I believe the State Coordinator himself issued the first declaration of a major emergency under that act and started the process. At each stage since then, the government have issued a 28-day extension of that major emergency, giving police commissioner Grant Stevens extraordinary powers under that act to have power over managing the emergency.

From the outset—and I have said it before—certainly we on the opposition side have had the utmost respect for police commissioner Grant Stevens, who has been very ably advised through this process also by the Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier. They have both given us as a state exceptional service in terms of managing this pandemic. It has been a big burden upon them.

I am sure they did not envisage that they would have such power placed in their hands, power that many people would imagine would usually be held by elected officials, but in this situation those unelected officials have done an extraordinary job in keeping South Australia safe and they certainly have bipartisan support from us on this side and I believe the confidence of the whole state in the way they have exercised their duty.

We are now faced with another extension of this process being in place. I think that it is fair to say that it has been an increasing additional pressure on the role of the police commissioner in having to provide that role for the past 13 months or more. There have been discussions over the past four or five months in particular about whether there would be changes to the way that this should be put in place. This was obviously put in place in a hurry.

There was a declaration made. That was followed up by legislation in this house that very rapidly passed the parliament with bipartisan support to ensure that those powers were in place, but we are now a significant amount of time down the track and we are seeing another extension of time. The government at various points have said that they are interested and in fact keen to change the arrangements that would be in place for the management of this pandemic, but we have not yet seen any results of that. We have not seen any proposals brought to the parliament to change those arrangements.

I should also make clear that at each point the opposition have provided bipartisan support for the powers and legislation needed in the management of the pandemic to ensure that our officials, the State Coordinator and the Chief Public Health Officer, have all the powers they need. Some of

those have been passed in rapid time, such as this legislation, which has not gone through the usual process of being laid on the table between sitting weeks and allowing briefings to occur.

We have provided support for the legislative agenda, but this is very clearly not what was being discussed a few months ago when the government was discussing putting in place new arrangements for managing the pandemic. You only have to look back at January when the Premier was quoted as saying that the government had been working on longer term reforms to emergency management since at least November last year—some six months ago. On 4 January this year, he was reported in *InDaily*, and I quote:

As the state enters its tenth month under an emergency declaration—and Marshall enters his final full calendar year before kicking off the re-election campaign—the Premier said authorities were considering how to return the state's emergency decision-making to cabinet government.

'We're looking at that at the moment,' he said. 'We were looking at it very carefully in November—before the Parafield cluster.'

The State Coordinator himself also addressed this issue when he spoke to journalists at a press conference. When he was asked when he may step aside from the role of the State Coordinator, he said, and I quote:

We are providing advice to the government in relation to what those options might be that see the requirement for a major emergency declaration to be revoked. At this point in time this is the only mechanism we have that gives us the ability to require people to participate in QR code activity, to have marshals on board, to have one person per two square metres, all of those things are contingent upon some ability to require people to do that, that's the major emergency declaration.

The government is having a look at how we can replace that with another mechanism that provides the same level of accountability to the community, and until that's developed I'll continue to operate as the State Coordinator.

Additionally he said, quote:

The major declaration is the only mechanism under the Emergency Management Act that allows this to occur. The replacement for this would be a piece, a specific piece of legislation that provides a baseline level of restrictions for community activities and gives us the ability to introduce restrictions for people coming into South Australia so we can manage risk.

When asked whether he would continue as the State Coordinator under such legislation, the State Coordinator responded, and I quote: 'My role as a State Coordinator would cease.' So very clearly we have the State Coordinator, Grant Stevens, saying that there has been work underway since November last year to look at a new process of managing the pandemic, including baseline restrictions that would be put in place and other ways of accountability, ending not only that major emergency declaration but also that ongoing role as a State Coordinator, remembering that in previous uses of the Emergency Management Act I believe a couple of days is the longest that this role had ever been employed, whereas we have now had it in place for more than 13 months.

Clearly something has gone awry because now we are six months down the track since this was apparently first being discussed. We do not have any proposal before the parliament from the Attorney to revoke that or to put in place a new arrangement, to put in place baseline-level restrictions, to put in place, as the Premier was apparently talking about, a cabinet-level, normal government returning. We have in place an extension to this additional power for the State Coordinator to continue to be able to apply directions to the whole state and a continuation of the legislation that is tied to the declaration of the emergency being in place.

So, if that major emergency ends, then the other pieces of this legislation that are in place cease along with it. I think that there are some very legitimate questions for the government in terms of what options were being looked at, what the proposals were that the State Coordinator was putting forward and what has happened. Clearly something has happened, where they have no longer proceeded with that and now we are kicking the can down the road again until September.

Has the government now decided that it no longer wishes to pursue the reforms that the Premier himself was talking about back in January this year and we are going to continue to use the State Coordinator role for the foreseeable future under the Emergency Management Act? I think that is important for the government to explain clearly because this obviously is one of the most important elements not only in terms of our COVID response but also it is an important legal system that we

now have in place here in South Australia, where these declarations that have been made carry the force of law. They are not individually brought to this parliament to be debated but are put in place by the State Coordinator.

I think that we have been very well served by the State Coordinator and the Chief Public Health Officer, but I think that as a parliament we deserve to hear from the government what its intentions are. Is this just going to continue for some time into the future? I think that one thing that has become increasingly clear over the past few weeks is that COVID continues to be a threat across the world. We have seen that in India, we are seeing it in other countries, and at the same time the vaccine rollout continues to be at a glacial snail's pace. It is going to take a very significant time to vaccinate the South Australian population to a level that restrictions can be removed.

If both those things continue, then these additional powers for the State Coordinator and that emergency management declaration are going to need to be in place for a very significant period of time—well past September, I suspect, if both those things are in place. If we continue to vaccinate people at the rate we have been so far, by the end of the year we may well be up to 700,000 or 800,000 vaccinations. That is at the current rate that both the commonwealth and the state program have been going at.

But remember that this is a two-dose vaccine program. If you are aiming, as the Chief Public Health Officer has said, to get to 80 per cent of the adult population with two doses, that is well over two million doses being delivered. If we are only one-third of the way through that by the end of the year, then we have a significant way to go. Hopefully, that does pick up pace. We have been calling for that to pick up pace and hopefully we can get people properly vaccinated by the end of the year.

This is, of course, sitting in the responsibility of the Minister for Health, the Hon. Stephen Wade. Under him is the chief executive, Dr Chris McGowan, and under him is the chair of the vaccination task group in the Department for Health and Wellbeing, Don Frater, who is the deputy chief executive. Those people are responsible for this vaccine rollout in South Australia. I do hope that they can pick up the pace and I do hope that we can get on with that rollout. At the pace it is going now, it is going to be a significant period of time before the population is vaccinated.

On the other hand, we are absolutely seeing COVID taking off across the world. We are obviously seeing a very dangerous second or third wave, depending on how you define it, in India at the moment. It is likely that is going to continue to spread to other countries around the world and it is likely we are going to continue to see more variants coming across the world. If we do not vaccinate the whole world, then the whole world is not protected because there will continue to be variants.

This is going to be with us for some time. We do have the ability now and we have the time in this parliament to properly consider what the management and the legal framework for this are going to be over the next three, six and 12-plus months down the track. If the government's response is, 'We just want to keep everything the way it is at the moment,' that is fine. I think we should just be honest about that and be up-front about that.

Perhaps we need to look at the resources and support around the State Coordinator if that is going to be the long-term case because I think he has made clear on a number of occasions the burden that is being placed on him and his office, given he has a pretty substantial normal role as the police commissioner. Hopefully, through the course of this debate today and through the committee stage we will hear some answers from the Attorney on that.

I think the other factor when you are looking at this legislation, though, is the Liberal party room. Clearly, we have been through a process in the past few months with other legislation we are debating where there have been leaks from the party room, there have been debates within the party room and there have been things pulled from legislation. It was the initial proposal of the Attorney-General that the elements of the State Coordinator's powers here would not be extended to September but would be extended permanently, until she was essentially rolled by the party room.

Members of the party room indicated that they would give their notice that they may object in the parliament to that, and that was abruptly taken out of the legislation. We now have a separate piece of legislation that extends it to September only without a clear indication as to what is going to happen after that or what the government's intention is on any further reforms to the management of the COVID legislation or the COVID management.

Clearly, there is a hot debate within the Liberal Party as to whether there should be a return to cabinet-style government and cabinet-style management of this pandemic. I suspect that is playing into the fact that we do not have the proposals that were being talked about from the Premier since January, proposals that were being talked about and apparently have been talked about since November last year in terms of a new framework that would create a baseline of COVID restrictions in place.

The Attorney also claimed in her second reading speech that there has been considerable consultation on this bill. I look forward to getting a detailed answer from the Attorney during the committee about exactly what has happened in relation to that consultation, what the State Coordinator has requested and what has or has not been agreed to out of what the State Coordinator or SA Health have requested through this process.

There certainly has not been broad public consultation in relation to this. In fact, the first we heard about it in the opposition was on Monday evening during our shadow cabinet meeting. We have not had the usual ability to get properly briefed in regard to this legislation. The usual protocols in relation to legislation being left on the table for between sitting weeks have not been provided in this case.

This has been something that the government has known was coming for some time in relation to this deadline but has been sprung up in the parliament at very short notice. You have to ask why that was the case, why there was not a proper ability for the parliament to consider this in detail in the usual way. We are now a fair way down the track from when clearly there was an emergency reason to spring legislation on very short notice.

We have known that this deadline was coming for some time since the last legislation was passed, but it seems that either through the government's desire to spring it on us at the last minute or the government not having its act together in terms of the drafting of this, or perhaps because of other factors and the government considering other reforms that then did not proceed, either due to their party room issues or because of some other concern in relation to what the permanent arrangements would be, this did not happen.

This came at the last minute and was provided to the opposition on Monday night. This came after a four-week break in the parliament when that could have been provided to the opposition at any time. There could have been consultation during that four-week break and there could have been the opportunity to be properly briefed in all that time. This critical piece of legislation, making sure that these protections for our state and the role of the State Coordinator can continue to have that broad-reaching power, was sprung very late. I think yet again it is a sign of the management of legislation that we see time and again from the Attorney-General.

This does have the support of the opposition through this house. Of course, particularly with such late notice being sprung on us in the last 48 hours, we reserve our right to look in detail at whether there are any amendment proposals considered in the upper house. We have been consistent throughout in giving the government the ability they need—and particularly the State Coordinator and the Chief Public Health Officer because they are the ones who have been managing the pandemic—to manage the pandemic that has had very broad support from South Australia in keeping us safe.

The government owe it to the parliament to outline what their vision is for the management of this going forward because there is going to need to be in place management, directions and restrictions for some time to come because the threat of COVID is still very real.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:42): I thank the member for Kaurna for his contribution and indication of the opposition's support for this bill, which is to extend the COVID emergency response to 17 September 2021 or at the expiration of the 28-day period under a declaration.

The model that has been administered throughout the COVID pandemic period to date has been to establish an emergency by way of declaration under the Emergency Management Act. It has been utilised in the past, but usually for fairly short events. Of course, COVID introduced a new type of emergency, remembering you can have incidents up to catastrophic circumstances in the act and we are using the emergency provisions.

That requires that a management mechanism is established where the declaration is made for not more than 28 days. It is a process that has to be a cabinet decision, obviously endorsed by the Governor, so it is a decision ultimately of Executive Council. It provides in it that during such an emergency the Commissioner of Police is the coordinator. That is the process, and it has served us well to date, and it is one which the government is of the view should continue for another three months.

The three-month period, in relation to periods of legislation to effect this model, had been settled upon the first time we had debates on this matter. At that stage I think we offered a bit longer period but there were some who wanted to make it shorter, and it was settled on to have it at three months. Because I think there was a desire by everyone that there be some fairly close supervision, examination and capacity available for the parliament to have some scrutiny over this process, given we were in uncharted waters as such, that was reasonable, and the parliament determined that. We have offered to extend that time in only three-month bites, so to speak. That is the first thing about this model.

The second is that it has been a circumstance where we have had periods of essentially home quarantine. We have had the workforce at home, we have had schoolchildren stay away from school, we have had shutdowns, even for a period of three days, when there was no movement of the population except in some very explicit circumstances. We have had various directions restricting access to areas of high risk, such as aged-care facilities, and we have had restrictions of movement, of travel and of association in numbers. These have all been designed around recommendations presented to a committee, largely with significant public health advice, on which the Coordinator, under this model, has ultimately made a direction. That is the process.

It has already navigated fairly choppy waters, as I said, in relation to potential outbreaks and indeed potential threats, such as the *Ruby Princess* outbreak last year. We then saw circumstances where our sister states, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, and more latterly Western Australia, experienced some very serious potential spread of or contamination by this condition.

We are still working around how we might best address the management of this COVID circumstance, but I can say that one would have to acknowledge that the situation South Australia sees itself in, within the Australian envelope and then within the global envelope, is a pretty good state of affairs, comparing ourselves with other areas that have been riddled with death and distress. More recently, we have seen via our media outlets the Indian circumstance, but we have seen it in the United States, we have seen it in Britain, we have seen it in Italy, and goodness knows what is happening over in Africa.

We have to accept that something must be working well to think we have been fairly disciplined, the whole population, in maintaining social distancing, keeping cleanliness practices in place and ensuring we keep a record of where we have been so that we can easily trace where there has been a positive identification. This has worked so far.

The question is whether this model is something that ultimately could develop into something else. We have discussed before the utilisation of the Public Health Act, which also has a process in it. We do not need to go through the detail of that; I know the member for Kaurana is familiar with it because he was involved at the time that legislation was developed. The purpose is to ensure that we have certain powers and another model in place to deal with a public health event.

That has been utilised before. We have used it with bird flu, I think we have used it with horse flu and we have used it for other reasons when we have had to have some protection of the public against some health invasion.

Mr Picton: Swine flu.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Swine flu is another one, the member for Kaurana reminds me. I am not sure whether we got that eventually, did we? We certainly had bird flu.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am sure the member is right because he was very familiar with what was happening at the time. Certainly, that was a major problem in China as well. So we have dealt with these. We have not been utilising the Biosecurity Act nationally, which is another piece of legislation which is available in the commonwealth. That, incidentally, has been used during this

COVID pandemic, particularly for the protection of our Aboriginal lands because a number of them are on territories where they needed to have very strict containment of people moving in or out. It was felt in their interests that they have that protection, and that applied for a number of months as well.

Anyway, the question is whether we move to a health model or whether we continue on with the Emergency Management Act. Although it did not seem to neatly fit into an ongoing emergency, it could be applied to that and that is what we have done. Another option was to look at going into a different management model altogether and that might involve the responsibility of any directions or management being by another party, i.e. the Public Health Act, the chief executive of the health department.

Some might say it might be better in a public health circumstance and it should be the head of the public health division. Of course, we have been very well led by the advice we have had on a daily basis, sometimes more often than that in a day, from Professor Nicola Spurrier, who has that role. Other models have been considered.

I want to assure the member for Kaurna and the house that, as a government, we have been very keen to consult with a number of agencies. We have had invaluable advice from health officials, public health officials, the Commissioner of Police, his assistant police commissioners who have had different roles through this period as well in the application of work that they are doing and, in addition to that, the Crown Solicitor's Office to be able to consider what else we might be able to do.

The other thing which is overlapping all this, which most of the members are probably not familiar with, is that while this pandemic has been going on there has also been a number of cases go to the High Court of Australia to challenge the validity of directions issued by other states. That is in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland that I am aware of. There may be others. I think there is still an existing application in WA with Mr Clive Palmer. One of his claims is still extant, as I recall. Others have been dismissed.

In any event, there has been consideration of this matter at the highest level, namely, the High Court of Australia, to consider the validity of directions in particular to be able to restrict people's travel, to be able to stop them going in and out of another state and being able to assemble in restricted numbers essentially. These are the areas that have been under challenge, so we have also had to keep a very clear eye via the excellent advice of our Solicitor-General, Mr Michael Wait, to be very clear about how we provide the supportive structures under this model under the Emergency Management Act.

I just want to assure the house that this is not being simply continued because we think it is the only idea. We have considered others in consultation with these people. Secondly, we are not progressing with this because other ideas are better and for some reason, as the member for Kaurna seems to suspect, they are not being progressed because it has something to do with the Liberal party room.

I think the example that the member for Kaurna used in relation to permanency relates to the permanency bill which is currently before the parliament. It has nothing to do with that bill to do with the extension of the current COVID administration or an alternative model. It has absolutely nothing to do with the question of whether we change to a different model. That is a bill—which I do not think I can actually talk about other than to remind the house—which relates to some permanency aspects in relation to emergency powers, not about changing the model at all. I want to assure the house, even if the member for Kaurna has some conspiracy theory about there being some model that has somehow or other fallen foul of the—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Is the member for West Torrens making a contribution, or is he just—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I am just waiting for you to finish.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you. Notwithstanding the member for Kaurna's conspiracy theory about it, I want to assure the house that other models have been considered and the members have—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Attorney, just take a seat for a moment please. The Attorney is closing debate. I sense that she is drawing it to a close. There will then be the opportunity in committee to ask various questions. The member for Kaurna has a point of order.

Mr PICTON: I take offence at the suggestion that there is some conspiracy theory when it is in fact their own MPs who are telling us what they think of the Attorney's management of this.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know anything about that, member for Kaurna. The Attorney is speaking.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Let me reassure the house that, in relation to the commissioner's powers referred to by the member, that relates to the permanency bill that is in the parliament, which relates to a different aspect, and we will come to in due course in the business of the house. This has nothing to do with the change to a different model of how we get through and navigate the emergency.

I remind members that under the Emergency Management Act there is also a catastrophic role, so we could go to the catastrophic role, where the cabinet then takes over, which might send shivers up the spine of the member for West Torrens. In any event, there is another level of the Emergency Management Act but, after consultation with the parties I have outlined and in particular working closely with the police commissioner, who has to have the ability to make day-to-day decisions on the directions, this is the best one to stick with in the meantime, and that is precisely why we are doing it.

The member did raise the question of resources of the police commissioner and the fact that he has other important duties. Of course he does, and we have had to consider whether he needed, for example, the capacity to have on-the-spot fines. This is a question of the resources he needs to use and having to use his police officers, as authorised officers under this act, to attend to other duties where he thought their time would be better spent.

These are all things we take into account as a government in receiving advice. I want to assure the house that, whilst the police commissioner has significant responsibility in this area, and we appreciate the work that he is doing, he certainly is continuing his role as the Commissioner of Police and we have no reason to be in any way critical of that. To date, the resources and support he has needed to carry out this extra function have been provided, and we have enjoyed the extraordinary support of the people of South Australia to make sure this works. Without that, it would have been very difficult.

We have also had a massive amount of support from the commonwealth level and our local government, which have also worked really hard to try to support our people through this. I point out that that is the position. In relation to consultation, I am happy to answer any other questions in committee.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: I ask the Attorney: why was this very short piece of legislation, when everyone presumably knew something needed to happen, given at such late notice to the opposition and to the parliament? Why were there no briefings provided? Why was this provided at such short notice, when we have just had a four-week break, when there could have been notice, could have been consultation, could have been briefings?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Largely because the police commissioner had indicated that he was thinking about another model. We said we were happy to receive that and consider it. It was not ultimately forthcoming last week, so we went ahead and got this bill ready to make sure that we could extend it and, of course, directions were made by the Governor last Thursday to extend the next 28 days. Yes, we have been indicating and working, as I say, with the police commissioner. As I understand it, he was working on another model that he was thinking about. I spoke to him about it

early last week. I told him that we were happy to receive anything further but that time was pressing on, that parliament was resuming next week and, in the absence of that, we would need to extend.

Mr PICTON: What is the other model that the police commissioner is considering? Have you received it, or when do you believe you will receive that from the police commissioner?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have not received it, so you will need to ask him.

Mr PICTON: You are here representing the government, so I think you can answer the questions, and that is how this process is meant to work.

The CHAIR: Member for Kaurna, you asked the Attorney and she said she had not received it.

Mr PICTON: Yes. I am making a contribution, as I am entitled to under standing orders.

The CHAIR: Excellent. You have the call.

Mr PICTON: What indications have you received from the State Coordinator, the police commissioner, Grant Stevens, in relation to what legislation and system he would like in place to manage the pandemic going forward?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Apart from an indication that he was thinking about another option, which he was not sure would involve him, I have not received it; otherwise, we will proceed with this.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr PICTON: The Attorney gave a very detailed description of how lots of things have been thought about but did not quite land in terms of where the government is actually going. Can I seek clarity from the Attorney? Have all the models that have so far been considered by the government, apart from the continuation of this model, been considered and rejected and is it now a process of considering new models such as those the State Coordinator is soon to provide to you?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: All I can think of is that, apart from utilising the Public Health Act with or without necessary amendment to accommodate it, other models were considered. Not all were formally put before government for consideration. Unless we had an indication that it was something that could work with the health officials and the Coordinator, it did not progress. I hope that assists.

As late as early last week, the police commissioner indicated that he was thinking about whether something else might work. I said that of course I was happy to present to cabinet any proposal, but it was not forthcoming. It was always understood that the position of continuing under the current declaration and process under the Emergency Management Act would be the continuing protection.

Bear in mind, there are two things that we need to have directions for to comply with all the rules; one is the travel restrictions that relate to quarantine obligations, and you need to have powers to do that, and the second is in relation to QR codes. They are the two areas for which we would have had to rewrite completely different laws if we were not going to use this model because there was no capacity for the management of those two things, which the police commissioner considered to be critical to the support and safety of the community as we get through this pandemic.

Mr PICTON: Have there been any proposals that have been previously provided by the State Coordinator to the cabinet that have been rejected?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No.

Mr PICTON: Was there any consultation outside government in relation to this bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not in relation to this bill. There was quite extensive consultation back in March last year when we first started looking at how we would deal with this. In relation to the extension, which is really just to extend the time with the same model, no.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Was the Attorney-General lobbied or asked to change any aspect of this bill by any member of her party room?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr PICTON: Why was 17 September picked as the new end date? Why was an earlier or a later date not chosen?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The advice from the Crown Solicitor was that I think essentially it was to be basically three months but then to fit in with the parliamentary sitting dates. It is not exactly three months.

Mr PICTON: Is it the government's intention, if they are going to consider additional reforms in this area, to undertake public consultation on those reforms not just inside government?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is a bit of a hypothetical. Unless there was something else that came to our attention that suggested that there was a better way to do this, and the Coordinator-General agreed that this would be a better way to manage it, then we would continue this for as long as it might be necessary to deal with those two critical issues, particularly the movement and quarantining of people. The restriction on people in relation to that is quite significant. The utilisation of a QR code, which has been provided for by direction and is supported by a number of undertakings the government have given, such as the deletion of data after 28 days, for example, sits around it—so unless there was some other model that came before us.

Certainly, the ultimate review of the Emergency Management Act process during this pandemic—it is more than an incident now—has to be reviewed by statute, and I have already indicated to the parliament we would be doing that, and that would involve public consultation.

Mr PICTON: This is my last question. I thank the Attorney-General for getting through this. I hope you have a good tea with lemon afterwards. My last question is: I understand there is a process under the COVID bill where there is the ability for various provisions to be switched off from time to time. Can the Attorney update the parliament on which provisions are still in place and which ones have now been, for lack of a better term, switched off?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will start with a number that have gone. I do not have in front of me all those that have gone already, but there has been, for example, the capacity to detain a child—I think I dealt with this last year—and the removal of the capacity of the Treasurer to direct the Auditor-General. All those have gone.

Under this bill, I have indicated that I will also be expiring section 14 as of 31 May, so that is in the next few weeks. Section 14 allows for extension of time limits in terms of appointment. If the member requires any further explanation, he can ask me. The second is the detention provisions for certain protected persons, which relates to people often with an intellectual incapacity. For example, they may have dementia and they may need to be detained just to protect themselves, to not touch other people, that sort of thing.

It also includes the reverse of the presumption of bail for certain offences and the amendments to the Development Act, which, from memory, largely relate to the time for notice to be given in relation to development applications for state development. Then there is the modification process for the Public Works Committee, which is to enable them to continue to meet if we did not have a parliament. It abbreviates some of the considerations. As it turned out, parliament resumed anyway and it has not been such a big issue for the other committees, but that is continuing.

It also includes amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. From memory, there was also a time frame for state development applications under that act, because we had some existing under the old act and now we have them under the new act. Of course, I have also indicated that the protections under commercial tenancies for occupancy already expired in early January and, in light of the transfers back to SACAT for them to be able to deal with financial hardship provisions, they would continue to have those protections until the end of June.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 1 April 2021.)

Clause 12.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, will the new description of persons who are parties to an application for an order, or the variation, extension or revocation of such an order under section 53 contemplate siblings over 18 years who live with the child or children?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: No, it does not actually include siblings. The changes to parties relate only to long-term specified person guardianship orders. An adult sibling would only be a party if they have the long-term guardianship of their sibling.

Ms HILDYARD: In that case, how will the inclusion, or actually exclusion, of a sibling in an order interact with the definition at section 51(1)(a), that is, 'each person under whose guardianship the child or young person is to be placed'?

The CHAIR: You might repeat the question, please, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: I was going to ask: how will the inclusion of a sibling in an order interact with the definition at section 51(1)(a), that is, 'each person under whose guardianship the child or young person is to be placed'? However, given your previous answer, my question is: how will the exclusion of a sibling in an order interact with that definition? Does that make sense?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There is no change to what is included. Currently, if a child is subject to an order they are included, and if they were not subject to the order then they are not included. It is the same as it currently is.

Ms HILDYARD: To whom do you envisage the provision at section 51(2) will apply, that is, the provision that relates to an order made under section 53 potentially binding a person who is not party to the proceedings? What other person, other than a parent or guardian, could possibly be bound?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: An example of where section 51(2) is commonly used is where the court is contemplating making an order for an assessment of a partner's partner who is not a party to the proceedings. In these circumstances, the court will often allow that person to make representations.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could the minister please explain the impact on section 53(1)(h) of the insertion of section 51(1)(b)?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There is no impact on the court's ability to make long-term specified persons orders under section 53(1)(h). This amendment is to better support long-term specified person carers where an application is made to vary or revoke the order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, are all parents or guardians of a child or young person automatically parties to the application for an order under section 53?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The amendments do not alter the role of parents in applications for orders under section 53.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can I ask a supplementary on that?

The CHAIR: We do not really have supplementaries here.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: May I ask for clarification? I did not ask whether or not the role had changed. The question I asked was are they automatically parties to an application under section 53?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Parents or guardians?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you. Minister, can you explain any changes in the extent of powers conferred on the chief executive through this amendment?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: All it does is now allow the CE to be a party to the applications.

Clause passed.

Clause 13.

The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, minister, the opposition has the opportunity to ask questions should they wish.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can you please explain the rationale behind the nomination of an eight-week period specifically as opposed to a seven, nine or ten, etc.? What was the rationale behind the eight-week period?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Under the previous legislation, the initial investigation and assessment order was for a period of six weeks and there was the ability to seek an extension. It was called a 42-day order under the Children's Protection Act. That was removed from this act.

The rationale for bringing that back in and introducing that as an eight-week order in the bill is that there were frequent applications for extensions of the investigation period under the Children's Protection Act, so that is pre 2018. By extending the initial order length by two weeks, it is envisaged that there will be far fewer applications to extend the order.

Ms HILDYARD: Were there any submissions that raised issues or questions about the need for a different period of time?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The majority supported it. However, there was one stakeholder that did not really understand the implications or implications of it, and that was the Child Development Council, but there was a majority of support for this clause. It is more efficient for the courts and it is more efficient running.

Ms HILDYARD: Specifically, what is the procedure should the investigation take longer than the eight-week period?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: They ask for an extension. This was to fix the issue. There was originally a 42-day order, which is six weeks, and that was often extended and extended. That was removed in the 2018 act, thinking that that might speed it up because they could apply for the exact amount of time they wanted, and that did not work. We are bringing it back in with eight weeks so that there is less likelihood of the need for an extension. At the end of that period, if they are satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, the CE may make an application for a different type of order under section 53.

Ms HILDYARD: I have a clarifying question. Clearly, the new clause states that it is a period not exceeding eight weeks, and if I understand your answer correctly you have said that they can apply for an extension. Under what circumstances would you envisage that that extension would be allowed, given the clause quite clearly says the clause is about limiting the period to eight weeks?

Under what circumstances would you envisage that an extension may be granted and how many extensions could somebody possibly apply for?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: In the instance of the assessment not being completed, that would be a reason. You need to put forward obviously a compelling case to the court, so you need to be able to complete your assessment. It is envisaged that there would only be one extension of four weeks to take that to 12 weeks.

Ms HILDYARD: Sorry, Mr Chair, this is a clarifying question.

The CHAIR: I understand that and I will allow this one, but we should bear in mind we do have standing orders that we need to abide by. I will allow this one.

Ms HILDYARD: Should the process not be completed within the period of the first extension, what happens then?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: If that were to occur, at the end of the 12-week period the CE may, if they are satisfied that it is appropriate to do so, make an application for a different type of order under section 53, but the court would still have to be satisfied.

Clause passed.

Clause 14.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can you explain the rationale for only one order being able to be made under section 53(1)(ba) in a six-month period and whether there are any circumstances in which you envisage that more than one order could be made in a six-month period?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This ensures that investigations are carried out in a timely manner, and that the CE does not bring multiple applications of the same nature. It promotes timely decision-making, which is in the best interests of the child. We would not envisage that there would be any other further orders within that six-month time period.

Ms HILDYARD: Can the minister explain exactly what additional powers are conferred on the chief executive under new section 53A(4) and what the feedback was from stakeholders on the conferral of this additional power?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It is just the four-week extension; that is all.

Ms HILDYARD: Is the ability to appeal an order consistent with current legislation; if not, why not?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: These assessment and investigation orders are really short term to make an assessment as to whether a child is safe with their family or what needs to be done. It is just a short-term order. There is no appeal process because it is a short-term process in order to investigate and assess.

Ms HILDYARD: Sorry, I actually said something wrong there.

The CHAIR: Clarification?

Ms HILDYARD: I am sorry, Chair. I meant to ask whether the inability to appeal an order is consistent with current legislation.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It was consistent with this when it was in the child protection act previously. It was removed, and we are putting it back in. It is consistent with how it used to be when it was in the child protection act.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, could you outline exactly what participation means in this context? For instance, does it mean they have to physically be there, or they have to be there via teleconference, or they may have written, made a submission, to the particular hearing? What does participation actually mean?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This legislates current practice to accept consent orders from parties participating in the proceedings; that is, sometimes a parent who is automatically a party cannot be located or chooses not to participate.

Ms HILDYARD: I do not think that answers the question.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It was inserted at the request of the Youth Court. This was something they asked to have inserted.

Ms HILDYARD: I do not think that answers the question. I understand what the minister is saying, but my question was: what does participation mean? What constitutes participation? There are all sorts of reasons that a party cannot attend in person, and I really want to understand what would constitute participation and therefore mean that a person becomes the subject of an order.

It is a really important question because, as I said, there are many, many reasons that people cannot attend in person. I want to understand what participation means. It is a particularly relevant issue for people in rural and remote areas.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There are multiple ways they could be considered to participate. They could send in written information, they could send a representative on their behalf, they could attend in person. There are quite a few different ways they could participate.

Ms HILDYARD: I am not sure that quite answers it, but I will move on. Minister, are there any reasons that would enable a person who is a party to the proceeding but who could not participate in a proceeding to be subject to an order?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The court would have to be satisfied that every effort had been made to locate and give that person the ability to be present or to send a representative or to put something in writing. So the court would have to be satisfied that we did the right thing and followed up.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to clarify—and I have one more question on this clause—what would 'every effort' look like? Again, there are particular difficulties for people in particular geographic areas. There are particular issues for people who find themselves in certain circumstances. There are particular issues for some people with communication. So I am trying to understand what 'every effort' in relation to every conceivable person or group of people would look like.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It is determined by the court. They have to be assured that every effort has been made. If they are not sure, they would adjourn the court case to allow more time and more effort, but it is up to the court to determine whether they are satisfied.

Ms HILDYARD: I am not quite sure that that answers the question about what effort looks like, but maybe I can get an answer another way sometime.

The CHAIR: Just on that, member for Reynell, you would be familiar with the general thrust of questions to ministers and the ministers' prerogative to answer the question in whatever way they see fit.

Ms HILDYARD: Or not.

The CHAIR: You are not always necessarily going to get exactly what you want, but I am sure the ministers always do their best.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can a person who is a party to the proceedings but who could not participate in the proceedings appeal an order? That is whether it is in relation to them or not.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can you please confirm that there is no legislated limit in terms of how long a matter can be adjourned for?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This is covered in section 56 of the act. There are no specified time limits in there currently.

Ms HILDYARD: Are there any circumstances, minister, in which you envision that an adjournment could exceed 10 weeks?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The court will be required to commence a hearing to determine a contested application of any type within that 10-week period, but it can be extended by mutual consent of both parties, the court and the applicant.

Ms HILDYARD: To be clear, and this really goes to my final question anyway, minister, if parties were for instance negotiating and close to a resolution, they would not be estopped, by virtue of the insertion of this clause, from having the 10-week period extended?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It has to be commenced, but it can be adjourned with consent so then they can negotiate. The child may not be removed at that point and they may withdraw. The 10-week rule applies to contested matters. If the parents are contesting the order because they think they are doing a good job as a parent, if we have mutually agreed that it can be adjourned and further assessment and negotiation is needed, it can be stopped at that point.

Ms HILDYARD: For instance, if parents had decided to contest an order and they made an initial application, but the hearing, discussion, etc., had not actually commenced, is there still an opportunity for the extension beyond 10 weeks? I again ask this question because obviously these issues are very complex and it can take people some time to either decide their course of action or to access the resources they need to support them in that course of action to contest a particular matter.

For many people, going through these processes is really difficult. I am just trying to understand, if there has been an intention made clear to the court that there is a desire to contest, even if it has not progressed to a more formal stage, if that would be included in reasons that might enable an extension of the 10 weeks?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This is all about timely decision-making which is in the best interest of the child, so it has to be introduced within 10 weeks. However, with mutual consent it can be adjourned to give more time. If the family shows they need more time and they have not been able to access information, legal advice or whatever, then it would be mutual consent and it would be adjourned so that they could go off and get that information. But there has to be a limit because it is important for the child to know where they are going and for decisions to be made. The department would definitely agree to it if we thought it was in the best interest of the child.

Clause passed.

Clause 17.

Ms HILDYARD: Could you please explain the impetus for this clause?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This clause actually just clarifies the court's powers in relation to making orders for contact and placement, so it is not even really necessary. It is just really reiterating and making it very clear. These powers already exist. It confirms that the court does not have the power to make orders relating to a placement or contact. The courts did not have this power previously. This new section confirms this to avoid any doubt.

Ms HILDYARD: Are there any circumstances in which the court would be empowered to vary or revoke an order in relation to a child or young person under the guardianship of the chief executive?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Revoking is possible, but someone would have to bring that before the court.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to clarify, who would you envisage that someone to be?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The department or parents.

Ms HILDYARD: Just so that I understand this, you say the department could raise those issues; however, we are talking about a child who is under the guardianship of the chief executive. This question has been going around and around. I am trying to understand how the chief executive can be both the guardian and the initiator of an application to vary or revoke an order. I hope that makes sense.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: An example of when this would be used is when we are looking at reunification, so we would go back and revoke our own order so that we could reunify the child with their family. It often happens when children are teenagers and they are older and they are then reunified as adolescents.

The CHAIR: Final question, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Again, I think I am going to the same issue that I was trying to explore in the last question. How does this clause confer additional power onto the DCP chief executive and how is that managed in situations that we have just described?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It does not give any extra powers to the CE. In fact, all it does is clarify exactly the circumstance and the situation that exists already. All these powers exist. The new legislation also created the contact arrangement review panel, which is where any party can go if they are unhappy with the contact arrangements.

Clause passed.

Clause 18.

Ms HILDYARD: Again, I am probably just working my way through issues I raised earlier. Can you please explain the impetus for the change to 59(1)?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Currently, where the court has placed a child or young person in the custody of guardianship of the CE or another person for any period of time and a subsequent application is made, the onus is on the person objecting, which is usually the parent, to prove that the order should not be made, as in reverse onus. This amendment legislates that reverse onus only applies to applications for long-term guardianship specified orders. This responds to the views of stakeholders who express concern about the impacts of the reverse onus provision in terms of justice principles, particularly given the gravity of the orders being made.

Clause passed.

Clause 19.

Ms HILDYARD: This clause worried me, so I have a few questions about it. Can you explain, minister, how placing a child with a non-approved carer ensures their safety?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This amendment brings the current regulation 18A into the act but does not change the current legal position. So this can be done. It is being done by regulation. We are being open and transparent in putting it into legislation.

Regulation 18A permits children to be placed with temporary carers where that is preferable to placing them with an approved carer. For example, despite an approved carer being available, it may be preferable to place a child with a person they already have an established relationship with, such as a close family member, a neighbour, their teacher—somebody they already know and feel very comfortable living with—while we are doing the assessments. It prioritises family or established relationships over foster carers.

Ms HILDYARD: A few questions have come out of that. I know you said it prioritises family over approved foster carers, but you also mentioned neighbours. I have had somebody in my community who did step in as a non-approved carer and subsequently undertook training and became an approved carer. Because of the nature of the way that placement started, at a particular point in time the children in their care went to an approved carer, even though during the course of the period of three or so months when those children were with that family they had to become approved carers.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It is really about enabling family members to be assessed. While we are scoping for families—aunties, uncles, grandparents or whatever—the neighbour might already have an established relationship with the child. The child might be friends with their children and stay there, so that is a safe place for the child to be while a full assessment is done for family scoping. We know that kin is the preferred placement for children. At the end of that, we do have to choose the best placement for the child. If in the end the best placement was the neighbour, they would have to still go through the assessment process and become an approved carer.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to clarify, are there any circumstances in the scenario you have outlined where, if a neighbour takes care as a non-approved carer of children and they then become an approved carer, if there are no other family connections or kinship connections established, instead of remaining with the neighbour or other person who knows the child the child may go into residential care rather than staying with that particular carer?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There are placement principles that have to be followed, as you mentioned. Looking for family members would have priority over a neighbour or a teacher—if there was an aunty or uncle. There is also the Aboriginal placement principle that takes priority. However, if there was no family found they should be working with the department and getting assessed so that they could stay with them. It sounds like this is a specific case that perhaps my office could follow up for you.

The CHAIR: Final question, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: What communication and support can you guarantee is provided to those non-approved carers who take on the care of a child?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There are two different types of arrangements. One is a private arrangement, where the department is not involved. If it is the department that has placed the child there then there should be a caseworker and there is involvement then with the family and support.

Ms HILDYARD: To clarify what I said in my question, is it guaranteed that that always occurs?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: In the first instance, the support would come from the caseworker whilst things are being sorted out and then in the future it might be an NGO that would look after the placement.

Clause passed.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. R. Sanderson.

Clause 20.

Ms HILDYARD: This probably goes to a similar vein of questions I was asking previously. Given the chief executive replaces the minister in this clause, who is the arbiter of disputes?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This amendment is really a drafting error. This was left over from the original drafting of the bill, where it should have always said 'the CE', so it is just correcting an error.

The CHAIR: The minister is indicating that they are making a correction and it was never the intention.

Ms HILDYARD: So I understand, does that mean that 'minister' stays in the bill as is and clause 20 of the bill should not exist or is there something different in terms of the error, if that makes sense? I am just trying to understand. Are we getting rid of clause 20 in the amendment bill altogether or is there some other change if there has been a drafting error?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Section 85 provides:

85—Review of circumstances of child or young person under long-term guardianship of Chief Executive

(1) Subject to this section, the Chief Executive must cause a review of the circumstances of each prescribed child or young person to be carried out—

(a) if the child or young person, or another person who, in the opinion of—

which should be 'the Chief Executive'—

...has a legitimate interest in the affairs of the child or young person, has requested the review—as soon as is reasonably practicable after the request;

So it was simply a drafting error. That word should always have been 'the Chief Executive' because that is who the guardian is.

Ms HILDYARD: I am still trying to understand. I go to the question I asked earlier: how can the chief executive of the department be both the person who determines where a child is placed or whether they are placed under a long-term guardianship order, etc., and potentially also be the long-term guardian of a child? I am still trying to understand how that actually works.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This is really just about the review of the circumstances. The member may recall that under the Children's Protection Act 1993 the minister was the guardian and they were referred to as under the guardianship of the minister. It was the former Labor government that changed that to being the CE. There is a drafting error in that bill, which was drafted by the former government. There is one word that was not changed in adherence to the rest of the bill that was changed to give the CE now the powers of being the guardian. This is a drafting error that I believe occurred under the former government and is simply being corrected now.

Ms HILDYARD: It still does not make sense. If it is a drafting error, then what is the effect of not having that change?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I can give further—

The CHAIR: Perhaps elaborate, minister. Thank you.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There are built in review abilities. If you are unhappy with the contact arrangements, you can go to the CARP (Contact Arrangements Review Panel). There is SACAT, which is to do with a removal or a placement, and there is also an internal review process that is available as a safeguard.

Ms HILDYARD: There is a complete separation between the extent of the powers of the chief executive and the review panel?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Yes.

Ms HILDYARD: Absolutely? There is no—

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 21.

The CHAIR: In relation to clause 21, I am advised that the member for Reynell's amendments Nos 1 and 2 have already been agreed to by this house in the Statutes Amendment (Recommendations of Independent Inquiry into Child Protection) Bill, which passed this house earlier this week and is now before the other house. That being the case, I seek the concurrence of the member not to proceed with these amendments; in other words, they have already been picked up in another bill. That is the advice I have.

Ms HILDYARD: Is this the Rice review bill?

The CHAIR: Yes. There are nods from parliamentary counsel; that is good. Are you happy with that? We will deal with clause 21 as printed.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to be really clear, there is absolutely nothing in the clause that the minister has inserted into this bill that takes away or changes in any way what has already been agreed by this house in the bill I keep calling the Rice review bill.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It strengthens it. This amendment adds an additional ground for issuing a direction so that a person can now be directed not to be in the company of or otherwise associated with a guardianship child. Historically, there have been difficulties proving that communication occurred, even where the child is in the company of the person, because previously it was about preventing a child communicating or harbouring or concealing a child, so this just strengthens it. This was already an amendment that we had signalled and then the Rice review went further and made the penalties tougher, and he supported this.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to be clear, I do not have any issues with the strengthening of the direction of a specified person away from communicating, etc. When I asked the question, 'Is there anything different about this clause?' you advised that it strengthens what has been put forward through the Rice review. I just want to be absolutely clear about how those two clauses—i.e. the

clause in the Rice review bill and this one—work together, that no conflict arises, etc., and that it is clear they will operate smoothly.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: They work together. The Rice review is about the penalties as a way of deterring somebody from breaching a written directive, and this is about expanding for whom the directives can be made or how they are made, so 'in the company of' is the main wording. New section 86(4a) ensures that a child who communicates or attempts to communicate with the person to whom the written directive is issued against does not commit an offence. New section 86(6) legislates that a child who we are seeking to protect cannot be compelled to give evidence in relation to charges of an offence of breach of written directive. So they work together.

Ms HILDYARD: I have a really important question to make sure we have got this right. The current 86(4) sets out penalty provisions. I do not have the Rice review bill in front of me, but there are penalty provisions, from memory, of three years and four years. I just want to understand, given we are leaving the penalty provisions in the substantial act here, if there is anything we need to be aware of in terms of the new penalties that have been agreed to in the Rice review bill.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: They are identical.

Clause passed.

Clause 22.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 1 [ChildPro-2]—

Page 16, line 19 to page 17, line 9 [clause 22, inserted section 113I]—Delete inserted section 113I and substitute:

113I—Consent of child or young person

- (1) An adoption order contemplated by this Chapter will not be made in relation to a child or young person over the age of 12 years unless—
 - (a) the child or young person has consented to the adoption; and
 - (b) 25 days have elapsed since the giving of consent; and
 - (c) the Court is satisfied, after interviewing the child or young person in private, that the child or young person's consent is genuine and the child or young person does not wish to revoke it.
- (2) The consent of a child or young person—
 - (a) must be in writing; and
 - (b) must be witnessed in accordance with the regulations; and
 - (c) must be endorsed by a person authorised by the Chief Executive to make such an endorsement with a statement to the effect that the child or young person has been counselled by that person.
- (3) The Court may, on application by the Chief Executive or a party to the adoption (including the child), dispense with the consent of a child or young person where it appears to the Court that the child or young person is intellectually incapable of giving consent.

The CHAIR: The minister has moved amendment No. 1 standing in her name. Does anyone want to speak to that amendment?

Ms HILDYARD: I will just get clear about the process. There are a number of things I wish to say about this amendment as well as my amendment but, given that the minister's amendment is proceeding first and given that what I want to say goes to both the opposition—which is the substance of my amendment—and also to the amendment the minister is proposing to her own bill, is it appropriate for me to speak now? That is my question.

The CHAIR: My advice is that you have the opportunity to have three questions or three contributions on the minister's amendment. Should that amendment pass, you have another three questions on the amended clause, so you should have ample opportunity. My understanding is that

the way parliamentary counsel works now, your opposition to this amendment has been included as your amendment. You are simply going to oppose it.

Ms HILDYARD: I know that we get 15 minutes to speak in relation to amendments; I presume that is either to my own or I can have 15 minutes in relation to the minister's amendment—or potentially both.

The CHAIR: You are able to make a contribution. It is not simply just asking a question.

Ms HILDYARD: So I can speak to this amendment?

The CHAIR: You can, and you can detail why you are in opposition to this amendment during that contribution.

Ms HILDYARD: Then I will cross into a little bit about my amendment, but it is the same content anyway.

The CHAIR: Yes, but as I said earlier all you are doing, in fact, is opposing the amendment.

Ms HILDYARD: Yes. I presume the minister will speak to her amendment—

The CHAIR: Well, she has moved it, so the floor is yours, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: She does not want to talk about why—

The CHAIR: No, she has simply moved it. I invite questions.

Ms HILDYARD: There is no discussion about why you have amended your bill?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Not at this point.

Ms HILDYARD: I will take the opportunity to speak about my opposition to this amendment. As I said, I will speak a little about why we oppose the minister's amendment to her amendment bill, but I will also traverse to some degree—because it goes to the same subject matter—why I have proposed my amendment, which is to oppose the whole clause. However, that does go to the same subject matter.

As I think everybody in this house knows, indeed as everybody in our community is aware, adoption is an incredibly complex, difficult issue, and I believe that our deliberations regarding any changes to existing laws, existing regulations, existing processes and procedures, must be absolutely carefully, thoughtfully and compassionately considered. We must be rigorous in our examination of any potential consequences any changes will have on the lives of vulnerable young people who are currently in state care.

I believe that any changes to adoption laws should never be progressed because of one person's view or a few people's views. We must really carefully listen to the voices of those South Australians who have been adopted, who may have had a child adopted, and to the views of our broader community in a very robust way to fully understand both the impact these changes will have and also community sentiment in relation to any changes.

Unfortunately, it seems that detailed, deep discussion may not have occurred, given we established earlier in this debate that two of the main adoptee advocacy bodies in South Australia were not consulted by the minister. That in itself is not acceptable because, as I said, this issue has to be treated with deep care, given the long-term impacts it will have on children and families now and in the future.

Many individuals, advocacy groups and other stakeholders have raised a number of concerns both with me and, I understand, the minister regarding this section of the amendment bill, which relates to the adoption of children from care. Foremost amongst these concerns is that the Marshall Liberal government appears to be intent on establishing a two-tier system of adoption in South Australia, one for children in state care and one for the remainder of the population. I think that whenever a government anywhere seeks to treat people differently before the law they must be very clear about why they intend to do so.

They must consult at length and they must be very clear about what impact this will have on various individuals and groups of people, people who may currently have that particular change apply to them. The impact must also be considered in terms of potential impact on future generations of

South Australians. It is of deep concern to me that the minister seems not to have done deep, meaningful consultation on these adoption measures and has spoken, in the course of the debate on this bill, about the fact that she did not speak to Adoptee Rights Australia, the peak body for adoptees.

I also understand that Post Adoption Support Services, which operates under the auspices of Relationships Australia, may also have not been consulted. I think it is very worrying and indicative of the lack of depth with which this minister has approached these most crucial issues that deeply impact people's lives that the minister did not speak with these groups before embarking upon such significant changes to adoption provisions in South Australia.

Despite this, I understand that the government recently told *The Advertiser* that the changes were widely supported during consultation. Worse still, the submissions the government did receive from its rather selective consultation process have not been made publicly available, nor has any detailed summary of key findings from that consultation. I think that the concern that has been raised about this government's failure to adequately consult with key stakeholders about these issues is of the utmost concern, especially as the previous review in 2016 of adoption from state care in South Australia recommended against prioritising adoption over long-term orders.

Due to the concerns that have been raised—the apparent lack of consultation—we are now left with many questions, questions that I think have to be heard and substantially answered before we proceed. Some of those questions are: are we creating a two-tier system of adoption in South Australia whereby children in state care have fewer rights, including to object to the adoption? Will this bill make the laws and processes surrounding adoption excessively complex, depending on the child's care status? What are the actual benefits to children in state care, given the minister herself recently stated, as I understand it, that adoption is not the only means by which a child in care can live parentally with a foster family? Will the courts be able to make alternative orders even when other orders would be in the best interests of the child?

I am deeply concerned that crucial decision-making power is being moved from the courts to the chief executive. This will no doubt impact children, service providers and individuals responsible for administering these changes. We do have a troubling, terrible history in this country of taking children from their birth parents and placing them away from their families and communities. We have to be very clear so that we do not make mistakes. We cannot contemplate making mistakes that could wreak hurt, humiliation and pain on thousands of Australians and their families.

Whilst adoption can be a positive experience—and it is something that many in our community support—we have to approach changes to the Adoption Act or changes to adoption through other acts as this change represents with the most robust of consultation and the utmost care. South Australians and future generations rely on us as parliamentarians to do that.

This Children and Young People (Safety) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill seeks to deny the right of a child to be heard on their view in relation to the adoption. I understand the minister has now moved to amend her bill in relation to how the voices of children are heard. But again, given it is very clear that these changes were made after the bill was introduced into this parliament only a relatively short time ago, it makes it very clear to me that these changes have been made on the run and have not been made with the necessary robust consultation.

Under these laws, I understand that birth parents may no longer be required to give permission for adoption. These are huge departures from existing adoption laws, and the question beckons: if these changes are necessary for children in care, is there more we must contemplate for the remainder of children in this state in relation to potential adoption? In a recent joint statement, advocacy groups wrote that the bill 'removes key rights and protections currently available to children and adults subject to adoption in South Australia and alters the role of the courts in the adoption process'.

These groups also stated that they firmly believe that the bill may not comply with international human rights standards and may be in breach of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Under the reforms, a court must consider placing a child for adoption even when other care orders, such as long-term guardianship, may be deemed to be in the best interests of the child.

If a child refuses to be adopted, it seems that their views could be dismissed if it is deemed in the best interests of the child or young person that the adoption order be made. I am also concerned—and I would like to hear more about it—that the minister has apparently flagged a reimbursement payment for adoption and may have gone as far as consulting the Australian Taxation Office so that any state-based payment could not be considered income.

The minister, I am sure, can explain her reasons for having that consultation. However, the minister so far—and we are now here at close to 6.30pm when we are debating this bill at its third stage—has not explained those comments and, as with so many other aspects of this bill, the minister has not explained to our community and to stakeholders how this will work, what people will be eligible for or if in fact it has been budgeted for by the government.

In light of these concerns, we strongly urge the government to delay the progress of this particular aspect of the bill until further consultation has occurred and to revisit its design to improve its compliance with human rights standards and to make sure that everybody who has a say on this bill has had the opportunity to be thoroughly heard and to be thoroughly considered in any provisions that are drafted. This aspect of the bill, should it pass, makes the laws and processes surrounding adoption complex, inconsistent and contradictory depending on the child's care status.

In summary, due largely to the lack of consultation and the grave uncertainty that these provisions have already caused among individuals, providers and support groups, we cannot support these changes to the adoption regime in South Australia. We would absolutely welcome, however, thoughtful, thorough discussion about improvements to adoption, but it seems that these suggested changes, outside of the Adoption Act for some reason, need much, much deeper consideration.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, adoption is an incredibly complex issue, and I believe that it is really important that we work in a much deeper way with stakeholders and with our entire community to develop consensus and to actually contemplate any changes through the Adoption Act itself.

In the earlier stages of the debate on this bill, the minister referred numerous times to the fact that this review, which is around a year late, is not comprehensive and that deeper, further reform will be considered at the time of the next scheduled review. In her comments she also stated that work towards that next scheduled review of this Children and Young People (Safety) Act will begin at the end of this year, just six or seven months away.

Given this, I say again that we would welcome a thorough discussion about any necessary changes to improve adoption laws to make it work for all South Australians. We would welcome a discussion about any improvements to the Adoption Act itself. We would welcome being part of those consultations and being part of reaching out to community members to work out how we can improve adoption processes.

However, given the next review of this bill is just six or seven months away, given the angst that these proposed changes have brought about for a number of individuals and groups and given that for some reason we are not dealing with changes in the Adoption Act itself, I really urge the minister to back away from what are really drastic changes and to take the necessary time to include and talk with more people.

I am sure the minister will talk about who she has spoken with, but on such an important issue, if we are hearing such concern, I think we should take the time to include and talk with more people, with more groups, with compassion and openness about the best way forward. Again, I say I would absolutely welcome that debate about adoption and improving adoption laws here in South Australia.

This issue is far too important and it will have far too much impact on vulnerable young people's lives to move ahead with a bill that the minister has had to amend herself just in the last couple of weeks with a clause which, if I understand the committee process correctly, is a clause—in relation to adoption of children from care—that takes up about a third of the bill, goes for about eight to 10 pages and has multiple new subclauses. If I understand the committee process properly, despite the length of that clause, I will have simply three questions to ask.

To me, this does not seem to give our parliament—certainly not me as the shadow minister but our parliament—the robust opportunity it should have to thoroughly explore such an important

issue. As I said—and I am just closing; I can see you have your hand on the timer, Mr Chair—this issue is incredibly important. It will have such a deep impact on vulnerable young people's lives.

If it is not properly evaluated—and that includes a proper consultation process with the appropriate groups and individuals with lived experience of adoption—I worry greatly about its passage, particularly given, as I said, that there will not be the opportunity for a robust examination. Three questions on a clause that is eight to 10 pages is not going to afford us that opportunity. Again, I say that the minister has amended her own bill. I think we need to take a step back and think much more deeply about this issue.

Again, I just want to say I am very happy to do that. I am very happy to look at improvements that we can make around adoption. It is a really important process in our community that impacts current children and families and future generations. We should always look at improving such important processes, but I do not think that we have thoroughly examined these changes, nor will we have the opportunity to do so.

Also, very importantly, it is really clear from the feedback to me and indeed the feedback that I know has gone to the minister's office, that there is still much more to contemplate about these proposed provisions before we move forward.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Reynell. Before I call the minister to respond to that, I will just remind everybody that we are dealing, at this point in time, at this stage of the committee, with the first amendment standing in the minister's name.

I understand that from time to time members do not feel that they have adequate opportunity to forensically examine a clause or a bill in the way they might see fit. I am going to read to you from standing order 364, and the member for Reynell is aware of this:

1. a Member other than the Member in charge of the Bill, motion or amendment may not speak more than three times on any one question, nor for more than fifteen minutes on any one occasion;

According to our standing orders, that really does restrict it to three opportunities. Also:

2. debate [will be and] is confined to the motion, clause or amendment before the Committee.

I will call on the minister. Once again, before I get her to respond to that, I need to reiterate that your amendment, member for Reynell, which you are referring to as your amendment, really is just an indication of your opposition to it; it is just the way it appears and the way parliamentary counsel deals with that at the moment. Anyway, enough from me.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I would like the opportunity to respond to the member for Reynell. Adoption is an emotive issue. I think it is something that many people would avoid and not bring to parliament, but I believe that being a member of parliament and being a minister requires difficult decisions and difficult discussions. That is part of being a leader: bringing difficult discussions to the house.

This is something that I have considered for seven years now. This is not a new issue. This is something that has been raised many, many times. I was the shadow minister for four years. I have been the minister for more than three years. For seven years, I have contemplated this. I have researched this. I have looked at what is done in other countries, in other states and in other jurisdictions. I have met with people who have been adopted. I have met with people who would like to be adopted. I have met with foster carers who would like to adopt.

I have met with people who believe this is related to the abortion law and that if we had adoption there would be fewer abortions. There are many different aspects and angles to look at. I can assure this committee that I have taken this matter very seriously. This is not an ill-considered policy: it is a well-considered policy. As a government, we announced this in September 2019—a long time ago. Since then, we have held workshops and we have discussed it with people. I have met with young people in care, with foster carers, with workers, with staff, with many people. We have held a formal gathering and we have also had written submissions.

I have done my very best to bring to this house the best adoption policy possible. I have met with people who have adopted children and I have said to them, 'If you could design an adoption policy from the ground up—which I can—what would it look like so that we are supporting you and

the child so that they can have permanency and stability and the life that I believe our children deserve?'

In reference to the dual adoption policies, rightly so, there is an Adoption Act and this is being put in the Children and Young People (Safety) Act because it relates only to children who have already gone through the court process—some of them many times—which has determined that the children are not safe to be with their biological family. There have been court orders based on the evidence through the Youth Court.

This government is spending a lot of money and putting a lot of effort into early intervention and prevention, into family group conferencing and into strengthening families because wherever possible I would much prefer the children to be with their biological family where it is safe to do so. Where it is not safe to do so and a court has determined on the facts, on the evidence of the case, that a child is not safe with their biological family, they are brought into care under the guardianship of the chief executive as it stands.

In that instance, these children form relationships with their foster carers. Many of the carers I have met have had their children for many, many years—five, 10, 15 years—some from babies, some from young children, and they see those children as their children, as their family. They want the opportunity to make that child part of their forever family and to show the child they are chosen, they are safe, they are in a family who loves them forever, not just until they are 18 but forever. They want to make them part of their will and part of their family and let them know that they have been chosen, and it makes a big difference to the child.

I can tell you, Chair, nearly all the foster carers I have told that this was available burst into tears at the thought that finally the child they have cared for and loved for many years can now be part of their family. This is not about removing children from birth and getting them adopted out. This is not a stolen generation. We have already decided and determined that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children are not part of this. We have made every safeguard to ensure that the ills and the wrongs of the past will not be repeated. We have put every protection possible in this bill.

This is for people who already have an established relationship. They have already been a carer for the child for at least two years. They have gone through the assessment, they have a working with children check, they have gone through all the child safety checks and all the requirements. They have been with a child for two years, they have had caseworkers, they have had annual reviews, and we have had ample opportunity to look at how that relationship is going, how the child is faring.

This is not about the adult determining they want the child. The voice of the child is incredibly important. Whoever would force a child to be adopted? It is ridiculous. That is not our intention. This is simply another option that would be available. It might be suitable for five children a year, 10 children a year. I am not expecting or anticipating that the 4,500 children we have in care are all going to suddenly be adopted. This is an option for those who want it.

Emmah Money, who came out and spoke and did all the radio interviews when we announced this in September 2019, was a former model of mine. She was adopted from foster care and has a wonderful story to tell about how her life turned out, about that opportunity and how it felt to be chosen. Another of my former models was open in connecting with foster carers. I did not know that she was a foster child, and when I told her at that time the then Labor government had made adoption available for over 18s she was delighted. She always wanted to be adopted. She is in her 30s.

This is something that is still so precious to people, even as adults—to be part of a family legitimately. This is an open adoption. We have integrated birth certificates, where the biological family and the new family are both acknowledged. This is not about denying the child access to their former family or knowledge of the former family or pretending they did not exist. This is an open adoption with an integrated birth certificate. This is all about giving a child and their foster family the ability to make that commitment together. In recommendation 157, the Nyland royal commission actually said that adoption should be considered when it is in the best interests of the child, and the former Labor government accepted that recommendation. I am just going forward from that recommendation and putting the legislation in place to make that possible.

The people I have met with said that, if you were financially well off, the most important thing to them was access to therapies, access to health care and access to the extra education supports that guardianship children have currently. I have negotiated with both the education minister and the health minister to ensure that those services will continue because we do not know if the child might need more help as they go through different stages in life, and we want that to be available.

I then looked at the fact that in South Australia around 80 per cent of foster carers are on benefits. I did not want to exclude these wonderful people who have done an amazing job, some of whom have been foster caring for many, many decades. I did not want to exclude them from the ability to adopt a child simply because they could not afford it. I want this to be the best possible piece of legislation and policy that is in the best interests of children and their carers.

That is why we have considered, and we have a letter from the tax office, that the money—just as it is for a foster carer or a kinship carer, the same payment—would be considered in the same way as a reimbursement and not as income, where it is considered to be a reimbursement. That would need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. Those families who are eligible for Family Tax Benefits A and B would be eligible for that payment to continue.

The idea is that this is all about what is in the best interests of the child. Research shows us that permanency, stability and forever families are incredibly important. We know that mental health is a huge issue in our state and in our country; it is quite prevalent. We know that that stability, a family that will be there to support you through that forever, is so incredibly important. That is what this legislation is about, and that is what I am trying to establish here.

Where there has been consultation, the voice of the child is incredibly important. The payments are consistent with the foster carer payments; that is, if they are eligible for Family Tax Benefit A, families can elect to not be part of that. If they financially do not need it, there would be money—I think it is \$1,500—for their education expenses and to settle the child in.

It is important to clarify that applications for adoption orders will still be made pursuant to the Adoption Act and that, unless otherwise stated, the operation of the Adoption Act has not been modified. Consistent with article 21 of the CRC, the best interests of the child are still the paramount consideration of the court when determining an application for adoption pursuant to section 10 of the Adoption Act. I think this is very important, and I do hope that I have the support of the crossbench to pass this legislation tonight.

Ms HILDYARD: To reiterate some of the issues that I raised in my earlier comments, I note that the minister talked about her desire to progress legislation of this type during her time as shadow minister and as minister. I will take it on face value, absolutely, that the minister has thought about that and considered very thoroughly what she would like to do and her views around this policy. I respect that she has done that and explored what she thinks is the right thing to do.

It is really important to remember when we debate issues of this nature, issues that go to very deeply held views and desires of our South Australian community, that we are here to represent the views and desires of the South Australian community. As I said before, I am very open to a detailed discussion about adoption, to potentially progressing improvements to adoption in this state. That is not the issue here at all. I would be very supportive of that discussion.

What I am really concerned about is the groups and individuals who have come to me and spoken about their deep, deep concern about the provisions in the bill, the way that they have or have not been spoken with and included in the deep sort of discussion that is required when we consider issues that are so incredibly important to people's lives now and also long into the future.

As I said, and I will keep saying it, I am very open to a discussion about adoption, but when I have been provided with the thoughts and the emotions that people are feeling about this bill, when I see that the minister herself has proposed an amendment to her own bill, when I see that despite the minister's assurance that nothing changes about processes in the Adoption Act and yet we are inserting a lengthy clause about adoption for one particular group of people into another act altogether, I think that it would be best for us to sit down and consider reforms with a much more robust consultation and conversation—not just consultation and conversation but much more of a deep listening to all of the different groups and individuals—with a focus on coming to some sort of consensus.

To pick up the minister's point about leadership, I think that is what we as leaders need to do on these really difficult issues. I think we need to deeply listen to people, think about how we bring people together, think about how we come up with legislation and provisions in which people feel that they have been heard and where people have confidence and feel that that is the best that we could possibly do after all those conversations, after all that listening, after all of us coming together to find a way forward.

At the moment, particular groups are feeling disenfranchised from this process. As with any bill, it is not always possible to get consensus, particularly on these difficult issues. That is often a very difficult thing to do, but what we should always be able to do as leaders is to make sure that people feel as though they have been listened to, that they have been heard, that time has been taken to speak deeply with them and to have their views taken into account in some way in what is going to go forward. That is what I am concerned about.

Again, I would welcome lengthy discussion with the minister, with as many people as possible in our community to think about what improvements we could make that get closer to a position of understanding and unity, even if, as I said, that does not necessarily mean every single person is happy with every single aspect of a particular law, a particular change. However, I do think that we need to do the work to make sure that everybody feels as though they have been heard, listened to and contemplated in the act.

As I said, the things that do not give me confidence that has happened in this case are that an amendment has been made on the run, people are feeling very unhappy and very disenfranchised and that we can do better. I think we can have, in just six short months, a real and deep discussion about changes to adoption to make sure that we get closer to that feeling of inclusion and compassion that people are looking for around this.

I agree with the minister that there are many lovely stories that we hear about adoption. There are lovely outcomes and lovely changes that happen in people's lives as a result of adoption. Again, we would welcome a discussion to suggest improvements to laws that help us to get closer to a place where more people are feeling positive about the way forward, even if they do not utterly agree with every aspect, and feel as though they have been heard, listened to and, importantly, treated with dignity and respect in this process.

Again, I would urge the minister to hear that, to hear our desire to engage in this issue. As she has said in this debate herself, we will be reviewing this bill. I do not have the *Hansard* in front of me, but I think I can recall the words the minister has used on several occasions in the course of this bill when I have raised issues about other clauses, I have been told by the minister not to worry: 'This is just a small review. We have a much bigger review coming up at the end of the year. The next one is the substantial one. This is just a minor one.'

Well, inserting these provisions into another act, other than the Adoption Act, making amendments at the last moment, to me fits with something that is done in a short, hasty way. It does not feel like it is in keeping with the longer review that the minister herself has described we will contemplate together in this house towards the end of the year. Again, I do not have the dates in front of me, but I know the minister has spoken about the time frame and assured me in relation to other clauses that we will have the opportunity not only to consider more deeply the issues that are in front of us but also to deeply consider other changes we might wish to take forward as a parliament and, indeed, as a community.

I will finish by again saying that I would absolutely welcome a discussion about adoption, about potential changes to the law, but we need to do it properly, with compassion, with thought, with inclusion and with leadership that make people know that their voice is heard and respected.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The proposed changes are within the Children and Young People (Safety) Act, as this is a unique and limited pathway to adoption as a permanency pathway for children already under long-term orders made pursuant to this act. Where the court has decided that a child cannot be cared for safely with their birth family, as such it is more appropriate for the pathway to be contained in the legislation relating to children within the care system.

It is important to understand that the group of children this pathway applies to are children in care. These are not children in the general public or from overseas. To ensure the voices of children

who will be impacted by this policy were heard, CREATE, as the peak body, was consulted, as were children who had been in care through Relationships Australia.

My department and I have consulted with those who have lived experience. Individuals who have been adopted themselves have spoken to me directly about their positive stories and life experiences about being adopted and growing up in a loving home. Those individuals have relayed their support for these amendments, regarding expanding permanency options and adoption from care as one of a suite of options for permanency.

These provisions relate exclusively to children in care where the courts have already made decisions regarding the children's long-term care. I am aware that Adoptee Rights Australia is a national organisation based in New South Wales. To the best of my knowledge, other than Sharyn White, no other members of Adoptee Rights Australia have been in direct contact with me. As the member noted, we will never get consensus. This has been considered for a long time. It was announced in September 2019. An immense amount of time and consideration have gone into this bill and I do wish to progress with this.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FUND SELECTION AND OTHER SUPERANNUATION MATTERS) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments and suggested amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments and suggested amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 7, page 5, line 23 [clause 7, inserted subsection (2)(b)(ii)]—Delete 'the person's selected fund' and substitute 'a complying superannuation fund (within the meaning of Part 3A)'

No. 2. Clause 8, page 5, lines 34 and 35 [clause 8(2), inserted paragraph (b)(ii)]—Delete '—to the selected fund' and substitute:

in their capacity as a police member—to the fund selected for the purposes of that fund selection

No. 3. Clause 8, page 6, line 9 [clause 8(3), inserted subsection (1b)(a)]—After 'subsection (1)(a) or (b)' insert:

as a deduction from the salary received by the member from the employer to which the fund selection relates

No. 4. Clause 8, page 6, lines 15 and 16 [clause 8(4)]—Delete subclause (4) and substitute:

(4) Section 20(2)(b)—delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

(b) require specified members, or members of a specified class, to make contributions as a deduction from salary at a prescribed rate—

(i) to the Treasurer; or

(ii) if the member has made 1 or more fund selections—

(A) to a fund selected by the member for the purposes of a fund selection; or

(B) if the regulations so require, to a fund specified in the regulations,

(and a regulation under this paragraph may prescribe different rates or specify different funds in respect of different members or different classes of member); or

No. 5. Clause 11, page 14, line 27 [clause 11(1), inserted text]—Delete 'to the Treasurer'

SCHEDULE OF THE SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

No. 1. Clause 10, page 8, lines 26 and 27 [clause 10, inserted section 21A, definition of *existing member*]—Delete the definition

No. 2. Clause 10, page 8, lines 29 and 30 [clause 10, inserted section 21A, definition of *new member*]—Delete the definition

No. 3. Clause 10, page 8, lines 33 to 35 [clause 8, inserted section 21A, definition of *selected fund*]—Delete 'the fund specified by the person in the fund selection notice given to the person's employer' and substitute:

a fund specified by the person in a fund selection notice given to an employer of the person

No. 4. Clause 10, page 10, line 5 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(1)(a)]—Delete 'the person's employer' and substitute 'an employer of the person'

No. 5. Clause 10, page 10, line 16 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(3)]—Delete 'the person's employer' and substitute 'an employer of the person'

No. 6. Clause 10, page 10, after line 27 [clause 10, inserted section 21C]—After subsection (5) insert:

(5a) If a notice given by a person to their employer for the purposes of making a fund selection does not comply with all requirements under this section, the employer may nevertheless accept the notice if satisfied (whether on receipt of the notice or after consultation with the person) that it complies substantially with those requirements, and, in that case—

(a) the notice will be taken to be a fund selection notice; and

(b) the person will be taken to have given a valid direction under subsection (3).

No. 7. Clause 10, page 10, line 28 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(6)]—After 'fund selection' insert:

in respect of a particular employer

No. 8. Clause 10, page 10, line 29 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(6)]—Delete 'their' and substitute:

that

No. 9. Clause 10, page 10, line 31 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(7)]—Delete 'in relation to a person' insert:

for a person in respect of a particular employer of the person

No. 10. Clause 10, page 11, lines 16 and 17 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(2)]—Delete 'the member's selected fund' and substitute:

a complying fund (which, in the case of a designated member, must be the eligible fund selected by the member in their capacity as a designated member)

No. 11. Clause 10, page 11, after line 21 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(2)]—After paragraph (b) insert:

or

(c) another employer of the member is required to make contributions to the Treasurer on behalf of the member under section 21.

No. 12. Clause 10, page 11, line 28 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(4)]—Delete 'subsection (2)' and substitute:

section 19(2)(b)

No. 13. Clause 10, page 11, lines 30 to 42 and page 12, lines 1 to 15 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(5) to (8)]—Delete subsections (5) to (8) and substitute:

(5) If a member makes a fund selection, the member's employer must commence making contributions required under section 21 to the member's selected fund within 2 months, or such other period as may be prescribed by regulation, following the day on which the fund selection notice is received by the employer.

(6) The regulations may prescribe variations or additions to the procedure set out in subsection (5) (and any such regulation has effect according to its terms).

No. 14. Clause 10, page 12, line 31 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(b)]—Delete 'is a new member' and substitute:

becomes a member of the Triple S scheme after the commencement of this Part

No. 15. Clause 10, page 12, line 34 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(c)]—Delete 'not' and substitute:

no longer

No. 16. Clause 10, page 12, lines 35 and 36 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(c)]—Delete '(whether the person is a new member or an existing member)'

No. 17. Clause 10, page 12, line 37 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(c)]—Delete 'not' and substitute:

no longer

No. 18. Clause 10, page 13, lines 13 to 29 [clause 10, inserted section 21G]—Delete the section

No. 19. Clause 10, page 14, line 5 [clause 10, inserted section 21H(3)(a)]—Delete 'section 21D' and substitute:

section 19(2)(b)

At 18:56 the house adjourned until Thursday 6 May 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***SOCIAL HOUSING**

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (30 March 2021).

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Homeless Connect SA is the main point of contact for people to seek information and gain access to homelessness and related services, including emergency accommodation. This is a statewide service available 24 hours, 7 days a week.

In 2019, the Marshall Liberal government released the state's new \$550 million housing, homelessness and support strategy, Our Housing Future 2020-2030. The strategy commits to a once-in-a-generation plan to modernise and reform the state's housing system to meet the future needs and aspirations of South Australians, from homelessness, to social housing, to affordable housing, including in the regions.

South Australia's Homelessness Alliances will be operating from 1 July 2021 and will better meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness. The key aims of the alliances will be to intervene early to prevent people falling into homelessness; and support people into safe, stable and long-term housing so they do not cycle in and out of homelessness. Port Pirie will be part of the Country North Alliance, and the new domestic and family violence alliance will work together to support at-risk women and children.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to improving our public housing assets. We are investing \$75 million over 10 years to address the capital maintenance backlog and improve sustainability and energy efficiency of public housing properties across South Australia including regional areas. \$12.6 million has already been spent, including \$980,000 in regional areas.

Our Housing Future also outlines the delivery of more than 20,000 affordable housing outcomes over the next decade, which will reduce and prevent housing stress. This will provide low-income households across South Australia, including regional areas, the opportunity to move into homeownership. By boosting the supply of affordable housing, we are supporting local employment and economic growth in regional areas.

SA Housing Authority will continue to assess opportunities and work collectively with key agencies across Port Pirie and the wider Upper Spencer Gulf region to benefit local communities.