

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25 May 2021

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.B. Teague) took the chair at 11:00 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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COVID-19 PERMANENT MEASURES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 March 2021.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (11:02): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition in relation to the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill, which of course has come out of the COVID-19 legislation. However, it would make aspects of that legislation permanent in our law, applying not just to COVID-19 but to all future pandemics or emergencies where relevant provisions would apply. In that sense, it is not necessarily related to this current pandemic but is looking to the future.

This piece of legislation was debated in the community before it came to the parliament, and most notably it was hotly debated within the government's own party room, where we have leaked papers and leaked reports of the discussions from the government party room raising significant concerns about this legislation and its handling by the Attorney-General, the Deputy Premier, to the point where the government then changed their approach to this legislation because the party room was in open revolt and many members of the Liberal party room indicated that they would withhold their rights, in terms of potentially opposing this legislation or particular clauses of it, if they were to proceed.

After that happened, there was a backdown by the Attorney-General—a backdown that has seen this revised legislation brought to the parliament in a different form than was provided to her own party room. This is also a piece of legislation where we are still waiting for what has been long promised in regard to a permanent set of measures for dealing with the current pandemic. We have been dealing with a state of emergency in this state for in the order of, I believe, 14 months, and Grant Stevens, our police commissioner, has also been acting as the State Coordinator.

Let me put on the record again, as I have done many times, that the opposition has a huge amount of respect for the work the State Coordinator, Grant Stevens, has done in managing the COVID-19 pandemic. He has been ably assisted and advised in that role by the Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier. Both those office holders have huge respect and admiration from the people of South Australia for how they have managed, how they have made the difficult decisions in relation to handling the pandemic. They have done our state proud and they have put us in an enviable situation.

Of course, right around the country, we have done very well, and New Zealand has done very well. You only have to look at many other countries around the world to see the dangerous situation that they are in. Here in South Australia, our legislative model has been that it is not the Premier making the decisions, it is not the Deputy Premier making decisions and it is not the health minister making decisions: it has been the State Coordinator, Grant Stevens, making decisions, and he has done that very well.

I believe that prior to this pandemic the longest that anybody has used the Emergency Management Act in a major emergency declaration, or a state of emergency as it is colloquially called, is in the order of a couple of days, but we have now had this in place for 14 months.

I think the State Coordinator himself, Grant Stevens, has made clear on a number of occasions that he is looking forward to having a different set of arrangements in place, a different

legislative process in place that would allow him to step back from that State Coordinator role to focus on his primary role, which is big enough as it is, in terms of being the police commissioner of the state, the Commissioner of Police, and allow all those important measures to proceed in a different form.

This has been his stated desire for many, many months. He has said it very clearly in press conferences and in interviews. However, for mysterious reasons, those suggestions and recommendations have either fallen on deaf ears, in terms of the Premier and the Attorney-General, or they have hit stumbling blocks when it has got to the Premier and the Attorney-General, because we have not seen them presented to this parliament. This legislation does definitely not address those issues, and this is highlighted by the fact that we just saw a piece of legislation pass this parliament that extended some of those powers of the Commissioner for Police for another three or six months, whatever the case was.

It is kicking the can down the road. We had a debate and questions and answers in this parliament, and the Attorney said she was considering more proposals from the Commissioner of Police, Grant Stevens, as the State Coordinator, in relation to what those measures would be. But, here we are, a few more weeks or maybe a month down the track, and we still have not seen what those permanent measures are going to be that the government is considering.

Let's be very clear: the pandemic is still around the world and it is still posing a significant threat to South Australia and Australia. This is highlighted yet again by the second leakage we have had now from our hotel quarantine medi-hotel program in South Australia. The first leakage, of course, happened from the Peppers hotel last year in November and caused a statewide lockdown to be put in place.

This leakage now from the Playford Hotel has, luckily for us, not impacted South Australia but is causing a significant effect in Victoria, where new restrictions have had to be put in place—with only five people allowed to be visitors at homes, masks to be worn indoors and restrictions on gatherings—because of that leakage from the South Australian hotel quarantine program at the Playford Hotel.

We are apparently told that there is a report. Yesterday, we were told it was finalised; today, it is apparently not finalised. We certainly have not had it released, but there is clearly an ongoing risk to South Australia. That is why there are very important powers that need to be in place for the medium term in South Australia in relation to how this pandemic is going to be managed. The police commissioner, as the State Coordinator, has made some of those very clear. He has made clear the importance of continuing QR codes and having that enforcement in place.

Currently, that is in place because of a direction by the State Coordinator, which of course has the effect of law but is therefore under the Emergency Management Act. The government has decided not to bring that before the parliament to debate and to pass through the parliament. It is keeping it under the Emergency Management Act—and, likewise, restrictions around borders, which often need to be put in place.

I think credit goes to the police commissioner and Professor Spurrier. I think we have a better system now in the drafting under the Emergency Management Act of those changes of borders where there are different levels that can be activated at different times, whereas prior to that there was a very complicated direction that needed to be read in full to understand all those border restrictions. Now there is a slightly clearer process in place.

This is an area where we need those powers to continue, but the government have made the decision that they are going to keep that drafting under the Emergency Management Act rather than bring it before the parliament and consider it as the law of the state in an ordinary function. They have also clearly decided not to go down the path of other potential models that would see some parts legislative or some parts referred to other bodies.

We have this body that has been in place for some time in South Australia, which is called the Transition Committee, that has no legal effect whatsoever. It is not a statutory body, it is not a body that is created under any legislation or regulation, to my knowledge, but it advises the State Coordinator in his legislative role in considering the directions and decisions that he would

make by the various bureaucrats and public officers who sit on that committee. I think that process has served us well, but we are not seeing any of those measures made permanent.

I think it is worth noting that, despite the fact that the Premier announces those decisions from the Transition Committee a lot of the time, the Premier does not sit on that committee. No minister sits on that Transition Committee. In fact, I believe the evidence that we had to an upper house select committee was that the Premier had only been to the Transition Committee perhaps one time when he was presenting, I believe, on tourism opportunities or international student opportunities or the like. He is not part of the decision-making process.

This has led to a lot of commentary, and I believe some of the government's own backbenchers have been raising concerns as to whether this is a continuation where we are no longer having cabinet government in place, and how long is it going to be before cabinet government is back in place and back making decisions. I do not necessarily subscribe to that. That is the view that has been put around internally in the Liberal Party, and they certainly speak openly to us about their concerns in that regard, and by some of the more conservative media commentators as well.

Perhaps that is some of the reasoning why we have not seen over the past six months, since the police commissioner has been raising his concerns in relation to continuation of the legal framework that we are operating under, additional proposals brought to this parliament to address that. We just continue to see extensions and now some of these measures made permanent. This is not a new model, it is a continuation of what we have seen so far.

As I said, this bill makes permanent various temporary measures that were included in earlier COVID-19 emergency legislation. Under this bill, these changes will become an ongoing part of our laws regardless of whether an emergency is declared or not, which is an important point. Clearly, some of these provisions in relation to the Emergency Management Act or the Public Health Act apply in relation to particular emergencies, but there are some that apply even if there are no emergencies declared at all.

Those changes include allowing various meetings and mental health inspections by audiovisual means, paying container deposit refunds electronically and reducing administrative processes for executing mortgages. The latter two I have not heard any concerns raised about, although I do have a number of questions with regard to why we are proceeding so stridently with the first of those in relation to mental health and other inspections that would be done by community visitors or the Chief Psychiatrist, which traditionally have always been done in person.

When we entered lockdown in March or April last year, there was, I believe, a very compelling argument put to the parliament that we needed to allow these sorts of inspections to happen by audiovisual means during the pandemic because of the transmission risk to people who live in those facilities by inspectors coming in and out, and that we needed to allow a process by which the inspections could still take place, despite the global pandemic and community transmission underway.

What the government are now proposing to do is, in a time in the future when there would be no pandemic—the pandemic would be over and there would be no declarations—they want this permanent so that there would forevermore be the ability for the Chief Psychiatrist or community visitors to conduct their inspections by phone, Skype, Microsoft Teams or FaceTime.

I have some serious questions as to whether that is an appropriate approach, particularly when we know the risks that people who live in some of these facilities face, the importance of making sure those facilities are inspected, the importance of making sure their voices are heard, and the power imbalance that clearly exists, which is why inspections are needed in the first place.

To think that you could have an appropriate inspection of those facilities by phone or by Skype, presumably with the operator of those facilities deciding where they point the camera, I really question whether that is an appropriate decision for the future, or that we would want to continue to allow that to happen in all circumstances into the future.

There are also amendments to the public health laws to allow directions by various means, to extend the time for giving written notice of directions, and authorising the disclosure of information for medical research or statistical purposes. It is worth noting that the first piece of legislation we changed in relation to the pandemic was the Public Health Act, to enable appropriate decisions and protections to be put in place for the managing of the pandemic.

I believe it was in the order of only a week or two weeks that we had an emergency declared under the Public Health Act before the police commissioner decided to order an emergency declaration under the Emergency Management Act. There was some early use of the Public Health Act, but we have not seen it used significantly throughout the pandemic and certainly not over the last 14 months.

However, the government has made some changes. We passed the first changes in a very swift fashion—I believe within the space of an afternoon through both houses, which is very speedy—given their importance and the fact that the opposition was very keen, as we have been throughout the pandemic, to support all measures to give the government the powers it needs to appropriately manage the pandemic.

Now we are talking about after the COVID-19 pandemic for future pandemic or emergency public health management. I do think there are questions with regard to the powers of detention, which are very serious powers. Giving notice within 48 hours was the rule. We are now proposing to change that to giving notice within 72 hours.

We would like to hear from the government what the rationale behind that further extension would be, particularly where we have people in detention and we clearly would know where they are. Why we would not be able to give them notice within 48 hours, which would be a reasonable period of time for a significant detention order? Bear in mind that this is in relation to future pandemics down the track or future public health emergencies of any kind down the track.

The bill also amends the Emergency Management Act 2004 regarding identity cards, confidentiality of information and expiations for breaching directions. As I mentioned, there were going to be some further changes to that that were proposed by the Attorney-General, but she was rolled by her party room and they have been taken out of the legislation. The bill goes beyond the existing COVID-19 laws with regard to government immunity from liability. Previous COVID-19 emergency legislation provided immunity for any government actions taken in response to COVID-19 under the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act.

This bill provides immunity for any government actions taken under the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act, the Emergency Management Act and the Public Health Act in addition to any law prescribed in regulation. Importantly, the current bill also makes the immunity retrospective. This creates an unusual situation where a minister can make regulations in a year or a decade from now that would indemnify the government against liability for actions taken under laws that do not even exist today as long as the actions are somehow linked to COVID-19.

When asked about what actions have been taken that could give rise to such claims, the government did not provide details. Whilst the opposition was supporting this bill through this chamber, as it has through all of the COVID-19 legislation, any such regulations brought before the parliament will be the subject of significant scrutiny. I think it will be important to hear from the Attorney in the debate on this legislation why those additional immunities are needed.

That first immunity protection was passed in very hurried fashion to enable the government to have all the powers that it deemed appropriate. We are now talking about some very long-term immunity protections in a much broader sense without that urgent need to pass this legislation, as can be evidenced by the fact that the government has had this sitting on the table for weeks now without debating it. So I think it would be prudent to hear from the Attorney as to the details behind that.

It is interesting that what is missing from this legislation is perhaps the most telling. This bill does not extend the current end date for temporary COVID-19 measures beyond 31 May; that was the subject of another bill, as I said earlier. This bill does not make permanent the additional powers of the State Coordinator during declared emergencies under section 25 of the Emergency Management Act 2004. Despite the bill title including 'Permanent Measures', it does nothing to reform how key decisions are made in the current COVID-19 pandemic or future emergencies.

As I said, we are still waiting. It has been six months since that was floated as something that the government, the Premier and the Deputy Premier were looking at. Clearly, there are issues internally in the government as to working out exactly what path they are going down because six months is a very long time to be considering that. The government allegedly have been trying to

move ahead with more substantive changes. We even saw a draft bill that was leaked to the media before the Attorney-General was rolled by her own party. In November last year, the State Coordinator was quoted as saying:

We are providing advice to the Premier in relation to options for stepping away from the emergency management arrangements.

That was in November last year. We are now at the end of May. Some six months down the track, that advice has been sitting with the Premier, yet no bill has been brought to this parliament to consider how those arrangements could be permanently put in place, which is particularly odd. There has been no detail released and there has been no consultation on what those arrangements might be. We are still waiting.

We had some vague promises last sitting week from the Attorney or perhaps even the sitting week before. It might have been a month now that we have been hearing about potential changes. But still no detail has come out. Then on 4 January this year, some five months ago, InDaily reported, 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 his 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.'

Before the Parafield cluster, which was in the middle of November, from memory, the government was already looking at how to put in place a so-called return to cabinet decision-making in government, but we are still six months down the track and no decisions have been made. There is nothing on the table to make substantive changes. While the opposition has been supporting the government's legislative agenda at every stage through this pandemic, the Liberal Party has not even been giving itself support during this.

The bill gives no reprieve to the State Coordinator, who has worked in those very two substantial jobs for more than a year now. There is no clear plan for what should happen in the next stage of this pandemic or the next major crisis we face. There is no proposal for how the government can deal with borders and directions, other than continuing with the State Coordinator being in control under the Emergency Management Act. There is nothing about elected officials having a role in the process because currently the only role of the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the health minister is that of appearing at press conferences. They do not have any decision-making roles in relation to any of these directions at all.

It is worth looking at the proposal that originally went to the Liberal party room, which we know was on 1 March 2021. It is probably unusual that the opposition historically gets copies of party room discussions from the government, but this is the world of the minority government we live in. The minister was listed as Vickie Chapman MP, the Attorney-General, and it said:

2. Those provisions that are to be permanently enacted are considered essential for managing the COVID-19 pandemic and other emergencies in the future, and also to modernise some practices in South Australia...
3. This is especially important as the State Government looks to move away from responding to COVID-19 within the emergency management framework.

At another time, back in March, the Premier was telling his own party room that they were looking to move away from the emergency management framework. We have gone from 1 March to the end of May and there is still no movement along those lines.

Very clearly, the recommendation was to support the introduction of the bill that sitting week. That did not happen because the Attorney was rolled. Very clearly her proposal, said to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004 to clarify and extend the powers of the State Coordinator in a major emergency, listed a very significant number of those changes that would be made and included the top dot point: 'To issue a direction that applies to persons generally throughout the State.' That is the key provision missing from this legislation after there was dissent inside the government over the Attorney-General's proposal.

We have a copy of the original draft which the Attorney had circulated, which had that provision included in it but which no longer exists here in the bill that we are now discussing in the

parliament. That was listed under what was clause 7, which was to delete subsection (3) and substitute:

- (3) The State Co-ordinator (or a delegate of the State Co-ordinator) may give a direction or make a requirement under this section that applies to persons generally throughout the State.

That no longer exists in the legislation that the Attorney-General is promoting here, even though she said to her own party room that it was essential for the operation and management of COVID-19 in South Australia that that be included.

So we have a legislative proposal that the Attorney was rolled on, and we have proposals that have been circulating within government for more than six months as to how they are going to manage the moving away from the Emergency Management Act, as the Attorney said in her paper. That has not appeared in the parliament, it has not been brought to the public's attention and there has been no debate about what those proposals are. We do not know what the problem is that has caused that lack of progress for over six months, and we still face a very real threat. Clearly, we still face issues in our medi-hotel program.

I think it is startling to South Australians that we currently do not have 100 per cent of the people who work in medi-hotels vaccinated but that in New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and other states they are all vaccinated—100 per cent of people who work in those hotels are vaccinated—yet in South Australia the latest advice we heard this morning was that it is in the order of 85 per cent.

We have had our second leakage now from the Playford Hotel and it is causing significant issues across the border. That could easily have caused significant issues in South Australia. We have a government that is refusing calls from experts around the country to do away with hotel quarantine and to establish permanent quarantine facilities. We have been calling for that since November.

We have written to the Prime Minister, and we have written to the Premier, and put on the table the need to establish those permanent facilities. If we had been listened to back in November, we may well have had facilities opening now, but instead we are using decades-old hotels throughout the central business district of Adelaide.

Some of these hotels are 30 or 40 years old and they clearly do not have the ventilation required to make sure that they are appropriately safe. We still do not have the private security guards and other staff in the hotels vaccinated, despite the fact that the vaccine program has been running since February and we are now at the end of May. So there are some very clear issues that have not been addressed.

We clearly need the ability to use QR codes for the foreseeable future, as long as the pandemic is a risk. We absolutely support that. We absolutely support the need for restrictions where the health advice dictates that they be in place. You have seen from us a very different response to that than most other state oppositions around the country. We have supported all of those health restrictions that have had to be put in place, as we have supported all of the legislation. But clearly there are risks in terms of hotel quarantine that we have not seen an appropriate response to.

Certainly, this is the responsibility of the minister. We know that the hotel quarantine program is under one of the deputy chief executives. In fact, up until recently it was under the chief nurse of the state, then a deputy chief executive of SA Health, then the Chief Executive of SA Health and then the Minister for Health. So it was a different management process from how other restrictions have been managed by the State Coordinator and the Chief Public Health Officer.

This is in the government's ability (what they have left as a non-COVID management cabinet government) to make provisions, to make budget decisions and to make provisions so that we have safer quarantine arrangements. That has not happened in South Australia. We have other states that are putting on the table very substantial proposals to the commonwealth for permanent facilities that would be much more able to safely manage people arriving from overseas. We have not had that proposal here; in fact, the Premier scoffed at such proposals when they were raised in November.

This legislation will have our support through this house, but I think there are some very important questions that we need to get answers to in the committee stage from the Attorney-General in relation to this debate.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:33): I acknowledge the contribution by the opposition and their indication of qualified support for the bill. I just wish to make a couple of observations in relation to the matters raised and any particular concerns as to the initiatives that are proposed under the permanency measures can be explored in committee.

To be absolutely clear, the Emergency Management Act sets out a regime for the coordination of an emergency. It also sets out incident procedures and catastrophic incident procedures but, in relation to emergency management, there is a declaration process, there is a coordinator appointment and there is a provision as to who makes the directions and how that is to occur, largely, and the obligation of the coordinator and his or her authorised officers for its implementation and enforcement. As has been mentioned, there are various committee processes and advisory roles that sit around that structure.

I want to make it absolutely clear that cabinet government continues. One thing the member continues to repeat in this house is the assertion that the governance of the state is under the coordinator. The Emergency Management Act itself, which I would have thought the member would be familiar with, since he was, I think, an adviser to ministers at the time it was created in this parliament, actually sets out that the determination of a declaration is by cabinet and by the Governor, in fact, and it can only be extended for a period of 28 days.

The overall supervision of the structure that is to be applied for the purposes of the act is a declaration process not by the police commissioner, not by Professor Nicola Spurrier, not by this parliament, but by the cabinet in its advice to the Governor. I just make that point. Indeed, regularly since March 2020 that process has occurred where there is an issuing of a decision of cabinet to the Governor with a request that it be endorsed. That is the process that continues.

Around that, this parliament has been asked from time to time to make a decision, usually in three-monthly bites, if I can colloquialise it in that way, on what extra measures we might need to make either in the relaxation and/or modification of laws that enable us to continue to function in the community in a law-abiding way within the envelope of living with a pandemic. That has been an important role of the parliament and we appreciate the parliament's not only capacity but willingness to deal with this as promptly as has been required to deal with this international pandemic.

From time to time, there have been indications by the Premier and our government of the desire to move out of emergency management and, indeed, for our whole community to move forward into the phase of economic recovery. This is after a very substantial input of money and support to our citizens, and that has come from all levels of government, to get back to normal, whatever normal is going to be in the future.

There is no question that, from time to time, even that process has been interrupted by circumstance. Last year, pre Christmas, we had the Parafield cluster. It sent us into a circumstance where we needed to immediately trace what might have been a disastrous outcome of contagion from that incident. Indeed, it was the proposal at that stage that everyone stay at home for six days, except in very limited circumstances, and that we try to trace these people.

Within a couple of days I think something like 4,000 people had been traced. It all worked and we were able to be reassured that there had been an identification of the likely people who would need to be tested, that matters were under control, and in fact we were all let out after three days—great. I suppose that was our first experience of having to deal with an immediate response requiring a lockdown, which, thankfully, in South Australia has been rare, unlike in other states where there have been very substantial periods of lockdown.

Only last weekend, I had some friends come over from Melbourne. It was the first time they had left the state for 17 months and they were pretty pleased to get out, I might say. Nevertheless, Victoria has had a pretty shocking set of circumstances. We, of course, right from the beginning of this pandemic have had our health and our professional people assisting Victoria to try to deal with some of the difficulties they have had.

Over in Western Australia, they have also been blighted by lots of situations that I would describe as fairly extreme responses to their situation. That is a matter for their government and their people to make those decisions, but I note Mr Clive Palmer, who is probably well known to most people, is on his third High Court challenge on the restrictions that Western Australia has imposed. I think he started with Queensland and lost there. He went to Western Australia, challenged there and lost the first case. He is now challenging the very legislation that the Western Australian Labor government has introduced, ostensibly to protect its citizens and restrict their movement and restrict others from coming to the state, and that is under challenge in the High Court as we speak.

In fact, just recently I instructed our Solicitor-General for us to be no longer participatory in that litigation. We will watch and observe and see what the High Court does with it. It just indicates to us the need to learn from other states' actions. We follow very carefully where there have been successes and we learn from where there have not been. Something that has been very clear to us all through this is that, as a state government, we need to assist our authorities or State Coordinator or authorised officers or public health advisers, etc., to ensure that, in the process of the drafting and implementation of directions, we do not overstep the mark.

We do not want our state to end up in the High Court and have lots of legal costs, etc. We want to be very clear that we will have minimum but necessary imposition on our citizens, whether that be movement, distancing or attendance at functions and the like. We are trying to have a fairly light touch, as it would be, legally to ensure that our citizens are not unreasonably restricted in any aspect of the lifestyle, employment, family life or attendance at school, etc. These are all very key for our government to be sure that we are doing everything we can to protect our people but within the envelope of minimal interference or restriction.

From visits I made last week to the Northern Territory and New South Wales, and indeed the Premier also was in New South Wales, I think it is fair to say that we are doing pretty well relative to some of the places we have visited. I think we should be very proud of the support we have had from South Australians to assist all levels of government that operate in this state. Indeed, I acknowledge the work of the Coordinator and Professor Spurrier, who with their respective teams have done an outstanding job of keeping us safe.

Secondly, this year there have been occasions when we felt, with the rollout of vaccinations and the like, we would again be moving towards recovery to normality in South Australia, as everyone is looking at across Australia. Sadly, overseas it is a very different situation. Thousands of people are still dying every day in other countries, so we are pretty lucky here, unquestionably, but we are still looking to try to have some economic survival and recovery, and that has been a mission of both the federal and state governments around the country, supported by our local government structures as well.

I make this point: if we do have an outbreak as in Victoria, for example—another five cases; I think it was four overnight and another one this morning—we need to be conscious again of the potential severity of the contamination or the expansion of that contagion within those envelopes. We have to be fairly careful. We have not had another Parafield cluster in South Australia, but it could happen, so we have to be conscious of that.

I note the comments made in relation to the provision of quarantine facilities in our hotels. I wish to place on record my appreciation to those who operate hotels in South Australia who volunteered their premises in the early days to be able to make them available for quarantine purposes. Obviously, there was minimal interstate travel at those times, and certainly overseas travel was shut down as well, so there was an opportunity, I suppose, for them to say that these facilities were available. They came to the government to say, 'We are prepared to be on the list, to make ourselves available for this service, and we will sign up to that.' I firstly want to thank them for doing that.

Secondly, it provided us with a model that I think will stand us in good stead. If there is an area of contamination, whether it is in a prison or an aged-care home, a boarding school or a hospital, we can decant those who are positive into a separate facility. That is not the same model that was adopted in New South Wales. They had a different view. If they had an outbreak in a prison—luckily we did not have any, but they did have some—they would not decant them into another facility. Their model was to take them into a unit or a wing within the prison facility to place them in isolation.

So there are different models around Australia, but in our case we proceeded down this way. We thank those who provided that service and indeed all the health professionals and security officers who provided services and all the small businesses around these hotels that were providing services to those who were working in those facilities. A big thank you to those in South Australia who provided that service.

The vaccination program is underway and we are, of course, receiving our share. Unsurprisingly, this is a fairly highly sought after product in the world at the moment and organisations, such as the World Health Organization, have been very clear in their messaging that obviously we need to share this vaccination with the rest of the world. I think it is fair to say that we are probably in the category of the least in danger. We are not losing people who are dying every day or having tens of thousands of people a day—or in India hundreds of thousands of people a day—who are catching this virus and contaminating others in their family and their immediate community.

We are in a lucky space. Notwithstanding that, we have secured and negotiated and are receiving our allocated share. We are undertaking the distribution through the commonwealth government and its application is via medical practitioners and hospitals under federal and state distribution respectively, so it is on its way out. As members would have read in the paper today, young people in the country are going to be the next cohort to receive their vaccinations.

I do not know about other members, but I receive on a very regular basis from the younger generation their desire to have their shot. They are probably a little bit less risk averse than older people, who might have some other comorbidity and are a bit concerned about their health in relation to it. Again, that is probably unsurprising given, frankly, some rather bizarre media coverage over blood clotting and so on. I think it is totally irresponsible. Caleb Bond highlighted this in an article.

I was at a dinner of the Australian Medical Association (SA division) on Saturday night, as was the member who just spoke. Leigh Sales from the ABC gave a very interesting speech about the work she is undertaking and a book she has just published—I think her third book—in which she highlights the media's attention in relation to issues such as blood clotting and concerns that have been raised and focusing in on something that is very unrepresentative of either the severity or the extent of what is being talked about. It has the effect of unnerving people and it has had the effect, clearly, of causing some concern and, as a result, some will of course elect not to have the vaccination as nothing is compulsory about it.

Overwhelmingly, certainly in my assessment, young people are saying, 'Let us line up. We are ready to go. We want to travel. We want to play sport. We want to be able to interact with our friends. We want to be able to attend functions. We want to be able to dance. We want to be able to do all these other things.' Probably, like most young people, they think they are fairly impervious to any kind of threat to their wellbeing. Nevertheless, they are very keen to get on with it, so our government has initiated access to vaccinations for over 16 year olds in country regions and, of course, according to the program that will continue to be applied.

It is extraordinary work being done under the leadership of the Hon. Stephen Wade, who is our Minister for Health. I thank him and his health department for that program, together with the ongoing advice in relation to public health recommendations from Professor Nicola Spurrier.

The particular aspects that are otherwise covered in the bill for continued permanency in future emergencies I will not dwell on because I think members may have some other questions in relation to the particular application of those. I will be happy to hold those over to the committee. Otherwise, I thank the opposition for their indication of support.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

The CHAIR: We have 23 clauses and a schedule. There are amendments on file and, we understand, more to come. I invite questions on clause 1.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: It is funny: just as we were starting this committee stage I got a notification on my phone from the COVIDSafe app: 'To improve the performance of COVIDSafe, open the app and check your internet or mobile data.' It feels like a long time ago that we were talking about the COVIDSafe app, which apparently never really detected anybody, at least in South Australia.

There will be a number of questions in relation to this bill, some of which I have flagged in the second reading stage, but firstly I wonder if the Attorney can very clearly tell us where exactly the proposals are that have been talked about for the past six or seven months to move out of the Emergency Management Act and into a new proposal, a new management regime? What is being discussed? Why is there still no proposal that has been brought to the parliament or released publicly from the government?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think I made it clear in the response I just gave that there are continuing matters that are under consideration and, for the reasons I pointed out, the Emergency Management Act model should continue to apply. That has been occurring in March and May this year, and indeed before Christmas last year, which are the consequences I have indicated as to how that is applying.

Mr PICTON: So we have no answer to what is being considered, no answer to why nothing has been released publicly or brought to the parliament, no answer to what the issues have been that have been causing concern in terms of releasing this, given that it has now been since before the Parafield cluster, which was the middle of November, when apparently these discussions were taking place, according to the Premier. The mind boggles.

Perhaps the Attorney can answer: in relation to this legislation, what did the State Coordinator, Grant Stevens, and/or the Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier, request or provide comments on in relation to this legislation before the parliament now?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Both were supportive of the initiatives.

Mr PICTON: That is a very short and sharp answer; however, clearly when we have two versions of this legislation, it is hard to know what they were supportive of. Were they supportive of the legislation that was brought to the party room or the one that was subsequently changed and brought to the parliament? Can the Attorney outline exactly what provisions in relation to that bill that was brought to the party room were taken out before this was brought to the parliament?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In short, throughout the development of this bill, Professor Nicola Spurrier and Commissioner Grant Stevens were supportive of the initiatives in the bill, including the one that is before you.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr PICTON: I am just going to follow up on that because I asked the Attorney what the differences were between the bill that was brought to the party room and the bill that is before the parliament now. What was in that bill that is not currently in this legislation? The Attorney did not answer.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I just refer to my previous answer.

Mr PICTON: Your previous answer did not answer that question. Are there any provisions in the draft legislation that you took to the party room that are not in the legislation that is before the house now and, if so, what are those provisions?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have made it clear: we presented a bill to the parliament and there has been the development of that. At all material times, Professor Spurrier and Commissioner Grant Stevens supported the initiatives throughout.

Mr PICTON: The provisions that were in the bill that you took to the party room—which I understood to include changes to the powers of the State Coordinator in relation to issuing a direction across the state—were those provisions that are not in this legislation supported by the State Coordinator and the Chief Public Health Officer?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot assist the member any further.

The CHAIR: If I can make a comment here, we are actually dealing with the amendment bill as it is presented, member for Kaurna.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr PICTON: Why has the Attorney-General instructed the Solicitor-General to withdraw from a High Court case as an intervening party in relation to, I believe, Mr Palmer's challenge in relation to borders?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We have been involved through a number of the court cases in South Australia because it related to the very pertinent issue about the directions powers of other states, Queensland and Western Australia in particular. There was also a case that was challenging the right of movement of a person in Victoria. I think it was a restaurateur who made a challenge in relation to directions powers there.

Largely, we have had a watching brief. We have been at the table to deal with that, but the remaining Palmer challenges—if I can put them in that category—that I am aware of relate to the validity of Western Australian legislation, which, if I were to try to describe it, is much more penetrating and restrictive than in other action that has been taken around the country. That is a matter for the Western Australian government and no doubt they will rise or fall based on what the High Court says about the validity of that legislation. But Mr Palmer, as I understand it, is suggesting that it is ultra vires in relation to the power that is purported to be exercised in that legislation.

Mr PICTON: You do not believe that we have any view, as a state government, in terms of our constitutional powers, that would be appropriate to be brought before the High Court in relation to what is a challenge to a state law in Western Australia, which, presumably, if it goes bad might impact upon our legislative ability and our constitutional powers in South Australia?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If it did, I think the Solicitor-General would bring it to my attention, and he has not, and he has recommended that we withdraw, so we have.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 4, after line 21 [clause 5, inserted section 53]—Insert:

- (3) Subsection (1) does not apply to a meeting or transaction, or meeting or transaction of a class, prescribed by the regulations.

This amendment to clause 5 inserts subsection (3). For the information of members, new subsection (1) in clause 5 of the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021 provides:

- (1) If an Act requires that a meeting occur or...transaction take place that requires 2 or more persons to be physically present, the requirement—

is met if the meeting or transaction occurs remotely using AV or audio means. This amendment inserts the new subsection (3), as I have just read out, to allow certain meetings or transactions, or certain meetings or transactions of a particular class, to be excluded from the operation of these provisions by regulation.

Similar provisions to new subsection (1) in clause 5 have been in practice under the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020 over the last year. In some cases, a review will be undertaken to ascertain how these provisions have been working in practice before the meetings will be allowed to occur via audiovisual means on a permanent basis.

In the case of local councils, the Office of Local Government is concerned to fully understand the implications of allowing meetings to occur electronically, particularly given the strong community expectation that such meetings be accessible to them and to allow council discussions to be

transparent and well managed within the chamber. There is also a need to maintain a high level of accountability and integrity for such meetings, such as the proper management of conflicts of interest.

This amendment will allow local councils to be excluded from the operation of this provision while the review is undertaken. On the basis of the advice I have received outlining those concerns, I present this amendment for your consideration.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9.

Mr PICTON: This is another matter that I flagged in my second reading speech. On what basis does the protection from liability need to be extended to additional acts as the Attorney-General is now proposing?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If I can speak generally, the clause has the effect of protection of all good faith actions from liability. We are talking about those who are acting in good faith and not with any mischievous purpose. I should also mention that I am advised that a person who mistakenly acts beyond their powers but genuinely thinks they are empowered or obliged to do something would be acting in good faith.

On the advice I have received, these are examples of where the provisions might operate: where there was a direction of the State Coordinator that cafes and restaurants can only serve takeaway, if a place was wrongfully shut down the proprietor could not claim economic loss from the government. If it is found that the police officer had bad faith in decision-making, this clause would not protect the police officer. For the benefit of the member asking the question, police officers are authorised officers under the act.

Another example is where there is a failure to close a school which results in a caregiver catching the virus and in turn results in a reduced ability to care for a child which is then said to impact the child psychologically but also impact the child's long-term ability to achieve their full potential with loss of income earning capacity. That is drawing a long bow, isn't it? Anyway, that is an example. This may not manifest for many years. Again, that is another example that was given.

Finally, another example is a direction to close a type of business which results in a person losing work which some time down the track results in long-term unemployment and psychological detriment. As long as these actions are done in good faith, then the provisions of the protection from liability will operate under this clause.

Mr PICTON: Why does the government view it as necessary to make the immunity clause retrospective, which certainly in our interpretation could mean that there could be not just an impact later but also a government decision or regulation made later which would have this retrospective immunity power applied to it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The retrospectivity, in a sense, introduces a protection for things that have occurred during the course of this pandemic. Of course, that has been really noticeable since February last year or, for the application of this act, some of these obligations and directions that have been issued and statutory impositions have been essentially since March last year.

There may well be instances, such as I have given, which have already occurred but which may not manifest themselves in any kind of claim or support for damages and the like until some years to come. Yes, it is retrospective in the sense that it is to cover any acts of good faith in respect of the protection that is granted during the course of this pandemic and during the course of the operation of the act.

Mr PICTON: What kinds of actions has the government taken that it reasonably expects could give rise to claims against the government and why aren't the existing liability measures that we already have sufficient to cover those?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have just given you three. I suppose I could try to think about some others. In relation to any of the directions that have been given, which have very often been

things like you cannot dance—although I do not suppose you would have many damages or liability out of not being allowed to dance.

But say, for example, there had been a restriction on the number of people who could attend a funeral or a wedding and there were cancellation costs, as a government, we have been trying to assist people who have had some pecuniary impost as a result of all the restrictions and so on that have been imposed. But from time to time a number of these directions would have had a direct impact on somebody's capacity to earn income, receive a benefit and so on. There could be a number of them.

In any event, we want to make it absolutely clear that, if you are acting in good faith, you will be protecting against liability in relation to that. It is not uncommon, of course, for the Crown or others to have protection. I am advised that the difference between the existing provision in the EM Act and the new provision is firstly that it protects from liability under the COVID act into the future when the current provision expires—so, that is obviously important. The current COVID specific provision under the EM act and the Public Health Act applies to the Crown. This one applies to individuals as well. Thirdly, this provision ensures consistency from liability under the EM Act, the COVID act and the Public Health Act. My excellent adviser here has given me that comprehensive response.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 13 passed.

Clause 14.

Mr PICTON: This is in relation to visits by the community visitor. I could have asked similar questions in relation to the Mental Health Act as well. But to cover it off once, we now have a standard that is being set that if, in the opinion of the Principal Community Visitor, it is not reasonably practical for a community visitor to physically visit or enter the relevant premises—so it is quite a low standard—now, via audiovisual or other electronic means, the visit could occur.

So the question to the Attorney is: does she not see that allowing this very broad use of audiovisual or other electronic means for inspections of facilities could create the risk that visitors may not detect things that they otherwise might have seen if they were physically present on the premises?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is no doubt that the Community Visitor Scheme, which provides for the physical attendance at mental health facilities—and has now broadened to a number of other areas of responsibility—has been very important. In fact, from our side of politics from opposition, we fought very hard under the Mental Health Act for the establishment of the Community Visitor Scheme. There was an amendment. I think the Minister for Education at the time was Minister Lomax-Smith, and ultimately she conceded to having it incorporated and made provision for it.

Firstly, we are very conscious of the significance of this scheme and it has now been, as I say, expanded in the disability area and in relation to other vulnerable people in our community. So it is a very important program. Secondly, our Public Advocate, Anne Gale, who is responsible to me as Attorney-General in my department, is currently the Principal Community Visitor in South Australia. As Public Advocate and team leader, she and her team operate as community visitors and deal with vulnerable people every day. We applaud her work, especially during the pandemic. It has been a real challenge.

In fact, I have valued Ms Gale's advice, together with people such as Professor Richard Bruggeman. These people have been very valuable in advising the government and our public health department on how we might best deal with vulnerable people in these situations, particularly those who might be in a mental health institution who suffer a disability, have age-related dementia or other frailties that cause them to be in that position.

Let me say from the outset that I have every confidence in Ms Gale as both our Public Advocate and the Principal Community Visitor supervising this scheme. I do not see this as broad at all. She is the one who makes that determination. The act provides for it, and I have every confidence in her doing it.

Secondly, it is to be done in a circumstance where she is satisfied that there are risks—I paraphrase this now—in relation to continuing to do a physical attendance. For example, a person

doing the inspection could go to the home of a person living with disability where carers are present and may carry the virus with them. The last thing we would want to do is add to the burden of those who are vulnerable in our community by being contaminated with this virus. That is the last thing we would want to happen.

Mr Picton: This is post COVID—you want it as permanent.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: These are permanent measures in an emergency—not forever, anywhere, any time when you feel like it. It is in an emergency. I am being told it is even more general in the circumstances that are there. So it is still specified in the act.

Mr Picton: It's not just in an emergency, so you are wrong.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No. I beg your pardon, it is specified in the act. Let's be clear: it is not just anywhere, any time when you feel like—it is as specified in the act. I do have every confidence in relation to Ms Gale's capacity to operate this scheme, and I am very confident that she will continue to do what is required.

She also reports to me regularly in relation to the inspections she does under the Mental Health Act, for example, for which there are mandatory attendances per year. Also, in relation to disability, some attendances are mandatory and some are optional and she has a program of how that occurs. She reports to me regularly. She not only reports to me regularly when it has occurred but she also reports when required in a circumstance where it is either on the phone or in some AVL capacity.

I have also made it clear, and she has supported this, that where there has been a telephone inquiry or somebody has walked around with a camera so that there can be an inspection in a non-personal attendance way, there is a personal visit as soon as practicable after that.

Mr Picton: That's not in the legislation.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I know it's not. The member shouts out, 'That's not in the legislation.' No, I am just telling you why I have such confidence in Ms Gale as our Public Advocate and Principal Community Visitor. This is what she is doing extra.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The member for Kaurna will cease interjecting. He has been persistent in that during the Attorney's response.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Kaurna, do not argue with the Chair, please. You will have two more opportunities to ask questions on this clause. Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Chair. I have every confidence in Ms Gale in relation to her role in this regard. Of course, to date, in any event, there has been no indication of some weakness, that is, that there has been some unidentified event or circumstance that has not been viewed as a result of not having a personal attendance, which has subsequently been identified as a weakness in that process.

For all those reasons, I think it is not unreasonable that we maintain the opportunity to do this so that at the very least there is some continued scrutiny in relation to the protection of these people in these circumstances. I am very confident of the model that operates.

Mr PICTON: That was absolutely shocking, in that the Attorney-General just completely misinterpreted her own legislation and gave advice to the parliament that was 100 per cent wrong, that this only applied in relation to an emergency such as COVID-19. That is completely wrong. This applies forever. That is what she is proposing here.

Just as a bit of a hint I even read out the section to her, where the Principal Community Visitor believes 'it is not reasonably practical for a community visitor to physically visit or enter the premises'. That is going to apply forever into the future, whether there is a public health or an emergency management emergency in place.

It is shocking that the Attorney-General clearly has not read her own legislation and has not been properly briefed on it. Thank goodness she was able to get some briefing whilst speaking to correct her complete error in relation to that. It does make me wonder whether, if she is not across the detail of this, she actually has thought through the fact that we are now making this permanent, this is not just in relation to COVID, and it will be in place forevermore.

Further to that there is also an additional clause: (a) if the Principal Community Visitor deems that it should be done by Skype or the phone or other electronic means, so presumably just audio would suffice under that, and (b) the visit or inspection occurs in any circumstances prescribed by regulations. I would ask the Attorney, and perhaps she can get briefed before trying to answer this one: what are the situations that are considered in relation to 52B(1)(b) where the visit would be under regulations? What types of circumstances are envisaged for those regulations where the government would be mandating that this type of inspection can occur in certain situations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In relation to 'visit or inspection occurs in any other circumstances prescribed by regulations', as the member would be well aware, for example, we have a new cohort of people who are under NDIS plans and they are under consideration as well, so there will be changing definitions in the services that are provided by the Community Visitor Scheme that have expanded already since the Mental Health Act amendments in relation to disability and now we have others.

I suspect that, as a result of the royal commissions in relation to aged care and disability, which is still pending, there may even be more. This is a moving area of supervision and security. I think the public are looking for some support for those vulnerable people in our community so they are supervised, and we may need to make that prescription by regulation to cover that.

While I am on it, the member might also like to read subclause (6), which sets out the obligation of the community visitor in ensuring what information has to be reported on a publicly accessible website and updated on at least a quarterly basis, and it sets out all that material. I would urge the member to read it.

Mr PICTON: I am not quite sure that that answer would even be correct because it is talking about the types of inspections that occur (i.e., aged care, NDIS), as opposed to, 'These are the circumstances in which a non-physical but an audiovisual inspection would take place.' I do not want to answer your question for you but, presumably, if there were some sort of emergency, that would be the type of thing that you would prescribe by regulations. Clearly, the Attorney is not across that either.

During the COVID emergency, the Attorney did touch on the fact that she believed that she had not heard of any problems, sort of 'see no evil, hear evil', in terms of any problems that occurred in relation to only doing audiovisual inspections so far. Of course, it would be difficult to know whether things had been detected or not.

Has there actually been any evaluation done though? Are we just taking people's word for it that there was nothing that should have been picked up that had not been picked up, or have we actually done any study or any evaluation on the audiovisual inspections to see what sorts of risks were identified? Was there anything that was not picked up? Are there any issues with that approach going forward? Are we now making this permanent, or are we just hoping for the best?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure if there has been a review of the Principal Community Visitor's process, other than the fact that she has to give me regular reports and identifies in those circumstances if she has done some audiovisual inspection as distinct from a personal attendance. Sometimes it is because the programmed community visitor is sick themselves or obviously is in a vulnerable circumstance and so they then do the audiovisual and those sorts of things; from time to time, she has reported those.

But as to a review of that, the only immediate sort of oversight of the people vulnerable in this situation I think is by Mr Bruggemann, where there is a circumstance of someone being kept in a detention circumstance, and you might recall that there is quite an extensive provision in our COVID laws that has applied—

Mr Picton: This is different.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I understand that, but I am just explaining that where there is someone who, for example, is kept separated from others because they might not understand or appreciate the significance of touching or hugging other people, they might be kept in a separate room or area to other people in the residence. This is the sort of thing where we have tried to make sure, as legislators here in this parliament, that we keep the protections there but also minimise the restrictions. We need to keep our people safe, including people who are vulnerable, but also be able to protect them.

In terms of the inspection process in any of these entities, whether it is a mental health hospital or generally in a hospital or in a prison or in an aged-care facility, vulnerable people are in lots of these places and we need to be able to maintain, as much as we can, impromptu attendances and obviously the capacity to access and see what is going on. Although we do have the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner, the Ombudsman, the Guardian for Children and Young People (Penny Wright), the head of the children's training centre, the children's court—there are myriad people who have a role, usually in charge of some kind of integrity body, and who have inspectorate powers and access entitlements to a number of these people who are in vulnerable situations.

We have a lot of different agencies that have different roles, depending on what the institution is or the facility and, as much as we can, we want to be able to maintain that so that we do not end up with people in those circumstances who might be harmed in some way. In respect of this specifically, we expect that there is compliance with the legal obligations in relation to inspecting these places and, as I have indicated, we expect a follow-up in a circumstance where there has not been able to be a physical inspection and, to the best of my knowledge, that is occurring.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 to 21 passed.

Clause 22.

Mr DULUK: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Duluk-1]

Page 10, lines 30 to 33—Delete subclauses (3) and (4).

I will speak briefly. My concern mainly comes out of the power to require detention, which is of course in the South Australian Public Health Act 2011 and is what these clauses seek to amend. From the briefing we had with the minister's staff previously, I have not been satisfied that there has been enough need granted to extend the time limit for someone to be in detention under this section of the act from 48 hours to 72 hours. Obviously, I am looking to keep the status quo in my amendment and I thank the opposition for their support in this as well.

Mr PICTON: I will just make some brief comments in relation to this amendment. This has just been brought to our attention by the member for Waite. I think it is worth making note of a couple of things. One is that this is in relation to the period of notification. This is not in relation to the time period or the manner in which somebody can be detained but is merely saying that if you are being detained you have to be notified within 48 hours as to why you are being detained. The government are proposing to change that so you could go 71½ hours in detention without even being told why you are being detained.

This is something that we are prepared to support through this house. If there is some compelling reason that is brought to our attention as to why that needs to be in place, then we are happy to consider it through the houses, should this amendment be successful. But we certainly have not heard that from our briefings to date and would therefore be supportive of this amendment to make sure that people get notified when they are being detained, as has been in the Public Health Act since it passed a decade ago.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I thank the member for Waite for the reference to this. Essentially, it is to propose that the 48-hour time frame be maintained for obligation of reporting as distinct from the proposed 72 hours. I am advised that this is to accommodate where there is a

multiple number of parties who have to be reported on and so that is why the time frame is proposed to be extended.

I am also advised that, in relation to the amendment to section 77 under clause 22, apparently we are no longer progressing with subclauses (3) and (4), which also moves 48 to 72, because this multiple factor of parties does not apply. So that is unnecessary for subclauses (3) and (4) in this bill and only seeks to expand it to 72 hours' notification time in subclause (1). On that basis and on the advice I have received, we would oppose this amendment, but you can be assured that we are not taking any issue with the 48 hours remaining in the current subsections (6)(a) and (b).

Mr DULUK: Unless I have misinterpreted what the Attorney says, my amendment looks to deal with section 77(6)(b)(i) and section 77(8a), which are amended in clause 22(3) and (4). That is indeed what we are seeking to remove. I think that is what the Attorney is saying and that her advice does not have a problem with this issue. Attorney, for your clarity, are you looking to leave section 77(3a) at 72 hours?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In short, I think the answer in relation to lines 30 to 33—that is, subclause (3) and subclause (4), which is what you are seeking to delete—is that we are happy with that, but if you are progressing it under subclause (1)—

Mr DULUK: No.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No?

Mr DULUK: No, I am not.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Right. No problem.

Amendment carried.

Mr DULUK: Attorney, subclause (2) is seeking to insert new subsection (5a), can you give us some examples of when these detentions may be imposed by the Chief Public Health Officer?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot give you any answer other than the only one that I think is relevant to this that I am aware of. You might recall that at the beginning of the pandemic concerns there was a young woman, I think a university student, who was returning from overseas and her parents were here. It turned out that she was positive. I think from memory she was Chinese born.

She was treated, and her parents were at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I think I am recalling this correctly. I am getting a bit of a nod here. They said, 'Well, look, we're not staying.' My understanding is that there was some question at the time about whether there was sufficient power under the public health laws for the authorised person—this is the Chief Public Health Officer or an authorised person, and we are under the Public Health Act now—to hold them there.

I do not know what happened in the end, except that, as I understand it, they did stay. I am not sure how that happened, but anyway. They might have been told that they would have to stay there and they did. In any event, the situation was dealt with on that occasion. Obviously, the Chief Public Health Officer, or at least the person who was in charge at the hospital, considered that there was a risk that the young woman who had the virus, or at least who was suspected of having the virus at that stage, could well have contaminated her parents and that they were then at risk of leaving the hospital and spreading it elsewhere.

That is the only time I can recall. This is before the Emergency Management Act powers were invoked and we were actually operating under the public health law and under the act that we are now proposing to amend. That is the only one that I can recall where it had been raised as to the extent of the authority of a person to actually hold that person in the hospital on that occasion.

Mr DULUK: With respect to the insertion of subsection (5a), at what point will it interface with section 79 of the South Australian Public Health Act, where it states:

If the Chief Public Health Officer considers it necessary to do so, the Chief Public Health Officer may apply to a magistrate—

(a) for the issue of a warrant for the apprehension by an authorised person—

Will the insertion of section 77(5a) override that need for a warrant at all?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not necessarily. Using the same scenario, had the parents left the hospital, then it may be necessary for them to issue the warrant. This really relates to the fact that they are there: they are on the site or they are within an area where they can be restrained or apprehended. The only other time I can think of, in the time I have been here in the parliament, is some years ago when a group of schoolchildren returned from China. I cannot remember whether it was the bird flu, but it was one of those flus.

The children were asked to stay at home, not go to school, until they were all checked to see if they might be carriers. The Public Health Act was drawn upon for an indication of what to do. One of the schools on the trip was from my electorate and, as you would expect from a school in my electorate, they were all very willing to comply and they did all the right things and they stayed home. Obviously, they were keen to protect their own, other students, staff, etc., and everyone was happy. After an appropriate time, they were all tested and everything was fine.

That is the sort of situation where I would imagine, had there been a family who just said, 'Well, we're not interested in doing that. We are going on holidays to Victor Harbor and we're leaving,' it might be necessary for the Chief Public Health Officer to exercise the new (5a) if they were already here or, if they had already gone to Victor Harbor, issue the warrant.

Clause as amended passed.

Remaining clause (23), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 18 March 2021.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Mr Chair, I draw your attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Clause 1.

The CHAIR: Both the members for Ramsay and Cheltenham have had three questions on this clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr SZAKACS: My question is around the commencement date and whether there is a view of government to hold off commencement subject to the charter being consulted and drafted, or whether it will commence and then proceed with the administrative work of that charter.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that I am aware of. I would expect, in the first instance, with the preparation of a charter, as for most other legislation where we have a charter, there would be some accommodation of the preparation of that before the implementation of a number of things. But, as the member would be aware, there is quite a considerable amount of material that would otherwise have gone in a charter that is now going into the act. How much is going to be left for the charter, I do not know. I could not really provide you with any further information on what will populate that charter and whether it should in any way impede the implementation of the rest of the legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

The CHAIR: We have an amendment standing in the name of the member for Badcoe. The member for Ramsay is indicating that that amendment will be withdrawn or at least not put.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have some questions regarding the charter. I am curious about the time that you think it will take for the charter to be produced. Perhaps you can detail the consultation you will do regarding the charter.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that this is a project that is to be undertaken by the commission, so it is probably more properly a matter that they be consulted on, as to how they propose to consult on it and how long they think they might take to actually to finalise that. This is not a job for government; this is a charter which is proposed to be for the commission. They should have, and I expect they will be given, support from the department, but it is ultimately a charter that will be prepared. It is their job to do.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Attorney, recently the government called for expressions of interest for commission members in order to have new members of the commission. Given the time line of this process, are we expecting that a charter will not come probably for some time? I am concerned that you are waiting for a new commission to come together. It feels to me that perhaps the charter does not have the urgency that we would be seeking.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, this is something that is being sought. It is being proposed in the legislation. It is intended to be implemented under the supervision of the commission in consultation with the community. My understanding is that the general expectation is that it will be by 22 July 2022.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

The CHAIR: If I could have the committee's attention for a moment, the member for Ramsay has amendment No. 1 standing in her name, which to me appears similar to paragraph (e) of the Attorney-General's amendment. Have you picked up on that, member for Ramsay?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: There is a slight amendment to that. We are going to propose an amendment to the amendment containing the Attorney's proposed change. If that is acceptable, we will not be moving amendment No. 1 [Bettison-1].

The CHAIR: As long as we are clear, that is fine.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [AG-3]—

Page 4, lines 10 to 19—Delete clause 4 and substitute:

4—Parliamentary declaration

The Parliament of South Australia recognises and acknowledges—

- (a) that Aboriginal peoples are South Australia's first peoples and nations, and the traditional owners and occupants of land and waters in South Australia;
- (b) the cultural, linguistic, racial and religious diversity of the people of South Australia;
- (c) that all people have a right to express and celebrate their cultural, linguistic and religious diversity;
- (d) that South Australia's diversity should be reflected in a whole of government approach to policy development, implementation and evaluation;
- (e) that all South Australians should be able to participate in the cultural, economic, political and social life of South Australia to the maximum extent possible;
- (f) that State authorities are responsible for giving effect to principles of multiculturalism in the course of their official functions and responsibilities;
- (g) that all people are entitled to mutual respect and understanding regardless of their background;
- (h) that diversity is an asset and a valuable resource benefitting South Australia;

- (i) that diversity brings richness to the South Australian community;
- (j) the valuable contribution of South Australians from diverse backgrounds to South Australia,

and wishes to promote South Australia as a unified, harmonious and inclusive community.

This amendment is to put in a new clause 4 as published. I indicate that, in line with feedback received from current and previous members of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, we are proposing the parliamentary declaration be reframed to more strongly set the tone of the principles of multiculturalism that will underpin the South Australian multicultural charter when that is developed following the passage of the legislation.

The amended parliamentary declaration is more comprehensive and explicit about the parliament's commitment and intent regarding multiculturalism. The charter, which will give effect to the sentiments behind the parliamentary declaration, will be developed in close consultation with the commission and the community, as I have previously outlined.

Mr SZAKACS: Chair, if I may, for clarification, we will deal with the amendment in the Attorney's name and we will subsequently deal with the amendment that I have moved to the amendment?

The CHAIR: Yes. For clarification, member for Cheltenham, it is a good point you raise. We will at least finish the discussion on the Attorney-General's amendment. Before I put that, you will come in and move your amendment to the amendment. At the moment we are dealing with just the Attorney's amendment. Are there any further questions on that?

Mr SZAKACS: This is a very significant amendment that changes the bill before us. There was a large and very time-consuming consultation process that occurred before this bill came before the house. What has changed, since this has been tabled, that has meant the government has made this amendment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think the member knows full well, and it is that there have been a number of discussions in relation to specifying, in the act, information that would, frankly, otherwise be in the charter. Nevertheless, there seemed to be a desire for this to be specified in the act, and that is precisely what we are doing.

Mr SZAKACS: Who were those conversations and discussions with that you just referred to?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It included the shadow minister and a predecessor.

Mr SZAKACS: Were there any stakeholders who were consulted or not consulted during the consultation process who have raised with you or the government their desire to include these substantive matters in the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure who was not consulted; that is a bit hard to say. However, there have been a number of parties who have, in particular, worked with the Hon. Jing Lee and with the Premier's office. I know I had conversations with the former shadow minister, the member for Badcoe.

I cannot recall whether I specifically had them with the now shadow minister, but in the conversations I have had in that regard with the opposition, under the new leadership, they are consistent with the same conversations I have had previously with Ms Stinson I do not think I can take it any further. There is ongoing conversation with Premier's office representatives and, in particular, the minister assisting, the Hon. Jing Lee.

Mr SZAKACS: I note the persuasive efforts of the member for Ramsay and the member for Badcoe, and it is certainly worth putting on the record my appreciation and our appreciation of the consultation efforts of members of SAMEAC, who have independently and collectively expressed a view about their absence within the consultation process of this reform of the bill in the first place. The endeavours of the opposition on this have been to give voice to the members of the multicultural communities, who have felt silenced or sidelined in their views to include this in the substantive bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will take that as a comment.

The CHAIR: Which the member is quite entitled to make.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In relation to the parliamentary declaration, how do we give effect in the parliament to this declaration? It is a great set of words, which has been amended quite substantially, particularly to include acknowledgement of the Aboriginal people, South Australia's First Peoples and First Nations and the traditional owners and occupants of the lands and waters of South Australia. There was no reference to it previously. Now that we have landed on this set of words, how will we give effect to it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think the member is experienced enough in this house to know that once something is in the statute there is expected to be some compliance. Some of it is not punitive; some of the laws we pass here are to express an intent or, in this case, a declaration of the parliament of the recognition of the diversity in our community. That is precisely what it does, and it is in the statute.

We have different names for different documents like these, such as a charter. We have a public sector charter, we have children's charters, we have all sorts of charters now in modern legislation.

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I know you say that it is a declaration, but I am just saying that, like that, there has been a development in our statutory law of the commitment to certain recognition. In this instance, it is described within a declaration of the parliament.

It is actually much more common in the commonwealth arena in the legislation, and it is very common in relation to our association of signing up to international treaties and other declarations at the level of the United Nations. I do not know if it will help any further, but it is there. The publication of legislation, when it passes this parliament, has a significance to contemporise the intention of the parliament and also the government, where it is to actually enact a number of things, and it is to have an educative value.

It is just like what we are doing in this legislation in moving away from 'ethnic' to dealing with the recognition of 'multicultural' and 'intercultural'. That is part of the contemporary development of this type of legislation. We want this to be a statement that is incorporated in the legislation. It incorporates a number of areas of recognition, including the First Peoples of our state and of course the diversity of the cultural significance of what we enjoy the privilege of in this state.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have a concern that when I read about the submissions from different organisations, different stakeholders, they were very clear that we should have a recognition of Aboriginal peoples in this declaration. I am a little concerned, and I am asking for some clarity as to why that was not in the original proposal in this original bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think that is very obvious. It was proposed that this be developed under the supervision of the commission itself in a charter. Clearly, that conversation has moved on, and there is an expectation that the diversity of our community be considered in the legislation, and that is what we have done. So I do not know how clear I can be about that. We are happy to do it and put it in the bill, and we have.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Is there intention for the Attorney, who has carriage of this bill here, or the Premier or the minister assisting to actually give effect to this declaration: to ask parliamentarians to sign this bill, sign this declaration and make it transparent and open to South Australians?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Indeed, that is sort of the implementation of these things. This is not a declaration of government; this is a declaration of the parliament, and I would hope that every single person in this house of parliament and in the other place actually commits to this, because we are putting in a law, and if this law passes, which we expect it will in one form or other, then we as a government would expect that all of our colleagues here in the parliament will indeed sign up to it. So if they have not got that message, let me be very clear: I expect it to be signed up to, if it is passed.

The CHAIR: Member for Cheltenham, I am conscious of the time, but it might be appropriate for you to move your amendment to the amendment now, and then most likely we will report progress.

Mr SZAKACS: Thank you, Chair. I move to amend the amendment as follows:

After paragraph (j), add the following additional paragraph:

- (k) the contribution that migration, temporary migration and refugee resettlement has made to multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to speak to that at all, member for Cheltenham?

Mr SZAKACS: If I can speak to it and I may seek leave to continue.

The CHAIR: Yes, that is fine.

Mr SZAKACS: This is an important amendment. As has already been the case, the member for Ramsay has indicated that we will not be proceeding with a series of other amendments on this clause; however, in the words of the Attorney, the importance of this clause is a recognition of diversity. It would be improper for this parliament to pass a declaration recognising diversity without recognising the enormous contribution that migration has made to this state.

We have already seen very important amendments moved that recognise that we are all migrants in this state. We are all migrants in this country, and we tread lightly on the lands of First Nations people, who have had a continuous living culture of 60,000 years. However, as we talk about a declaration, talking about the contemporary contribution that migration has brought to this state is profoundly important.

The CHAIR: I am going to interrupt there. You do not need to seek leave to continue. As you have carriage of this amendment, you are able to speak as many times as you wish.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RECOMMENDATIONS OF INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD PROTECTION) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FUND SELECTION AND OTHER SUPERANNUATION MATTERS) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

DISABILITY INCLUSION (RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES - NDIS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***BRIGHTON ROAD**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 121 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.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 5,845 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to remove the Sturt Lions Football Club proposal from the Master Plan for Belair National Park and explore an environmentally sound solution with lower impact recreational activities.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General Report—Probity of the processes for the heavy rail service contract—
Report 9 of 2021 [Ordered to be published]

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Freedom of Information Determination—Shop Trading Hours
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Explosives—Security Sensitive Substances
Public Sector (Data Sharing)—Data Sharing—Relevant Entries

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulation made under the following Act—
Electronic Communications—Government Agency

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—Miscellaneous (No. 3)
Rail Safety National Law (South Australia)—Modification of FOI Act

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)—

Regulation made under the following Act—
Police—Merit Pool

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. D.K.B. Basham)—

Management Plan for the South Australian Commercial Northern Zone Rock Lobster
Fishery—July 2021

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Aquaculture—Fees Notice (No. 2)
Controlled Substances—Fees Notice (No. 2)
Fisheries Management—Fees Notice—General (No. 2)
Forestry—Fees Notice (No. 2)
Industrial Hemp—Fees Notice (No. 2)
Livestock—Fees Notice (No. 2)

Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fees Notice (No. 2)
 Plant Health—Fees Notice (No. 2)
 Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—
 Fees Notice—Food Safety Schemes—Eggs (No. 2)
 Fees Notice—Food Safety Schemes—Meat (No. 2)
 Fees Notice—Food Safety Schemes—Plant Products (No. 2)
 Fees Notice—Food Safety Schemes—Seafood (No. 2)

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw to honourable members' attention the presence in the Speaker's gallery of Annette Hurley, former Deputy Leader of the Australian Labor Party and former member for Napier. Welcome.

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:07): I bring up the 44th report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into the surgical implantation of medical mesh in South Australia'.

Report received.

Question Time

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Premier. Have all South Australian medi-hotel workers received a COVID-19 vaccination? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In the state of Victoria, the state of New South Wales and the state of Western Australia they have policies in place to ensure that every medi-hotel worker is vaccinated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. As he would be aware, we are following the advice of SA Health and, in particular Professor Nicola Spurrier, with regard to our quarantine hotel arrangements. What I can confirm to the house is that we have 100 per cent vaccinated workers within our SA Health clinical workforce in those quarantine hotels. We have 100 per cent of all those people who are working in the Tom's Court Hotel, which is the COVID-positive hotel in South Australia.

I am advised by Dr Emily Kirkpatrick this morning that, as of a couple of weeks ago, about 85 per cent of all workers within the quarantine hotel arrangement in South Australia had been vaccinated. We are strongly encouraging every person in South Australia when they are eligible to go and get that vaccination.

But, as you would be aware, sir, there is turnover within the hospitality sector, so it is perfectly plausible that somebody who is working on a loading dock may not have their full two-shot vaccination administered whilst they are working there. We are constantly looking to make sure that we get as many people in this state vaccinated as possible.

As I said at the outset of my answer, we follow that advice from the Chief Public Health Officer. She is satisfied with the position that we are in at the moment. We are, obviously, always looking to continuously improve, and if there are suggestions that come to us then that is precisely what we will implement.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Why does the government not have a policy in place similar to other states that prohibits workers from performing duties in medi-hotels unless they have received a COVID-19 vaccination?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): As I said in my previous answer, we follow the expert advice that has served South Australia extraordinarily well so far, so I am not actually taking lessons from Victoria or any other jurisdictions, as it turns out: I am taking advice from the experts in South Australia. If those opposite think that they know better than Professor Nicola Spurrier, the police commissioner in South Australia and Tom Dodd, who is running SA Pathology, well, put your hands up, but we have seen exactly and precisely how they ran health in South Australia.

Thank heaven they are not in government at the moment if they were going to be interfering with the science, the evidence, the experts. We are not doing that. The experts are providing that advice and, as I provided in my previous answer: 100 per cent of those people in the Tom's Court Hotel, which is our COVID-positive hotel, have all been vaccinated.

We have all our clinical staff vaccinated, but we have to balance that risk, that opportunity, to make sure that we have a full complement and workforce within our quarantine hotel. It is sitting at around 85 per cent as of a couple of weeks ago. I am happy to make an inquiry and update the house if there is a change to that.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Given the recent medi-hotel outbreak from the Playford Hotel, why not have all workers vaccinated at all medi-hotels rather than just at the Tom's Court Hotel?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): Well, of course, the incident that occurred at the Playford Hotel had nothing to do with the vaccination rate amongst the workforce. To suggest that had something to do with it seems an extraordinarily long bow, and I think it goes more to the point that the Leader of the Opposition hasn't been following the COVID response we have in South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas: I didn't say that. Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's difficult to even know how to answer a question that is putting two completely disparate pieces of information alongside each other. The reality is that there now is a confirmed situation where somebody has become infected at one of our quarantine hotels—in fact, the Playford Hotel. The genomics testing confirms that.

What we know is that there is a thorough investigation underway by SA Health into the circumstances that could have led to that. We have reviewed all the CCTV footage and we have interviewed staff there. That draft report is with Professor Nicola Spurrier at the moment. She is reviewing those findings. We hope to be able to release that to the public within the next 24 to 48 hours.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Why have a 100 per cent worker vaccination rate at one medi-hotel, in Tom's Court, but not in others?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): It's almost extraordinary that we are just repeating the same question asked slightly differently. The reality is, as I said in my first two answers to this line of questioning, that we are listening to the experts.

I know that those opposite like to consider themselves as experts. They had that expert report, which they presented to the people of South Australia. It was called Transforming Health. They haven't gone back to that expert report very much lately. In fact, I haven't seen anybody mentioning it at all. I have seen some old posts of people, who are sitting over there opposite now, advocating for Transforming Health a few years ago. That can make very interesting retweeting. The reality is that we are listening to the experts and they have served us extraordinarily well.

If we look at our performance in South Australia relative to the rest of the world, relative to anywhere else in Australia, we have done well, and you've got to ask yourself, 'Why have we done well in South Australia?' Well, I put it to you, sir, that it's for two reasons: first, we have listened to evidence and science and we have constructed our response in light of that expert scientific and

evidence-based advice to us as a government; second, it has been a great partnership with the people of South Australia who have recognised that we need to all be working together.

Whilst there are those who want to undermine confidence in our response in South Australia, they are making very little ground, because the people of South Australia are very proud—extraordinarily proud—of the way we have responded to the coronavirus. When we look on the television set at night or we open up the paper in the morning and see the situation that is unfolding in other parts of the world, it is very frightening: 750,000 people are becoming infected with this insidious disease every single day and 13,000 people are losing their life every single day. We don't have that situation in Australia and we certainly don't have that situation in South Australia, and that's because we have been listening to the experts.

So it's not good enough for the opposition to say, 'We've got a better idea.' The reality is that from day one we have listened to those experts. That's been our position and we will continue to do that, and those opposite can continue to undermine public confidence. They are not making much progress whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): My question is to the Premier. Why were there so many ambulances ramped outside the Flinders Medical Centre last night? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Video footage released this morning reveals 11 ambulances were ramped outside the Flinders emergency department yesterday evening.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16): There would have been a surge at that time. I don't have the exact dashboard in front of me at the moment but, as we know, the reason for the situation that is currently occurring in South Australia at the moment is twofold. One is because we are having a very significantly heightened presentation rate in South Australia. Nobody really understands exactly and precisely the reason for that increased presentation rate, although it is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Although, as I have stated to this house before, and with the media, we are seeing this same phenomenon right around the country at the moment. There is a very significantly increased presentation rate. Whether it be for mental health reasons or for other medical emergencies, it is significantly higher.

The second reason for the situation that we are currently experiencing, and the Leader of the Opposition cited in particular Flinders Medical Centre, is because of the significant downgrading of services in South Australia which occurred under the previous government. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition was the health minister at the time who closed the Repat hospital. Now, you don't think that might have had an effect—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on our ability to respond to these surges? They downgraded the Noarlunga Hospital, they closed the Repat hospital and, of course, as was evidenced with the presentation I made in the sitting week before last, with reference to former health minister—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —John Hill's very informative novelette, the Flinders Medical Centre was designed to fail. Of course, let's not go over things that have happened in the past. Mistakes were made in the past; let's not go over that.

The reality is, we've got to fix the mess that we inherited from those opposite, and I'm very proud to lead a government that is massively investing in increasing the ability for our state to respond to these surges. We have put more than \$2 billion worth of new money into the health budget. We've got more than a billion dollars worth of new money going into capital upgrades to fix the downgrades that were inflicted upon the health system in South Australia when they were last in government.

The Flinders Medical Centre is the busiest emergency department in the state. After we complete those capacity increases, which will occur around the middle of this year, it will be the largest emergency department in the state. This will have a massively positive effect on the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, and I met with the chief executive and the chair of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network this morning.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those upgrades are on track. So that's absolutely great, and it will be a massive improvement there. It will also have a corresponding improvement in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. At the moment, because the situation that we inherited from those opposite was a massive undercapacity situation in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, too many of our ambulances are diverted into CALHN, the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. We have taken a systems approach to fixing the issue. We don't want to have ramping. Ramping was introduced to South Australia by the former Labor government. They presided over the introduction of that. What we're doing is implementing our plan to fix the mess that we inherited.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Newland, I call to order the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, I call to order the member for Kaurna, I call to order the leader and I call to order and warn the member for Lee.

JOB CREATION

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's COVID-19 recovery plan to create more jobs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): I thank the member for Newland for his excellent question. He is quite right: we have, if you like, these dual crises to deal with. At the moment, we have a global health crisis and we also have an economic crisis. What we are trying to do here in South Australia is get both of those situations optimised.

I think by any independent metric—not those opposite of course—South Australia has done very well in handling the health crisis. I put it to you today, sir, that we have also done extraordinarily well in dealing with the economic crisis that has enveloped much of the world.

To provide some evidence to you, sir, and to this chamber here today, I cite the ABS statistics that were released on Thursday last week which, of course, showed that South Australia created more than 15,000 jobs in the month of April. In fact, we now have a record number of people employed in South Australia—864,200 people are employed in South Australia at the moment. It's a record. It's the highest in the history of the state. It's much higher than pre COVID. How many other places in the world could say that they have grown employment through a global pandemic? Well, South Australia can. In fact, when we look at April—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They love talking the state down. They are barracking for failure but their barracking is all in vain because the people of South Australia are responding to the very strong economic conditions that have been created. In fact, in the month of April, South Australia created more jobs than the rest of the country combined. That is something that every single South Australian should be very proud of.

When we look at the unemployment rate, at the beginning of year it was 7.1 per cent. We have now seen it progressively move down to 5.7 per cent here in South Australia and we've got plenty more work to be done. Only today, the single touch data came out also from the ABS—completely discredited by those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They hate good news.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But let me tell you, there was more good news with the ABS single touch data today: South Australia was the only jurisdiction in the country that actually grew its employment over the last fortnight reported. The ANZ has just released their Stateometer: the highest rating we have ever received and they particularly noted that the net population outflow to other states has been reversed under this government, with the first positive flow to South Australia since 1991. Again, we have been able to provide the people of South Australia with a great opportunity to stay in South Australia, to get a good job, to stay here to grow their family.

We also look at the BankSA's State Monitor, with the highest level consumer confidence in more than 10 years and the highest level business confidence in more than 15 years in South Australia. Of course, the Business SA Survey of Business Expectations for the March quarter found the general business conditions index is at its highest point for more than 13 years. So there is plenty of good news, and part of that is because we had an immediate response of \$4 billion to the coronavirus, the second highest per capita in the entire nation. In addition to that, of course, our state budget provided \$16.7 billion worth of economic stimulus and that is creating tens of thousands of jobs.

There is still more work to be done. I can guarantee that every single member in my cabinet, every single member in my team, is working as hard as we possibly can because this is an insidious disease. It has had massive devastating effects right around the world, but not here in South Australia. Despite those opposite, things are looking very good for South Australia in the future.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the Minister for Trade and Investment, I call to order the member for Playford and I warn the member for Lee for a second time.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Are things looking good for the 102 patients who are currently stuck waiting for an emergency bed across our emergency departments in the public health system?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): I am happy to answer this question. Of course, there is a huge amount of work to be done in our health system across South Australia. As I referred to in my previous answer, we were left with a very unattractive situation, with our health system—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —left in a perilous situation with the downgrading of the Modbury Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Noarlunga Hospital and the closure of the Repat. Those opposite, the brains trust opposite, said that what they needed to do was to concentrate all the services on the three major spine hospitals: the Lyell McEwin, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. Well, this was a disaster. We have never even heard them refer to that document again because they know it was failed policy.

It can't be undone overnight. Those downgrades were very, very significant. But I can tell you what we have been doing: massive upgrades to virtually every single hospital, metropolitan and country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They say, 'No worries,' like they have something to do with it. Let me tell you, the Leader of the Opposition should hang his head in shame. He closed the Repat hospital. He broke the heart of the veterans community in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He failed to listen to anybody and then he sits over there and says, 'Thank you very much.' Why should we be thanking the Leader of the Opposition for closing the Repat hospital? Why should we be thanking him?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The leader will cease interjecting. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is engaging in debate in his answer, and that's disorderly, and I would ask you to bring the Premier back into line to answer the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: I have listened very carefully to the question. The Premier has taken the question, notwithstanding that it might appropriately have required leave in terms of the facts that it introduced. It addressed itself to the number of patients that might be awaiting public beds and was otherwise broad in its scope. I am listening carefully to the Premier's answer. The Premier is addressing the question. The Premier has the call, so I don't uphold the point of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can outline to the house is that since coming to government we have very, very significantly reinvested in health in South Australia; in fact, more than \$2.2 billion worth of new money going into the budget. This was necessary and urgently required. In addition to that, of course, there has been a very significant investment in our COVID response, but also, as I said, in that general area.

The Auditor-General has independently made it very clear that we now have more doctors, more nurses, more paramedics than when we came to government. They are of course extraordinarily important to making sure that we provide the very best service that we possibly can. We are currently experiencing a surge. We are experiencing a surge here in South Australia and we are experiencing a surge nationally, but we are not sitting on our hands.

We are incredibly involved in a range of programs to increase the capacity, whether it be increasing the physical capacity within our hospitals, whether it be making sure that we can get the patient flow through our hospitals to an optimal level or whether it be alternative care pathways—for example, the Urgent Mental Health Care Centre; the very first of its type in Australia is right here in South Australia.

I have been reliably informed—I spoke to the members of that team very recently—that they have had an excellent response from the urgent mental health care service here in South Australia. But there are many other things that we are doing, including very significantly increasing the number of paramedics that we have in South Australia.

The problems that we inherited from those opposite have not all been solved yet. There is still more work to be done—much more work to be done—but we have a plan. We are implementing that plan and we will see a very significant increase in the overall emergency department capacity here in South Australia. In fact, there are nine emergency departments which currently have advanced plans to upgrade their capacity. These are nearly all the hospitals in metropolitan Adelaide, plus the peri-urban hospitals, plus we are dealing with the urgent maintenance backlog that we inherited from those opposite in our country hospitals across South Australia. There is work to be done and we are getting on with that important job.

AMBULANCE RESPONSE, WHYALLA

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Why was a patient in Whyalla suffering a seizure forced to wait more than an hour for an ambulance? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr HUGHES: On Sunday 16 May, a Whyalla patient suffered a seizure and was semi responsive. It took an ambulance coming from Port Augusta, 80 kilometres away, one hour and 20 minutes to arrive for what should have been a 16-minute response time.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30): I thank the member for Giles for his question. I don't have any details on that specific case, but what I do know is that we are very significantly increasing the capacity of our Ambulance Service in South Australia with a significant number of additional paramedics. I can't tell you the exact number here, but I am happy to get it for the member for Giles. A large number of those are going to be in regional South Australia. We don't ultimately answer the phone. We have to make sure that we've got the right—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier might resume his seat for a moment.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's a very significant issue that we are dealing with, and all we get from those opposite is just carping, whingeing, whining.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. Members on my left will cease interjecting. The member for Cheltenham is called to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We don't answer the phone calls when they come in, but what we do is have an excellent set of public servants in South Australia who do. They listen to those cases, and they have to make decisions. Often they are very difficult decisions around priorities. Emergencies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Emergencies don't present themselves in nice, even, balanced flows of patients; there can be surges. I back our hardworking public servants to make those informed clinical decisions.

What I can now update the member for Giles on is the recent commitment from the government for a further 74 paramedics in South Australia; 24 of them, or around a third of those, will be allocated to country stations in Whyalla, Port Augusta and Ceduna. It is very important that we recognise that we do need to provide significantly more health resources, and in particular paramedics, over and above what we inherited from those opposite, and that's what we are doing.

We are investing into that increased capacity with our paramedics, our ambulance officers in South Australia, our doctors and our nurses in South Australia, our physical capability as well as our operating budgets. That's what we have been doing, and we have been doing that exactly and precisely as we have been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —responding to a global pandemic. All those opposite can do is whinge and whine and carp and complain. That's all they can do. I have not heard one constructive strategy put forward by those opposite. There is no contribution whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting. The member for Playford is warned for a second time.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: All we get is a series of Meet Pete type corner meetings, trying to promote the Leader of the Opposition. We still haven't had any policies for the next election. We're not doing Meet Pete over here: we are just getting on with implementing an upgrade to the health system that we inherited from Meet Pete, who was of course the health minister when we came to government—the person who presided over the closure of the Repat hospital in South Australia.

When I go down to the Repat hospital, and I was down there recently with the member for Elder, it's fantastic. It is really a transformation. Just take your mind back three or four years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and remind yourself what was happening then. Do you remember what was happening at Oakden? Crickets. I will tell you what was happening over there. It was one of the darkest days in the history of our state.

What we are doing is fixing it, and we are developing that precinct down at the Repat into a globally leading centre for older persons mental health. I invite those opposite to take a trip down there, see what they were selling off—well, actually, they had sold off—that we had to bring back into government hands. We are proud to do that, as we are to deal with the task that is front of us. There's a lot more work to do. We are completely up for the task.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for King, I call to order and warn the member for Light, call to order the member for Hurtle Vale and call to order the member for Wright.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government has been creating jobs and delivering new projects for South Australians since January this year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:35): I thank the member for King for her question and her passion for building the infrastructure South Australia needs. She asks about jobs, and that is the order of the day. It is the government's primary focus, and keeping South Australians in work and creating more jobs is what it is all about.

Last week, we saw the unemployment statistics come out and, while there is always more work to do, it was very satisfying to see the massive jump in the right direction. We have dropped down now to 5.7 per cent, which shows that our infrastructure-creating projects are generating the jobs that South Australia needs, and we are very proud of that.

In fact, last month here in South Australia we created more jobs than any other state in the country—15,000 in the month of April alone. That is absolutely outstanding. Of course this is very much on the back of our \$16.7 billion infrastructure spend. We are building the infrastructure that South Australia needs.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Chaffey says that figure again—\$16.7 billion. It is outstanding.

I was actually up on the South Eastern Freeway with yourself, sir, the member for Kavel, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Premier just last week, having a look at some of those projects. Just running a brush over what we have started rolling out since January this year, since January this year there have been \$680 million worth of projects that have begun or are underway. That is a phenomenal number.

It is creating some 1,500 kilometres of roadworks along the way and creating 2,500 jobs in the process. That is 2,500 families that are being fed on the back of the investment we are making to build very important infrastructure. I will mention that figure again: \$16.7 billion over the next four years. That's 19,000 jobs, and as we come out of the back of COVID we know how important that is. Those opposite don't like it when we talk about jobs, and we are not hearing much from them at the moment, but that is a key focus we have on this side of the house, and we are very pleased about that.

I mentioned catching up with the Deputy Prime Minister and the great relationship we on this side of the house have been able to build with the federal government. That saw us, in the last federal budget, receive 22 per cent of the new infrastructure money—22 per cent coming to South Australia

for more of those infrastructure projects. It is absolutely outstanding. That means more jobs, and we can keep getting on with what we're doing—that is, building what matters for the people of South Australia.

I would like to take a moment to run through some of the projects we've got underway that are delivering those 2,500 jobs. Since January, we have started major works on the Goodwood/Springbank/Daws roads intersection, and the member for Elder is very excited by that project. That is one that was ignored for 16 long years under Labor. For 16 long years they did nothing, but guess what? We are getting on with the job—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and we are creating jobs in the process. The Magill-Portrush intersection is another big upgrade and a very important project. The Main North Road-Nottage intersection upgrade, the member for Adelaide—a great member and a good minister—is very happy to see that—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —project done to decongest that area. Again, for 16 long years there was nothing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Now we're hearing from them—because we are getting on and doing the project. Main North Road/Kings Road/McIntyre Road is another intersection we are improving. We have also started work on the Grand Junction/Hampstead/ Briens roads intersection. I was out there the other day, and that work is underway as well. We have also started resurfacing work on the South Eastern Freeway. We know how important that is to you, sir, and the member for Kavel and your electorates.

The Stuart Highway is another important project, as is the Eyre Highway, where the member for Flinders is seeing works rolling out. There is the Barrier Highway—more work in the member for Stuart's electorate—and the Princes Highway, the Horrocks Highway and the Riddoch Highway. I was in the South-East over the weekend visiting the member for MacKillop and also the member for Mount Gambier, and some great work is happening there. Again, here we are generating jobs and building what matters for South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Giles, I call to order the member for Schubert and I call to order the member for Chaffey.

AMBULANCE RESPONSE, WHYALLA

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:39): My question is to the Premier. Was there an ambulance-related death in Whyalla in December last year? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr HUGHES: The opposition understands that on 22 December a male collapsed at the Westland Shopping Centre, but there was no ambulance available to respond after a 30-minute wait. The patient was driven via a private car to the hospital and passed away a short time later.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:39): I thank the member for Giles for that question. I don't have any details with regard to that case, but I am certainly happy to look at it and the circumstances. I don't know whether that is a matter the Coroner is looking into. Of course, it's a tragic situation when anybody passes away, and if there is need for there to be an investigation into that then that is certainly what will happen.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION INVESTIGATION

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:40): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier now reconsider his government's decision not to provide additional funding to ICAC to investigate SA Health in light of charges announced by ICAC today? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Schubert!

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: Today, the ICAC announced 25 charges against a surgeon for deception over allegedly inaccurate time sheets. In 2018, this government refused a request from the ICAC for an investigation into SA Health.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:41): I will say that Commissioner Vanstone has made a public statement today confirming the charges that have been referred to, and that obviously is a pending matter now for the proper court processes in relation to it. I note that there has been some media coverage already about it. Members would be aware from that that it's now under investigation, so I don't make any further comment.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:41): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that vaccination rates in medi-hotel workers fluctuate from 85 per cent down to as low as 75 per cent? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: The Premier earlier told the house that vaccination rates were at 85 per cent amongst medi-hotel staff. Stephen Wade in the other place has just said that medi-hotel worker vaccination rates 'continue to fluctuate between 75 per cent and 85 per cent'.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42): I think I was very clear in my earlier answers that this morning Dr Emily Kirkpatrick, the Deputy Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia, said that the last time she had checked, which was several weeks ago, it was sitting at 85 per cent. I also said that I was happy to take a look at that issue. I provided a comprehensive set of answers—I think four or five of them—on the vaccination rates within our quarantine hotel.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is quite clear to me that they have already run out of questions. I think we should just be turning over the rest of question time to the members of the crossbench. They always seem to have reasonable, intelligent and thoughtful questions for this chamber, unlike some of the repetitive drivel we have heard from the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and other members of his lacklustre frontbench in recent times.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But, as I said, Dr Emily Kirkpatrick, one of three excellent Deputy Chief Public Health Officers in South Australia, made a public statement on this only earlier today. It's a pity those opposite, and maybe some of those up in the dream factory, weren't listening; they would have had the answer to that already and they wouldn't be troubling the house with these repetitive questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The member for Kaurna is seeking the call.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it's acceptable that the average wait time in an emergency department for a mental health patient is almost seven hours? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare data released in the past week has revealed the average wait for a bed for a mental health patient in South Australia is six hours and 50 minutes, the worst in mainland Australia.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): I certainly don't think it's acceptable for us to have delays in people seeking treatment. That's why we are unwinding the perilous situation that we inherited from those opposite that was inflicted upon the people of South Australia with the downgrading of hospitals and services right across South Australia.

I can advise the house that we have, since coming to government and more particularly in recent months, very significantly improved our services in terms of trying to reduce the wait times for emergency departments, especially with mental health presentations, with the opening of the very first Urgent Mental Health Care Centre in Australia. As I said, even though it has only been open for weeks now, we are already getting fantastic feedback on that service, and I think there is a great opportunity for that type of service to be rolled out right across the country.

We also have very significantly upgraded the number of patients who are going to our priority care centres in South Australia. I recently received some statistics that showed that 14,537 patients had been diverted from our emergency departments to priority care centres since August last year. This is massive because it is actually taking the pressure off the emergency departments. You imagine if that hadn't occurred when we came to government, the very significantly compounding effect that we would have on this surge that is occurring at the moment and the downgrade of our emergency department capacity which was inflicted upon us by the previous government.

We have also, as those opposite would remember if they were paying attention, put mental health clinicians into our ambulances in South Australia with the MH CORE program, again doing everything we can to recognise that there is more work that we can be doing to make sure that we can get the appropriate level of care as quickly as possible.

We find the current situation to be completely and utterly unacceptable and that is why we are moving as quickly as we possibly can to address that. We have moved very quickly since coming to government. One of the things that we had to do when we came to government, of course, was to completely rewrite the mental health strategy for South Australia because as those opposite would know—and they should hang their heads in shame—when we came to government in March 2018 we did not have a mental health strategy for South Australia.

In fact, the previous mental health strategy concluded in 2013. South Australia was without a mental health strategy for the entire state between 2013 and 2018 and, of course, that's when some of the disasters like Oakden were revealed. That's when they were revealed. So one of the priorities that we had, and certainly one of the great priorities for our Chief Psychiatrist, Dr John Brayley, on assuming that role and with us coming into government, was to develop a comprehensive mental health strategy for South Australia.

We have not solved every one of the problems that we inherited from those opposite since coming to government. Those opposite love to talk down the excellent work that the doctors and nurses do in South Australia around mental health.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Take a look. They say it's got worse, Well, let me tell you, what could be worse than Oakden? What could be worse than Oakden? I tell you what's a lot better than Oakden: the services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the facilities for tier 6 and tier 7 people living with mental health. They completely and utterly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —neglected the most vulnerable people in South Australia. They can scream and shout as much as they like, but they neglected the most vulnerable people in South Australia, the very people that we're addressing with new facilities and new capabilities like we are now seeing at the Repat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Colton, I warn the member for Hurtle Vale.

JOB CREATION

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister advise the house on how the Marshall Liberal government's support for startups is helping South Australia recover from the pandemic?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:48): I thank the member for Colton not only for his question but his enthusiasm for startups here in South Australia. As a matter of fact, he was telling me the story about his doorknocking experience at the weekend, when he met Kyle. Kyle is the lead engineer at a company called myvenue, who are tenants at Lot Fourteen. They produce point of sale ordering software for stadiums. You would think that there aren't many stadiums in Australia and it can't be a very big market but, no—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —myvenue has sales in the United States. This is what's happening here in South Australia, and this government is committed to creating a competitive, dynamic economy that provides new and real job opportunities that foster entrepreneurship and strengthen the future of our state.

Growing and maintaining local jobs throughout the COVID-19 pandemic remains a top priority. Local startups and early stage businesses are playing an important role in South Australia's response and recovery through this challenging period, and the Marshall Liberal government has created an environment for startup businesses to thrive.

Over 300 start-ups are now active in South Australia, and 50 tenants in the Lot Fourteen startup hub have collectively raised \$12.2 million in investment. The startup sector in South Australia is gaining momentum and there is an increasing number of startups in the pipeline that are investment ready. The Australian Startup and Young Technology Company Annual Funding Report shows that South Australian startup funding increased by 50 per cent last year. There is an increasing investment interest in South Australian startups, from seed funding to major acquisitions, as the Marshall government's startup policies take effect.

Life Whisperer—a startup AI company awarded \$1.5 million under the Research, Commercialisation and Startup Fund—has leveraged \$3 million in investment from private investors. Life Whisperer offers new hope for many families with improved pregnancy rates through the use of a cloud-based AI system to select viable embryos. The technology gives people greater certainty, meaning more IVF success.

The annual SouthStart entrepreneurship and startup conference was held in Adelaide in early May, featuring 11 separate events centred around the Wine Centre. Organisers reported a strong response to this year's SouthStart conference with many individually ticketed events selling out quickly. Speakers at SouthStart included Netflix co-founder Marc Randolph, Eloise Hall, co-founder of local social enterprise TABOO, and South Australia's youngest under-40 winner in 2020 at just 21 years of age.

This year, SouthStart was held in conjunction with Venture Downunder, the first of its kind to be held in South Australia—an exclusive four-day event with over 60 venture capital fund managers from Australia and New Zealand, and they had a terrific time here in South Australia. Not only did they conduct 286 one-on-one meetings with startup founders but they also enjoyed the many tourism attractions that we offer people who visit our state of South Australia. Of course, learning more about our state's startup ecosystem were the reported highlights for this group of venture capitalists. We look forward to welcoming more venture capitalists to South Australia to continually invest in South Australian businesses.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Kaurna, I warn the member for Cheltenham and call to order the member for West Torrens.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:52): My question is to the Premier. Why are one in 10 mental health patients in South Australia stuck for more than 27 hours across our emergency departments? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare data released in the past week shows that 10 per cent of South Australian mental health patients remain in emergency departments for more than 27 hours before finding a bed, significantly worse than at the time of the last election.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:53): Of course, this question is very similar to the previous question with regard to the mental health capacity and surge that we are experiencing at the moment in South Australia—the surge is being experienced across the state and across the country at the moment and of course the lack of capacity that we have here within our system now.

We are working very hard to address and to right the supply side. We are not waiting for the demand to subside; we are working with that demand to see if there are more appropriate, speedier ways that we can address that acute need. We are also developing longer term strategies to address that demand through the establishment of Wellbeing SA.

On 1 January last year, we established a new agency within government, Wellbeing SA, which is looking at proactive programs to make sure that we maintain the health and wellbeing of South Australians in a proactive and preventative way. That new agency is well resourced. It is headed up by Lyn Dean and her very hardworking team, and those programs that they are putting into place with that new money, which is in our budget, are really going to look at reducing that demand in the future, but we can't wait for that to flow through. We are very significantly increasing our capacity within our emergency departments in South Australia.

I've got some statistics to share with the house. The emergency department, for example, at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, when we came to government was 39. There will be a further 33 treatment areas there, taking that up to 72, and part of that is also an additional—

Mr Picton: You delayed it.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —number that will go into the short stay mental health beds that will go into the Lyell McEwin Hospital. These short-term beds will be very important to that northern system. At the Flinders Medical Centre—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —there were 56 beds or treatment areas when we came to government. That will increase by more than 50 per cent—by a further 30—taking that up to 86. That is in addition to the work that we are doing down at the Noarlunga Hospital, and, of course, the massive, massive increase in the number of beds at the Repat hospital. So the southern system is being very significantly upgraded.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—very close to my heart; I was born there—is having a very significant increase as well. When we came to government, 33 beds, and that was a hospital that had really been massively downgraded under the previous government where they basically stripped out even the cardiac surgery and capability in the western suburbs. Under the previous government, you had to decide—

Mr Picton: You're reducing cardiac services there.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —where you were living if you had a dicky heart! What we have done, of course, is to restore those 24/7 cardiac services for the people living in the western suburbs. I know that there are many members here who are always paying attention and advocating on behalf of people out in the north-east with a very significant increase in the overall capacity of the Modbury Hospital, which is one of our great hospitals and which was completely neglected under those opposite.

I was out there recently, and some of the changes there are not just one or two things. A huge number of projects are underway at the Modbury Hospital. This must be providing real relief to people out in that area, and of course it takes the pressure off the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Much work is needed and many resources are needed. We are providing those resources. The transformation from a perilous situation to the new situation is underway as we speak.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for West Torrens, I warn the member for Chaffey, I warn the member for Hurtle Vale for a second time, I warn the Minister for Trade and Investment, I warn the member for Kaurana, I warn the member for West Torrens, I call to order the Deputy Premier, and I warn the leader.

HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES, DEMAND-RESPONSE STANDARDS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Mining and Energy. Did the minister mislead the public regarding mandatory aspects of a new demand-response standard for household appliances like air conditioners, pool pumps and electric vehicle chargers when he said it was simply a trial? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On 15 April, the minister said on multiple occasions, and I quote:

We're looking to see if the customer chooses to invest in an appliance that can be turned on and off and if a customer reaches an agreement with a retailer so a retailer offers 'Look if you're happy to buy the appliance...

Then a journalist asked, directly interrupting the minister, and I quote:

OK but just to be quite clear you're promising South Australians that there will be no compulsory element to this at all, you will not be required to buy an appliance that can be remotely turned off?

The minister replied to that, and I quote, 'That's correct, yes.' However, today it has been publicly reported in *The Advertiser*, and I quote:

When *The Advertiser* reported this last month, Mr van Holst Pellekaan denied on ABC radio it would be compulsory for appliances to have the capability, saying it was only a trial. But Mr Duffy (from the DEM) said the capability would be compulsory and that, perhaps, the minister was confusing the capability with trials on how a business model might work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A and, when he does, the minister for Energy and Mining will have the call.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:59): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I think the member opposite deliberately crafted an

extraordinarily long question to make up for the fact that he hasn't asked one for two years and he wanted to extend that for himself as much as possible. It's a pleasure to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The minister has the call. The minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It's a pleasure to see the member for West Torrens step up and ask an energy question. The government's position is clear: consumers should be able to voluntarily receive benefits for being part of demand management programs. To enable that choice, appliances need common and basic technical capabilities. The best value appliances are hot-water systems, electric car chargers, pool pump controllers and air conditioners.

The proposed technical standard was agreed by COAG Energy Council ministers in 2019, and the current proposal is to implement the national standard in South Australia earlier. I should add that this work actually started in what is now the Department for Energy and Mining five or six years ago, when the previous minister was in charge of those people doing this same sort of work. That's because AEMO said in the 2019—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —Integrated System Plan, that for energy security into the future we need better demand management in South Australia and the South Australia-New South Wales interconnector. Unlike Labor, we don't ignore expert advice. They have opposed everything needed to fix the mess they have left behind. They play politics rather than deliver lower costs or improved security. Contrary to claims by the member for West Torrens, the activation of the appliance is actually with a third party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —with whom the customer has a contract, not with the government. That's why we are running trials of new business models with Amber Electric, Simply Energy and others, just as, under the previous government, they ran trials of managing air conditioners through smart controllers with SA Power Networks.

The good news is—and this has been in the public information for three years—many models already have these capabilities. Fifty per cent of air conditioners on the market already have these capabilities. The cost of these capabilities is negligible, and I am advised that there is no correlation between these capabilities and the cost of the appliances.

This has been through consultation a number of times. There have been nearly three years of process so far, with multiple rounds of consultation. The first was in 2019, as part of the COAG Energy Council process. A consultation paper for SA implementation was released on 1 March 2021. A public consultation session was held with industry in the same month. Industry has had an opportunity to give feedback. The Department for Energy and Mining has continued to engage with industry throughout this process, including one-on-one discussions with stakeholders.

Unlike Labor, we will follow expert advice and reform the power system for the long term. That's why they had—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It is extraordinary that the former energy minister would laugh—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —at the blackouts that he and his government at the time provided to South Australia. It is absolutely extraordinary that the leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —of the former government's energy policy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —would laugh and scoff at the harm that they did to South Australian energy consumers.

HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES, DEMAND-RESPONSE STANDARDS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Mining and Energy. Did the minister mislead the public regarding any government decision to bring forward new demand-response standards for household appliances as part of a policy agreed at COAG? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On 15 April this year, the minister publicly stated, and I quote, 'I never expressed any keenness at all,' in regard to these new standards. However, yesterday in the Budget and Finance Committee, the Department for Energy and Mining said in their evidence:

The former COAG Energy Council had endorsed a decision regulatory impact statement including demand response capability into a number of appliances: air conditioning, pool pumps, hot water services and electric vehicle chargers. I will have to check the date on that, but it was a year or so ago. What we have gone out for consultation with industry is bringing forward those requirements to apply in South Australia earlier than the commonwealth timetable that was included in the DRIS.

The department was then asked by a committee member: 'Did he (the minister) approve of the consultation that you were conducting and the measures you were conducting them on?' The response from the department was, and I quote, 'Yes.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting. The minister will resume his seat for a moment. The member for Schubert is warned. The member for Kaurana is warned for a second time. The Minister for Energy and Mining has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:05): I missed if there was any difference between the question just asked and the question previously asked. I did notice that there was a difference in the information provided when the member sought leave to provide some additional information, but I think essentially it's the same question, so I refer the member for West Torrens and the chamber to my previous answer.

SWITCH FOR SOLAR

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is cutting electricity bills for concession holders and any contrary views?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:06): Thank you very much to the member for Newland for his question. He is somebody who is always working incredibly hard for his constituents in many ways, including reducing the cost of living for them, including the cost of electricity.

We are working incredibly hard and we are achieving good results—not enough, and we have more work to do. We have already, through our work with industry, with supply side, with demand side, with regulatory bodies, etc., achieved a \$269 per year reduction in the cost of electricity on average for households. But there is more work to do.

One of the things that we very recently announced is what we are calling Switch for Solar. We are running a pilot program for a thousand homes to, if they choose, voluntarily surrender their

cost-of-living and their energy concessions in return for receiving free solar installation on their homes. This is a very positive opportunity. It is a pilot and it is an offer to those households. Nobody is compelled to do that. If they would like to sign up, they are welcome to sign up. We believe that this will be very good for those people.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Our modelling shows us that if they surrender approximately \$450 or \$460 per year in government taxpayer-funded concessions and they receive the 4.4 kilowatt-hour solar system on their homes they will save in excess of the concessions that they have forgone—between \$220 and \$465 per year. We are running a trial to make sure that the modelling is proven, and we are pretty optimistic that this will be a very good thing.

In return for voluntarily surrendering a taxpayer-funded energy concession, the household will be given the solar and the reductions per year on their electricity bills will more than offset the energy concession they have forgone. We are working very hard to make sure that everybody, not just those people who can afford the equipment but everybody across society, has the opportunity to benefit from the electricity cost reductions.

The member for West Torrens has publicly said that he completely disagrees with this program. I can't imagine why he thinks this is a bad program, but that's his view.

COURT DELAYS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:09): My question is to the Attorney-General. Following the 2019 report and recommendations of former Supreme Court Judge Martin, how soon after Auxiliary District Court Judge Barrett's current review and report will action be taken to reduce court delays?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:09): The member has raised the question of the review in relation to major indictable reform, which arose out of legislation I think in 2016. We felt, coming into government, that there were some major weaknesses in relation to that legislation and so we asked retired judge Brian Martin and former Chief Justice of the Northern Territory (he served there as well) to undertake a review, which he did, and there was some significant implementation of that.

Indeed, the new DPP coming into the office, Mr Martin Hinton QC, activated some significant reforms in the SAPOL prosecution unit and DPP department to try to increase some of those matters. Overlapping that, we have also acted as a government to reduce the significant level of discounting for sentencing in that time.

Meanwhile, as the member may be aware, there was a statutory obligation, I think at the end of three years or four years, that there has to be a review done, which was imposed by the parliament. That has to be done separately. I have asked Gordon Barrett, who is also a former retired District Court judge, to undertake that review so a fresh set of eyes looks at it as well. He may well look at some aspects that need to be improved.

It might be remembered that at the time of the major indictable review a lot of attention in the debate in this parliament was on what disclosure should there be by both the defence and the prosecution prior to matters—mostly by the defence in the bill, but we raised questions about the prosecution—so that there could be an opportunity for early resolution and early guilty pleas where the parties were fully advised, knew what the case was against them, etc.

In fact, there was a whole suite of other reforms in that legislation which related to making it essentially cheaper—this is, by the former government's intimation here—by reducing the workload and early intervention of the DPP's office and leaving it with the police prosecution. That clearly had weaknesses; Mr Brian Martin identified those, and some of those reforms, as I say, have already been implemented and we are proud to have done so. Mr Barrett, though, under the statutory review has to do that. He has been commissioned to do it. I expect I will have something in the next couple of months from him in relation to that review.

COURT DELAYS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:12): Supplementary: so, aside from calling for reviews and obtaining reports and considering recommendations, what steps have actually been taken to successfully address or reduce any delay in the court system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:12): A number of matters, including working with the DPP and with police prosecution to ensure that those cases are ready when they get to the Magistrates Court, before they are referred to the District Court. The concept here is—and this is something that was called for by defence counsel for years—get somebody in senior early in these cases so that we can know fully what the case is against the defendant or defendants and we can sit down and have a meaningful discussion about how we might address these matters.

That, again, was a repeated aspect of consideration by Brian Martin QC and we appreciate his contribution in relation to that, as a result of Mr Hinton coming into that position and goodwill, I would suggest, on behalf of SA prosecution and the support of the Commissioner of Police to ensure that we did upgrade this process so that we didn't get to the situation where a case would be many adjournments in the Magistrates Court trying to work out whether they are going to have forensic assessments, whether they going to have fingerprinting, whether they are going to have the other forensic procedures undertaken before, which were then taking some considerable time.

We, a new government, also introduced some measures in forensic services SA so that they could actually more quickly deal with their reporting and investigations to assist prosecutions. There are a number of initiatives we have already started so that we can have an earlier resolution. Clearly, notwithstanding the front page article in the paper in relation to trials being out to 12 months, we have had COVID in between. They didn't mention that actually.

One of the impediments to being able to deal with trials was the jury trials—the District Court particularly and probably the 12 to 15 murder cases in the Supreme Court every year—many jury trials. The capacity for us, including other jurisdictions around the country, to deal with those matters, including the commonwealth prosecutions we do in our courts, also were interrupted by the jury obligations. We had to reconfigure the courts, actually take juries in limited numbers up to the courts in lifts, spread them out, give them a separate meeting room so they could spread out. All during COVID we had that to implement.

Unlike the Federal Court—which is still not doing full trials, which is a concern in itself, here in South Australia and in fact lots of areas around the country—we have resumed that, although there was a four or five-month delay in being able to address a number of jury trials. Some elected by negotiation to go to a judge-only trial so that they could actually get their cases heard, but there was clearly an indication by the DPP to us at that stage that they would expect by this year there would be trials up to 12 months for some cases.

That's what has been reported. I would suggest the major factor in that was not actually the major indictable reform issues; it was in fact the intervention of COVID which made it very difficult for anywhere in Australia to do jury trials safely for jurists, and indeed the judges themselves were not prepared to be able to facilitate that.

We continue to do the Magistrates Court on a group A and group B arrangement, so they are rotated. Our District Court and Supreme Court criminal trials were interrupted by COVID, as was the capacity for jurors to safely come in, be empanelled for the purposes of jury service and then actually to operate in the courts. It is about a four or five-month delay in those cases, which has ballooned out to 12 months in some of our criminal cases for jury trials.

The SPEAKER: The time for answering the question has expired.

SWITCH FOR SOLAR

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister advise the house when concession holders in regional South Australia may be able to participate in the state government's recent trial, where it was announced that 1,000 eligible households would get a free trial for 4.4 kilowatt solar panels installed in their houses in exchange for their concessions? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain a bit further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: This is in addition to the member for Newland's question. The minister for social services in the other house during a media conference mentioned the 20 suburbs that would participate in this trial. I can't understand, and I want the minister explain, why regional people were not given the opportunity to participate in this trial and to save money by surrendering their concessions.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:17): I thank the member for Frome for this question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It's actually quite straightforward. People in regional areas are actually able to access this, but unfortunately not the people in the regional area the minister for Frome and I represent. People in Port Augusta can't get this, people in Port Pirie can't get this and other parts can't get it. People in the Lower Lakes area, for example, can.

The answer to the question about why it has been structured that way is that it is a pilot. It's a trial that has been set up, and it wasn't practical to do a thousand all over the state. It was actually practical to do essentially the north-east suburbs of Adelaide and one regional section of the state.

It would have been terrific to make it available to everybody anywhere in regional South Australia, it would have been terrific to make it available to anybody anywhere in Adelaide as well, but it just wasn't possible to do that. It's a trial. As the member knows, it is returning concessions voluntarily and swapping them for a free solar installation on your home. It will be outstandingly good.

I guess the most important piece of information to share with the member for Frome is that we are very optimistic that this trial will go very well. Based on that, we expect it to be something that we can roll out across the entire state, all parts of regional South Australia, all parts of metropolitan Adelaide. We want everybody to be able to benefit from this. However, I say again that the practicalities of actually running a trial—with regard to the cost of running the trial, with regard to keeping the cost of the installations down, being able to make it work efficiently—meant that we had to choose one suburban patch of metropolitan Adelaide and one patch of regional South Australia.

It would have been good to make that available for everybody and, just like the member for Frome, I also would have loved it to be in our part of the world, but the advice I got from the experts—and we do follow the experts' advice on this side of the chamber—was that it was most appropriate to work the trial the way we are working the trial. It is very much about proving it up so that then everyone anywhere in the state gets that opportunity.

SWITCH FOR SOLAR

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:20): A supplementary: can the minister advise the period of the trial, how long this trial will take place?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:20): I will have to check it, but I think it's a year.

STURT STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister please update the house on when the Sturt SES group will receive new fleet vehicles in line with the SES vehicle replacement program? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

Mr DULUK: Sturt SES have brought to my attention that several of their older vehicles are not fit for purpose. When I visited the group last week I experienced this firsthand, with two of the vehicles struggling to do 30 kilometres up Ackland Hill Road. When is the group due to receive new small and heavy vehicles to help them on days like today and when assisting our community in their 500 callouts each and every year?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:21): I thank the member for Waite for the question. It is certainly something I am more than happy to look into for the member. As we know, our emergency services personnel do a magnificent job keeping us safe right across the state. Obviously, we have just got through the most recent bushfire season, but of course our SES, like all the other services, work throughout the year. At this time of year, as we start moving into the wetter weather, we have floods, and of course there are car accidents right throughout the year. As well as that, the SES perform a number of searches right across the board.

I recently went out to the Sturt State Emergency Service (I think it is Matthew Burnett who is the head out there) and it was an exceptional opportunity to go out and talk to the unit and thank the volunteers for their magnificent work. By the way, last Wednesday was actually Wear Orange Wednesday (WOW Day). Believe it or not—and I'm sure the member for Waite did this as well—we donned orange clothing for the day. You might not think, sir, that I would wear the colour orange, but I did for the SES in support of a great cause—hat, socks, tie, you get the gist.

In response to the member's question specifically about the fleet program, as the member alluded to, the SES do have a replacement program. I can advise the house that, in terms of the SES across the board, in 2021-22 the following appliances will be delivered into service for the SES: five road crash and general rescue trucks at about \$200,000 per truck, six quick response vehicles (QRVs) at about \$75,000 per vehicle, and five storm trailers (I believe we've got some of those in the beautiful Adelaide Hills too) at about \$35,000 per trailer.

My advice is that quick response vehicles and storm trailers will be delivered in mid-2021, and the road crash and general rescue trucks will be delivered by the end of 2021. However, in response to the member's question about that specific group, what I will do is make some inquiries. When I have done that I will come back to the member.

Grievance Debate

RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:23): It is not often I feel sympathy or pity for my political opponents, but today is an occasion when I do. It is not nice to be humiliated publicly on radio.

The minister went on radio on 15 April and, when asked about this program, was adamant that there was no compulsory element to his program of making you buy brand-new air conditioners, pool pumps, electric charging stations for your vehicles, that there would not be any mandatory element about a requirement in those appliances—full stop, unequivocal.

He then went on to try to attack me as if I were trying to create some sort of huge storm. If only he had picked up *The Advertiser* on the same day, 15 April, when his own agency had given the very story exclusively to *The Advertiser* and told them that this would be a mandatory requirement in all new appliances, that he was bringing it forward. But of course he did not know. He did not read the paper and then still stuck to his guns that it was not true, that it was a trial. *The Advertiser* was wrong, his department was wrong, everyone was wrong; but he was right.

Of course, then comes in the Public Sector Management Act, where public servants cannot lie to parliament. They just cannot. So they turned up, they were asked direct questions and they gave direct answers: 'Was this a trial?' 'No.' 'Was it mandatory?' 'Yes.' 'Were they bringing it forward faster than every other state?' 'Yes.' The minister even said on radio that he had absolutely no keenness whatsoever for this program, yet we are the only state bringing it forward ahead of every other state, as agreed by a COAG timetable.

The next point is: was he being deliberate, or is he just incompetent? I am happy for him to choose which one he likes. It is up to him. It is not for me to speculate whether he deliberately misled the people of South Australia or whether he is just incompetent, because I have to say that the idea of a minister having his department correct him in the house after he had been on radio adamant that he was right and that they were all wrong is pretty humiliating, let alone that the information given to two of our most respected and trusted news outlets, *The Advertiser* and the ABC, was incorrect.

Talking about incorrect information, I will go on to another little vignette the government released just last week, where they announced they were privatising Port Bonython. Of course, this

was called something else. This was called an expression of interest for land, and we were told it was all about a hydrogen hub. It was all going to be about hydrogen. We were going to export hydrogen to the world. They are not copying Labor's policy document at all, but what they want to do is create green hydrogen from renewable resources and export it to the world. But it is nothing like Labor's policy document; it is completely different and new.

There is only one problem: when you go through the tender documents and you go to the mandatory requirements for the tender, there is no mention of hydrogen. In fact, throughout the entire tender document hydrogen is only mentioned twice—two times—in a document that is meant to be all about hydrogen. So we asked the head of the Department for Energy and Mining whether there was a requirement for any successful tenderer in the expression of interest for the land at Port Bonython, the last state-owned port, I think—the ones that Rob Lucas did not privatise when he was last in office—and the answer was, 'There is no requirement for a hydrogen hub.'

The strategy here is hope. They are hoping someone puts forward a plan for hydrogen. They are hoping the successful tender is about a hydrogen export facility. But do not look at what governments say, look at what they do. They are not serious about hydrogen. Just last week, the Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA) released \$100 million in funding for renewable hydrogen projects across Australia. Do you know how many were successful in South Australia, given the government's keen commitment to promote hydrogen and green hydrogen in South Australia? None—Victoria and Western Australia.

What does that tell you about the government's commitment to renewable energy? ENGIE has a program to underwrite new generation investment in renewable energy, and there are three pumped hydro programs that are short-listed in South Australia, but nothing has happened. So much for the special relationship. This government talks about renewable energy but does nothing about it. Do not listen to what they say: look at what they do.

ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:29): Last week, I had the privilege of addressing the year 12 politics and year 10 civic students at Adelaide High School. These students were undertaking a research assignment on current issues within their community and wanted to hear more about how the Marshall Liberal government was tackling these challenges.

The first issue we discussed was in relation to health services. The delivery of health services is one of the top priorities for any community and people of all ages. I was pleased to advise these students that since coming into government we have invested over \$2.2 billion into the health budget. Three years ago, we inherited a broken health system. Labor's Transforming Health experiment failed and resulted in downgrading hospitals and the Repat being closed altogether.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left! Member for Chaffey! The minister has the call.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The Marshall Liberal government is expanding emergency departments, delivering more beds and more staff. We have established priority care centres, which take the pressure off our hospitals and will provide patient beds for those who need them. We are increasing ambulance resources, and South Australia now has—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —the second highest per capita spend on ambulance resources in the nation. Another group was studying our public transport system. The Marshall Liberal government was elected on a platform of improving services. Recently, Keolis Downer was contracted to deliver our train services. Keolis Downer run—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —rail networks in every mainland state in Australia, and in South Australia our government will still retain the rail assets, retain fare revenue and ticket boxes, and manage customer service standards and service frequency. The new contract will deliver an additional 44 services a week on the Flinders line, which equate to around 12,000 extra trips per annum including late-night services. Our government is also completing the electrification of the Gawler line and investing in initiatives such as tap-and-go technology to provide better public transport services.

We also discussed the Marshall Liberal government's Hydrogen Action Plan, which was released in September 2019. This details how we are developing a renewable hydrogen export industry. The Marshall Liberal government wants South Australia to become the leading supplier and exporter of hydrogen in Australia. Just last week, in an Australian first, the country's largest electrolyser of hydrogen was switched on. This will deliver renewable hydrogen blended into the gas network to 700 homes in Mitchell Park.

Projects like this \$14.5 million plant were supported through a \$4.9 million grant from our Renewable Technology Fund. This fund is part of our ambition to create, use and export green hydrogen, creating local jobs and supporting long-term investment by industry. This is how you deliver the energy infrastructure of the future. As my colleague the Minister for Energy and Mining often says, 'Green hydrogen is a fuel of the future.' It will help us achieve our goals of 100 per cent net renewable energy and a 50 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in South Australia by 2030.

Another topic discussed was jobs and economic recovery. For young people about to leave school and transition into employment, this is perhaps the most important priority for any government. I am proud to be a part of a government that is driving job creation into the future and building what matters to South Australians. Our record \$16.7 billion investment in roads, health, education and other community infrastructure will create over 19,000 local jobs and drastically improve the lives of South Australians.

For young people, this is an exciting time to build a future here in South Australia. We are continuing to roll out the Skilling South Australia program, which has already delivered 33,000 apprenticeships and traineeships in its first three years. This is about ensuring young people have the skills for the future. Of course, our defence sector plan is further growing the South Australian industry, with more than 4,000 direct shipbuilding jobs and thousands of additional support jobs.

Finally, Lot Fourteen in my electorate is creating thousands of jobs in high-tech sectors and attracting international companies from across future industries, including space, defence, cyber and big data. All of this investment and growth is exciting because it provides opportunities like never before for young people to access and gives them the ability to achieve their future life goals right here in SA.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:34): I have been contacted by a number of environmentalists and environmental groups about their concerns about the way in which the government may listen to them when they raise issues about the environment. In particular, most recently there is a concern about a rocket launch site down on the southern tip of Eyre Peninsula which is proposed to be on a piece of land that has had a native vegetation heritage agreement over it.

These environmentalists are concerned that if they raise concerns about it they will not be listened to respectfully by the government. I have lots of reasons to think that they might be right, that this government do not really ever want to hear about problems with issues in the environment and particularly not with proposals undertaken by the government themselves.

I am going to give three examples. The first one is the truck road through the Semaphore dunes. When people in my community stood up and said, 'We don't want a road with trucks on it going through our dunes,' we had these comments coming back from the minister:

I just cannot believe that a small group of people want to stand in the way of a climate resilient strategy for our state. It is just a sad reflection on a noisy minority.

When I asked, 'Would you send some departmental officers down to talk to a public meeting?' he wrote a letter to me saying that sending departmental officers would be a waste of valuable departmental time—not to talk to me but to talk to my community.

We will all recall that in Flinders Chase National Park there is high-end accommodation being proposed on the cliffs away from the trail requiring native vegetation clearance. The Friends of Parks on Kangaroo Island were so horrified by this that they went on strike. That is how disrespected they felt by the proposal that the minister was undertaking. In fact, the whole group of Friends of Parks wrote a letter stating:

...send a message of support to three KI groups to say they are not alone and they are being thought of and that other member groups appreciate the time and energy spared for the KI development. The Board unanimously supports this motion. We share the deep concern that is behind taking a stand when a protected area—a national park—is threatened. We understand and regret the immense amount of energy and work that must then go in a direct action other than looking after our parks.

That is something that those people who are normally collecting seeds, weeding and planting are having to put into because the government, the environment minister, does not listen to the community when they say that this is unacceptable and that this should not happen. Of course, what has happened is that the minister not only approved the proposal but also put through regulations that waive the normal processes for both planning approval and native vegetation clearance approval.

The final example is Belair National Park. That is why I had to put in a petition today with nearly 6,000 signatures—because, although the minister has now backed off the proposal of seven soccer pitches being put into Belair National Park, the community has no faith that there will not be another proposal that is equally objectionable. What I also object to is that not only did the minister not listen to the groups but in fact he wrote them letters saying, 'We're going out to consultation on this, asking what people thought about it.' Then, when they wrote in and said what they thought about it, he stated:

I am heartened by the significant outpouring of interest in the protection of Belair National Park, but surprised that so many people are keen to have their say from the comfort of their homes, firing off quick emails or social media posts without consideration of how they can protect this precious space in a practical way. If you have not had a chance to interact or join the Friends—

the same Friends who went on strike for Flinders Chase of course—

I encourage you to do so, you will learn much about our natural environment, the need to protect it, and more importantly, have opportunities to get your hands dirty.

That is not the right attitude when you have asked people their opinion and they have written in and said, 'We don't agree with what you want to do.'

That is a terrible attitude. Not only that, he hung the Sturt Lions Soccer Club out to dry by distancing himself from a proposal that he himself put into the master plan, where he said, 'Yes, that's good enough that I'm going to make it the mainstay of this master plan, put it out for consultation, tell people they should get their hands dirty and not fire off emails,' when they told him that they did not like what they saw. Then, when it comes to backing away from it, he describes it as a relatively controversial proposal that emerged from the Sturt Lions Soccer Club and says, 'I'm now ruling out going on. That's not appropriate for the site, and I don't believe that it will be financially viable either.'

When did that happen? Why did that suddenly become a reason to stop doing that project? It was actually that the community stood up, and they have to shout loudly to be heard unfortunately, and they have no faith that that is not going to be necessary. They will continue to put their position, and that is why I had to put in that petition.

KING ELECTORATE KINDNESS AWARDS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:39): Today, I am recognising young people across my electorate for being kind. I do this because kindness is good for us as individuals and for our whole community. Witnessing acts of kindness produces oxytocin, occasionally referred to as the love hormone, which

aids in lowering blood pressure and improving our overall heart health. Oxytocin also increases our self-esteem and optimism, which is extra helpful when we are anxious or shy in a social situation.

The positive effects of kindness are experienced in the brain of everyone who witnesses a kind act, improves people's mood and makes them significantly more likely to pay it forward. This means that one good deed in a community can create a domino effect and improve the day of dozens of people. Mr Speaker, did you know that perpetually kind people have 23 per cent less cortisol—the stress hormone—and age slower than the average population—so many benefits of being kind.

Today, I say a heartfelt thank you to our local schools in King that are collaborating with me to reinforce the importance of kindness and are recognising the remarkable young people in our community who are helping to spread kindness. I would like to thank the Golden Grove Primary School for giving me the opportunity to recently recognise a student from every year level who has displayed incredible acts of kindness. Thank you to school principal, Wendy Moore, and her staff for their wonderful leadership and commitment to recognise and encourage kindness at the Golden Grove Primary School.

It was heartwarming to attend their school assembly in April to present kindness awards and to recognise these caring students in front of their peers. The students who received my kindness awards were as follows: Jessica Rudge, Caydan England, Ethan Chase, Stanley Hamlyn, Ella Williams, Natalie Hoffman and Georgia Aworth. I look forward to continuing to celebrate acts of kindness in our schools throughout 2021.

I would also like to thank the year 6 HB-18 students at the Golden Grove Primary School for inviting me also to be involved in their special ANZAC Day commemoration assembly on Friday 30 April. Thank you for the opportunity to lay a wreath on behalf of our King community and commemoration assembly.

The year 6 HB-18 students; Ms Sals, the teacher; and Karina Damare, the defence school mentor, advised that this year the students have been learning about ANZAC Day and the meaning behind its significance. One by one the students told stories to the whole school assembly about the sacrifices and what the men and women of Australia and New Zealand went through during that time. Their ANZAC Day ceremony was themed around what students have been learning, which was very touching to see and a great example of public speaking on a very important topic.

In more good news for our King local community, the Marshall Liberal government is investing \$750,000 in a \$1.57 million adventure playground at Golden Fields. Thank you to Councillor Brett Rankine, Councillor Bernie Keane and Councillor Sandy Keane from the City of Tea Tree Gully for the opportunity to support these plans and advocate to our state government on behalf of the City of Tea Tree Gully for this match-funding opportunity.

I am really proud that the Marshall Liberal government's Open Spaces and Places for People grants can support the council's plans to build an adventure playground and additional toilet facilities in Golden Fields. This will further improve our fantastic recreation area for our whole north-east community. Each time I go to Golden Fields there are people from across the state enjoying this regional playground. These upgrades will have many positive effects and promote an active and inclusive lifestyle for our residents and in the future cater for even more older children at this space.

I was advised by the City of Tea Tree Gully that the council will undertake detailed community consultation on plans, and I encourage, as usual, all our community to have their say on what will be most beneficial. Also, the council's draft annual business plan will be out for community consultation, and it is incredibly important for people to have their say.

Time expired.

TAFE SA WHYALLA

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:44): I rise today to talk about TAFE in Whyalla, but TAFE benefits people throughout my region. The Eyre Peninsula communities and Port Augusta community all make use of the Whyalla TAFE. It is a TAFE that has been hollowed out by this government and by the management here in Adelaide. Courses are being cut back and courses are being diluted, and the latest is the removal of Certificate III in Hairdressing in my community. The people who approached me—

Members interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: The irony is not lost on me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HUGHES: People did approach me about the loss of this incredibly valuable course in the community of Whyalla. People who avail themselves of the certificate III course are school-based apprentices, many as young as 16. Mature adults doing the apprenticeship through TAFE in Whyalla and through the salons in Whyalla will suddenly find that they will no longer be able to do certificate III in Whyalla. School-based apprentices, the 16 year olds, are expected to go down to Adelaide—but they are not allowed to without being accompanied—to do two-week blocks of training several times a year. It is not going to happen.

Parents have approached me and said, 'What are we meant to do? Are we meant to take time off work to go with our kids down to Adelaide to provide the support necessary?' It is not going to happen. They are not going to do school-based apprenticeships. Mature-age apprentices have come to see me, single mums with kids and families with kids, asking, 'What are we going to do, Eddie? How can we go down to Adelaide and do a two-week block several times a year? What am I going to do with the kids? How is that going to work?' For the school-based apprentices who are doing their SACE as well, it interferes with what they are doing at school in terms of their wider SACE undertakings.

What we see here is a typical example of metrocentric thinking. It is also an example of a government that talks about a commitment to TAFE but, when you look at what is actually going on and at all the courses on the chopping block in TAFE in regional South Australia, it is deeply concerning. Hairdressing is just the tip of the iceberg. On Friday, I went around to all the salons that were open in Whyalla. I walked in the door—they obviously knew I did not need hairdressing—and all of them were deeply upset about what was going to happen. I put something on Facebook about it and the response was absolutely huge.

There were hundreds of comments—a reach of over 40,000. It was a massive response, and the response was deeply hostile to the cutbacks that are going on. I could quote from a lot of them, but I do not have much time. Elly Kirk Nitschke said:

That's ridiculous and going back in time to when I did my hairdressing apprenticeship 50 years ago, pre the course at Whyalla Tafe. For one thing, it's expensive to find accommodation. Country resources are cut away too often and this cut is disgusting.

Tam Beaty, a long-term resident of Whyalla, said:

This has been such a popular course at Whyalla TAFE for decades. So disappointing. What a slap in the face for our wonderful local lecturer as well. So dedicated to [their] students.

So the lecturers are going to be got rid of as well. Jude Lawrie, a standout person in Whyalla and a fantastic singer, said:

As a single parent doing my apprenticeship there is no way I could have done it in Adelaide, and I wouldn't be a hairdresser today. This closes many doors for a lot of people...heartbreaking.

She went on to set up her own business in Whyalla. The comments over and over again were that once again regional students, regional apprentices, were being sacrificed in order to bolster activity here in Whyalla. It is also part of the contestability Kool-Aid that is serving to destroy what was a fine institution at TAFE.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:49): I rise to talk about a celebration we had in Chaffey last week because it was National Volunteer Week, 17 to 23 May. As many of us would know, volunteers are the fabric, particularly in regional communities, that keeps them bubbling along. There are so many different understandings of what volunteers mean.

This year's National Volunteer Week's theme was Recognise. Reconnect. Reimagine. As we know, volunteers have been the absolute fabric of our regional communities, donating their time and having a positive impact on so many lives, so many institutions and so many clubs. That is why Chaffey is such a great place to live and a great place to play sport. It is a great place to just get out and be part of a community.

Volunteers are invaluable and no dollar value can be put on the contribution of the volunteers in my community. Volunteers are in all facets of the community: some of them fly under the radar and some of them give dedicated hours without question.

The CFS, the SES, the Rotary clubs, Probus, Zonta, Apex, the Lions Club, Meals on Wheels, the Cobdogla Steam Museum (home of the Humphrey Pump), the Loxton Historical Village and the vast sporting clubs around the electorate of Chaffey are all underpinned by volunteers. The local HAC boards, Destination Riverland, the council volunteers, Friends of the Industry and Olivewood Estate are just a few of those great volunteer organisations.

I have touched on sporting clubs and local associations that rely so heavily on the hard work of volunteers. Whether it is a water runner, whether it is cooking up scones, whether it is cooking the barbecues or whether it is just enabling those clubs to be able to have coaches, umpires, runners and timers—there are too many to name.

However, there are a few I want to mention and there is no-one more worthy than John Pick, who has won multiple awards for his dedication to volunteering, particularly in the tennis scene. John is an absolute institution in his own right because he has been there forever, coaching young ones, bringing young ones up through the ranks and then seeing those young ones prosper along the way.

There are volunteer-run community events in our region, the car clubs, the flower show and sporting events. These events provide an economic boost to those small communities. The Riverland is made up of many small communities and there is nothing more important than those volunteers, keeping the Christmas events, the local markets and the Easter Parade running.

This year the Morgan Meals on Wheels celebrated 40 years and I want to thank Jakob Gamertsfelder and his important crew who look after the Morgan region, the Riverland west area. Recently, I caught up with some of the volunteers from the Waikerie Meals on Wheels: Shirley Mudge, Helen Williams, Chris Hoffman, Desiree May, Susie Adams and Gurpreet Kaur. I want to acknowledge Bev Gartery, who has volunteered for more than 45 years at the Renmark Meals on Wheels. Good on you, Bev.

Some other recent award winners are Beverley O'Loughlin of Renmark, who was recently awarded the Renmark Paringa Council 2021 Australia Day Community Services Award for her dedication to volunteering at—get this—the Renmark Netball Club, the junior netball clubs, the Renmark Basketball Association, the Renmark Rovers Football Club, the Renmark Hockey Club, the Riverland SAPSASA, the Renmark Bowling Club, the Renmark Independent Living Op Shop, the Renmark Meals on Wheels and the Renmark Legacy Group. Beverley is just an outstanding gem in Renmark donating her time.

Roslyn Dyer also of Renmark received the Renmark Paringa Council 2021 Australia Day Community Services Award for her contribution to our local community over the past 40 years, particularly with Meals on Wheels and the local Scouts groups. Also, Kym Manning is an institution at Baramera and the coordinator of the carp frenzy. He has been a long-time advocate not only for fishing but for a healthy River Murray. He is also widely renowned for his great work of putting structures back into the river.

Wayne 'Bluey' Fennel has 10 years' volunteering. Brenda Orchard has 18 years' volunteering. Simone Skinner has four years' volunteering with Renmark Mini Movers. Julie Ahrens has 30 years' supporting her community in the regional Girl Guides. Tyson Lindsay was an influential Riverlander, promoting the Indigenous Round, bringing recognition to both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander contributions to sport. Tyson, you are a great ambassador for the Aboriginal community in the Riverland. My heartfelt thanks to all the volunteers in Chaffey.

Time expired.

MOUNT GAMBIER BOWLS CLUB

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:54): I rise to congratulate the Mount Gambier Bowls Club on the opening of their covered bowling rink B, with the assistance of the state government to the tune of \$100,000. I want to also thank the minister for sport and infrastructure, Minister Wingard, who came down and officially opened that project on Saturday. Although the sun was out and it was a very pleasant 21° or 22° down there, that is not the normal weather during winter in Mount Gambier.

This facility will go a long way to providing not only enjoyment but an environment that is suitable for those who participate and enjoy lawn bowls in my electorate.

I also want to thank Minister Wingard for working with me and the bowling club to make sure that funding was secured past a couple of deadlines that had expired. Through no fault of the bowling club's efforts, delays with planning, delays with council and delays with heritage saw that project two years beyond the point where it was meant to be complete, and that created some nervousness amongst the proponents of the project. It was really pleasing that every time I went and saw the minister, he reassured me that the Treasurer, who may have a bit of a reputation for clawing back any unspent money at the first opportunity, would not do that and that those funds were secure for that club.

I guess the really pleasing thing is to see the project come to fruition. All the concerns that people had, that it would not tie in with the heritage of the area, that it would be an eyesore, that it would be out of place, really have not come anywhere close to being the truth. It is a fantastic design, a fantastic development and it is going to lead to much more comfortable conditions for those who undertake bowling at the Mount Gambier Bowls Club, which, coincidentally, is the oldest regional bowling club in South Australia, having been established in 1904.

It is pleasing to see that a club that is steeped in history is so progressive in its thinking and its move forward. This would not have happened without probably three key contributors, the first being Peter Clark. Peter is one of those people who, if he sets his mind to it, you might as well get out of the way early because he is going to achieve what he needs to achieve one way or the other. I had a lot of conversations with Peter around the design and development of this project.

Ian Von Stanke, the president, showed great leadership and strong determination, making sure that 'no' was not an answer that was going to be taken lightly. Probably highest on the congratulations list is Bob Cranwell. Bob made a \$200,000 contribution to this project because it had been floated for so long and it was so desperately needed. This will be the flagship for every other bowling green in our area to see the example and see what is possible.

Another really pleasing thing about that club and the character and the people who are involved in the club is a local-first attitude. There were plenty of times when they were told that this work could only be done by people outside our region because it had never been done before. But this club and the committee stuck strong and employed locals.

What an amazing result for local tradesmen to prove that they can do just as well if not better than those coming from elsewhere. So a great thankyou goes to Thomson Bilt and Leon Thomson—it is a magnificent structure; Ryan and Alana Creek and Stuckey Electrical for the lighting and power; Deanne Carmody and Decor House for the blinds; and Heynric Zaadstra for the plumbing. A big congratulations to all those local tradesmen. You have done our community proud and thank you for your efforts. There will be plenty of people thanking them as the winter months come in.

AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS SHOPPING GUIDE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:00): The 10th edition of the Florey *Australian Products Shopping Guide* has been released just in time for the inaugural Australian Made Week, on now until Sunday 30 May. The product guide was first suggested by one of my constituents, Mrs June Ayres, in 2001 and has grown to be widely welcomed throughout the electorate and more broadly across the north-eastern suburbs. This edition is no exception. It has also been picked up by radio and print media and independent supermarkets as a guide to help consumers more easily identify Australian products when they are out shopping.

South Australians may have recently seen radio and print advertisements about Australian Made Week. This week is the first ever Australian Made Week, a brilliant initiative by the Australian Made Campaign Limited. Dean Blake's article from 24 May quotes Australian Made chief, Ben Lazzaro:

It's an opportunity to focus on the benefits of buying local and highlight that when you buy Australian Made, you have a direct economic impact on the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of Australians throughout the supply chain.

This week in particular shoppers are being urged to say g'day to one extra locally made or grown product per week to help boost the state and the nation's economy over the next 12 months, as the beginning of a change in behaviour by trying products for the very first time. Every dollar spent on Australian made and owned products makes a difference to local businesses, growers and producers.

A recent Roy Morgan report predicted an extra \$5 billion injection into the local economy and up to 11,000 new jobs if every household spent just an additional \$10 a week on Australian-made products. That is where the Florey *Australian Products Shopping Guide* comes in so very handy. It lists hundreds and hundreds of products readily available in local supermarkets—that is the key to the inclusion of your product on this list: they have to be readily available in supermarkets—as there are hundreds more products available in smaller shops and markets throughout the state. We just cannot know about or even list all of them.

It is not an exhaustive list in this guide, but it certainly helps with easy identification of origin of goods when you are zipping about the supermarket, busy after the end of school or on your way home from work.

Why would Australians not want to buy high-quality, locally made products and locally grown food? We have seen in recent times a re-acquisition by Bega Cheese of the iconic Australian brands Vegemite and Farmers Union. The quality and craftsmanship of Australian-made products is internationally renowned, like those from the quintessentially Australian bush outfitter R. M. Williams, which was recently returned to Australian ownership through Nicola and Andrew 'Twiggy' Forrest.

It is not widely known that R.M. (Reginald Murray) Williams owned a large parcel of land in modern-day Walkley Heights and Northfield, currently located within the electorate of Florey. The names of many of the streets in Walkley Heights still bear names relating to R.M. and his family and highlight his historic legacy in our area. It is a legacy of making things here and making them well.

Small to medium as well as large Australian-owned companies create jobs for many people all over South Australia. Over the past year, with the onset of the pandemic, South Australians have rediscovered how important it is to continue making and growing things here.

The South Australian Produce Market in Pooraka have a wonderful 'Pick A Local, Pick SA!' campaign, and much of its excellent produce is locally grown and seen stocked on shelves in Foodland supermarkets and other independent stores across Adelaide. These South Australian success stories are unique to us here. They are stories which do not need the complication of widespread supermarket deregulation, but that of course is another story.

Foodland in particular have been keen supporters of the Florey *Australian Products Shopping Guide*, and I thank Franklin dos Santos, his board and all the Foodland people for all they do. Their work has seen an increase in the amount of Australian-owned and made products purchased for the very first time by households, dating way back to the very first edition of the Florey products guide some 20 years ago. It is a trend we all hope will continue to grow.

From food and drink to cleaning products and skincare, thousands of Australian-owned and made products listed and are correct, at least at the time of printing. It is a very big job, and I want to thank my staff for their painstaking attention to detail, Sue Dyer for her design and update of the brochure, Modbury Press for printing it and of course Australia Post for delivery.

Local South Australian products are highlighted and available at most Foodland stores throughout the state. It also contains a handy guide on how to look for and use the country of origin labels bearing the Australian Made logo. Anyone who has not received or wants a copy of the guide can pick one up from my Modbury North office while stocks last. I am always happy to help local people support local businesses, ensuring our community looks after each other.

If one thing can emerge from the hardship so many have endured due to COVID-19, let's hope it can be a shared responsibility to look after each other. When we think about looking after each other, nothing highlighted the extent of those sorts of things more in the COVID crisis than the run on toilet paper. I cannot believe what happened in that case.

I want to thank all South Australians for purchasing South Australian products whenever they can. Remember, spending just \$10 a week will play a part.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I call the house into committee, I recognise the presence in the Speaker's gallery of Mrs Antonietta Cocchiaro OAM, Deputy Chair of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. Welcome.

*Bills***SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL BILL***Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 4.

The CHAIR: Member for Cheltenham, you have moved your amendment to the amendment. I do not know if you finished speaking to that. Would you like to continue?

Mr SZAKACS: It would be my pleasure to complete my contribution on this important amendment moved by the opposition. As I was saying before the break, this parliamentary declaration, this amendment, signals the importance of recognising in this place the immense contribution of migration, of both a permanent and temporary nature, as well as refugees and their flow-on contribution to multiculturalism.

We are a state and a country built on migration. We are a country, the national anthem tells us and sings proudly about, for 'those who've come across the seas'. The numbers speak for themselves as well when it comes to this and, again, I stand to put this amendment for a raft of reasons, I think—importantly, it is to look at some of the statistics.

In 2016, the Productivity Commission undertook a significant body of research into the net contribution of migration to Australia, and some of the headline figures in that report show that the net economic contribution of migration to this country is quite profound. The uplift, as researched by the Productivity Commission, shows that there is an uplift of an average of \$7,000 per person to our GDP every year thanks to that migration intake. It is also quantified in about a 10 per cent uplift per person in GDP.

That is an enormous contribution, especially when we consider that the countries of birth of many of these migrants we welcome to our shores—economic migrants and migrants of different natures and also refugees—would dream about a GDP of \$7,000 per person per year. This is simply the net uplift in GDP that migration brings to this country.

If you look a bit closer to home, here in South Australia one of our proudest and greatest net exports is the education of international students—another very important part of the temporary migration dynamic that this amendment seeks to recognise in this place with very firm and proud words. The net contribution of international students is worth \$1.92 billion per year. Of course, that has taken an immense hit, and so has our state, during this pandemic that we are still living through. However, just before the pandemic it was \$1.92 billion.

We are very proud of our wine regions. Port Lincoln is a wonderful wine region, and I have had some fantastic wines over there. The wine industry is \$1.91 billion. To think that this cohort of temporary migrants has a net economic contribution that is greater than our wine industry is quite profound and I feel strongly goes to my argument of the need to recognise migration in our declaration before the parliament.

The types of temporary migration that we are talking about are quite diverse: international students; temporary graduate students; working holiday visa holders; employer-sponsored visa holders; refugees, as I have said already and spoken about comprehensively in this place, as have others, about the contribution of refugees to our own lives, mine included; bridging visas; and temporary protection visa holders and safe haven visa holders. As much as I feel strongly about the redundancy of temporary protection visas, it is still an important part of our refugee and migration system here in Australia.

Of those people who call South Australia home, almost 450,000 people who call Australia home were born overseas. As a proportion, even more in my electorate of Cheltenham were born overseas. Again, when it comes to a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reflect and to enshrine the voice of parliament in a declaration, something we have not done before, and as progressive and as forward thinking as the original act that we are seeking to amend today was, it did not contain a declaration. This is a chance to get it right.

In supporting the Attorney's much-needed amendments, it is very late in the piece, so including our amendment to support migration, temporary migration and refugees is very important, in my view. That is why we are moving it. Labor believes strongly in a statement in this place where every single member of parliament is hanging from the rafters and telling and singing the praises of the contribution that our migrants (temporary and permanent) and our refugees have made to this state, from business to academia, from work to arts and sport. It is difficult for us to quantify that contribution, but these words in this piece of law would go a small way to doing that. Labor believes that and the opposition believes that, and I implore the house to do the same.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can the mover of the amendment indicate where or from whom the submission was to incorporate this?

Mr SZAKACS: It was not a submission. It was in fact the government's own consultation process that was I think a couple of years in the making, but there were very significant submissions made in that process to do a number of things. As the Attorney has already provided in her answer, various submissions and stakeholders were engaged. In moving our amendment, what we have done is to actually try to retrofit and fix what I thought would have been done by the government in the first instance when this bill came before the house. There were a raft of submissions and publicly accessible information: the report of the consultation process, the 16 or 18-odd submissions from various stakeholders.

Since then, the member for Ramsay has been the shadow minister for multicultural affairs and before her the member for Badcoe. In my time as assistant shadow minister for multicultural affairs, we have had the immense privilege of not just attending the odd multicultural event but deeply engaging with members of the multicultural community, members of SAMEAC and community leaders.

Most importantly, for the Attorney's benefit—I know that she is a latecomer to this bill and it is certainly not her portfolio; it is the Premier who is minister—the member for Ramsay and I have met with members of the community who are not elected to lead in their community and are not necessarily on the SAMEAC but are the very people we seek to reflect in this amendment: those who work in our small businesses, those who are in academia and in our sporting industries. So in a roundabout way, for the Attorney's benefit, it was the extensive, comprehensive and engaging consultation that the government undertook on this that has informed the view that we have brought to this table.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will not in any way reflect on the Australian Labor Party's view about what should be in the parliamentary declaration, and much of what the member has raised about the significance of migrants in Australia to the very fabric of what we are today I take no issue with. It is just that in the course of the consultation there were a number of published documents, issues papers, etc., prepared to encourage discussion.

There was the consultation and there were a number of written submissions that were then forming a report—the Multicultural Legislative Review written submissions paper—and then there was a Multicultural Legislative Review Consultation Report, which I understood to be a document reflective of issues that had been raised during those consultations. Even in the Australian Refugee Association's submission, I did not see this.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just making the point. I have a summary here of the Multicultural Legislative Review Consultation Report July 2019, which purports to be a summary of all the key points raised at these public consultations for good reason—so that we can know as legislators about what is important to the general community—and it was not raised there. I looked back at the Australian Refugee Association's submission, which was quite a significant submission and where I thought it might be, and that did not even raise it. Do you see what I mean?

It may be that individuals have raised with the member during your own personal consultations about this being reflected in the parliamentary declaration or a charter. I am not specifically saying it had to be in the parliamentary declaration because this was a document or an amendment that we have created to add into this piece of legislation, but it still does not tell me or give me any guide as to who or what group the Australian Labor Party has consulted with, who said that this is something that should be recognised in this declaration.

It is not an unworthy thing. Let's face it: South Australia particularly was not built on convicts; it was built on the South Australian Company Act, which was a migration program. We are built on migration, especially South Australia, where we actually had a direct investment in people coming to South Australia, to permanently migrate here and to develop this part of Australia, so I think it is a very proud part of our heritage.

I do not necessarily see this as something unworthy, but I just do not want to suggest that it is something that we need to add in to the parliamentary declaration. I say that particularly because, having had a look at it, it does not recognise our tourists, it does not recommend our backpackers—

Mr Szakacs: Yes, it does.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: To be fair, you have temporary and permanent migrants.

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It may be. I am just making the point that temporary migration, I would suggest, if we have it in relation to looking at the Migration Act—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The CHAIR: I remind all members that interjections are out of order. The member for Cheltenham spoke very eloquently when moving his motion and now we go into the question part of the debate, and that is how it works.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For example, I would not describe tourists as being temporary migrants. I would describe them as people visiting our country or our state, and I do not think they are defined within the Migration Act as being people who are temporarily here under visas or the like. This is one of the reasons I asked about how this has come about. Is it just to recognise that Australia is very much the richer for migrants as distinct from people who temporarily visit here?

People come here to play sport, they come here to perform ballet, they do all sorts of things when they come here, not necessarily as a temporary migrant but as a visitor. Should we exclude them or should we be giving some consideration to it? I was trying to see whether there was something in our legislative review that would give me some insight as to where this might be coming from and as to how we might reflect this. I do not want people to feel excluded by us saying that it is only the migrants.

For example, we have a lot of people who come and live here and they are legally entitled to do so, and they do not ever sign up to be an Australian citizen. Are they not going to be included here, or do we have them as informal migrants? I do not understand how we are doing this. It may be the intention of the mover that we reflect the diversity of the communities we have in South Australia—and I frankly think they are covered in the other aspects of this parliamentary declaration—to enhance that and make a statement that we acknowledge that we are the better for being a composite of different cultural people in our community, some of whom have come from migration, some of whom were born here and are descendants or whatever. There might be somebody here who is Chinese but who came here in the 1920s and they are fifth generation.

I do not understand why we would produce something in here that only relates to temporary or permanent migrants and not others who are in our community who make a contribution. I am a bit concerned that we do not act in a way that might exclude them. I think I understand where the member is coming from. I cannot agree to it at this stage. We will give it some further thought but, in the absence of having any idea about where it has come from, I am just a little bit lost as to how we might support it.

Amendment to the amendment negatived; amendment carried.

The CHAIR: We have a further amendment No. 2 standing in the name of the member for Badcoe. My information is that the further amendments that we had on our sheet will not be proceeded with. Apparently, we have moved on from that and they are already incorporated.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously, one of the key things in the bill is to change the name from the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission (SAMEAC) to the South Australian Multicultural Commission. What was not working under SAMEAC?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not really understand the question. Is it in relation to the name or something else?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously, part of this bill is to reform the commission. I want to understand some of the rationale and reasoning to go through this reform process. Obviously, the name is being reformed, but there are other aspects as well. Why have you done this?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Firstly, the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980 is now 40 years old, and it is unsurprising therefore that we do not review it and contemporise it—as we do with lots of legislation. Secondly, it was developed as a commission back in 1980, and, as I explained in my second reading, there are a number of other entities that have been created since that time, including the Equal Opportunity Commission with its charter to deal with racial discrimination and other matters as an example of what has progressed independently of the commission.

Thirdly, in looking at contemporary South Australia and who is being represented by this body and/or any structure that is there to recognise and promote multicultural and intercultural matters within the public sector as well, we need to contemporise it, and so that is what has happened.

A substantial consultation period has occurred. Those communities, as I understand it, attended a number of public meetings. Their concerns and priorities were recorded. They are all in this 2019 report, and in addition to that there are a number of entities. I would not necessarily call them the usual suspects in relation to legislation in this field because it has very rarely been looked at—it has been left under a mushroom, I suppose—and it ought to be contemporary.

Those organisations were either invited to attend public meetings or to present their submissions and, as we know, a very substantial number of written submissions have been received, and in this regard I would say that they are very much reflective of the organisations that represent a number of our communities.

In the document titled Multicultural Legislative Review 2019 Written Submissions, the parties that were published in written submissions were Darian Hiles, Australian Refugee Association, Multicultural Communities Council of SA, Community Hubs Australia, Rod de Hoert, Robert Bean, Equal Opportunity Commission, Intercultural Connections, MARRNet (Migration and Refugee Research Network), Associate Professor Marmo and Dr Torresi, George Chin, South Australian Tourism Commission, Catalyst Foundation, and Community Centres SA.

What is not evident from that list, and I am certainly hoping is reflected in all the public meetings at least, was the invitation to all the multicultural groups in South Australia—the numerous ones that cover Indian communities, Chinese communities and European communities. There are hundreds of them. They provide a rich representation of the groups in South Australia.

Some of them are really large communities here, and their associations have quite a sophisticated governance arrangement. Some have multiple associations. The Indian community is one which I think has over 70 different organisations representing different groups within that migration population. Of course, we have some in the communities who are there in multiple form as a result of historical splits. The Greek community is one in that regard.

Then we have a huge umbrella of a whole lot of new communities who were not even here back in 1980, and so it is important that we recognise those and that they have a chance to have a say about the nature of the way they are structured in this representative statutory way. So, yes, I do think it is important that we have the review, and I am very pleased that it has happened.

Clearly, not everyone is happy with how they see the future of the commission, or perhaps even the name change, but it seems to be fairly reflective of what is being raised here, which is really basic questions like, 'How well you understand the functions of the commission?' and then there is the whole summary about that, as well as, 'What is your understanding of the role of the commission members?' and, 'How often do you come in contact with the committee members?' and, 'How often would you like to come in contact with them?'

This is digging down to those communities to have a say about what they want for either their commission or advisory board, whichever way you want to look at it, to help them. In addition to that, in this bill we have maintained the expectation that the commission itself will have a role in advising government—in particular, in this instance, the Premier, who is the minister covering this matter—and, secondly, to have an understanding of how that is going to be operating into the future.

I am very pleased the Premier has undertaken the exercise of understanding whether this is now the contemporary format we need to have and whether our modern, newer communities had a say in how it operates. In the material I have read, a significant number of people have talked about the composition of the commission. Some suggested that there needed to be mandatory provisions related to age, that is, youth.

I know, from having spoken to members of the commission over the years, there have been many attempts to try to encourage younger people to be part of the commission and it has not always been easy. Advertisements are made and invitations have been presented for that to occur, and it has not always been easy to fill. Again, there has been quite a bit of commentary, though, in what I have read on how that should be composed.

Clearly, it cannot possibly be a commission that represents every different community because we have hundreds of people who come from around the world—some of them are in small numbers and some of them are in huge numbers—so it is not an easy task, but it is something I think we needed to let people have a say on. According to this document, they have had a say, and that is why we have done it.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: How were members of the current commission consulted?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think I have answered quite a few questions on this. As I understand it, one or more of the commission's members attended at all the public consultations on this matter in relation to the communities. As I understand it, whilst they were not the proponents of a discussion as far as presenting their views on these public occasions, they were there to listen to what the communities were saying their future roles should be and the structure of the act.

We have raised this before. We have already had an hour on this discussion, but in any event I will repeat it. That has been the position. The commission has attended, been present and presumably listened carefully to what the people have said about what they see the role of the commission to be and some of these other questions that were asked. I have not seen any submission from them as a commission themselves. There is no indication why they should not or could not, but they did not. I have spoken to members of the commission, but I have not seen a written submission from them.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Attorney, could you please clarify for me that the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission members were not actually briefed as a commission about this bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that they were and that there was some disquiet about not having been given a draft of the bill before it was considered by cabinet, but they had certainly been consulted.

Mr SZAKACS: Just to be clear, were the members of the commission who were invited to attend, observe, listen and watch, given an opportunity at those meetings to speak? Were they given an opportunity at those meetings to contribute a personal view, or were they briefed and advised to attend and listen only?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have already said that, but I am happy to say it again: correct—to attend and listen.

Mr SZAKACS: Just so I am clear, the Attorney's view on the consultation that has occurred with the peak ministerial advisory body in this state at present for ethnic and multicultural affairs was to attend a consultation but to sit, listen and not speak?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: To the public, yes, correct.

The CHAIR: Clarification.

Mr SZAKACS: That is fine. The Attorney was not on her feet, but I will take that. Was there another opportunity given to members of the SAMEAC as a collective, not individuals but the SAMEAC at large, to participate in consultation that they were allowed to speak at?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that the commission from time to time meet with the Premier, and that is an opportunity for them to do that if they wish. In any event, at the public consultation we are talking about this was an opportunity, as I understand it—I have read the remit of what was to be done—for the communities themselves to come along and have their say about what they saw as the commission.

Members of the commission, who are experienced people and have been on the commission, not all of them for a long time but some in the previous government's time and some in the current government's time, would have some experience in what they were doing and what they were privy to and would be able to listen to that as well.

There is nothing that I am aware of that in any way prevented the commission themselves presenting their case to the government in a written submission if they wanted to. It appears they have not. I have not seen that. Apart from the direct consultation, they are able to make a contribution to the Premier, who they are entitled to meet. That is my understanding.

Mr SZAKACS: Thank you, Attorney. If my memory serves me correctly, you may have taken on notice when we were before the house a couple of weeks ago whether any instruction or advice was given to the SAMEAC to not contribute a written submission. Do you recall that? If you did not take that on notice then, will you take on notice now whether the SAMEAC was instructed or advised not to provide or submit a written submission?

You also noted that the Premier, as the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, has met with the SAMEAC on multiple occasions. I appreciate you will not have this data with you, but will you take this on notice and come back to the house on how many occasions the Premier has attended SAMEAC in the last 12 months?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They are two slightly different things. The question is: how often has he attended a SAMEAC? I presume that to be a SAMEAC meeting, as distinct from them coming to see the Premier, but, either way, I am happy to have a look at that. But I do not think at any time I have ever suggested that there was any instruction at any time ever to the multicultural commission as it is currently formatted not to put in a written submission in relation to what they wanted in relation to any reform in this bill.

What I indicated was, as I understand still to be the case, the public meetings were held for the general community to have their say, and that includes on whether they think their own commission is doing a great job or a hopeless job or that there should be some changes in it—that is a matter for them. I think everyone there was given that opportunity to actually say what they wanted in the communities and for government representatives and the commission to listen and make a note about what they were. I understand this document, which is the review summary of the things that have been raised, which are all footnoted, actually outlines that.

Clause passed.

New clause 5A.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [AG-4]—

Page 4, after line 33—Insert:

5A—Resources of Multicultural Commission

The Minister must ensure that the Multicultural Commission is provided with such resources as may reasonably be required to carry out its functions under this Act.

This new clause outlines resources of the multicultural commission. I understand it has been requested of the commission and has been inserted on that basis.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: While we welcome on this side of the house the amendment put forward by the government to provide further clarity about resources for the commission, there are considerable concerns about how those resources will be distributed and the entitlement of the commission to gain access through the department. Can the Attorney clarify—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My adviser asks: access to what, sorry?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Resources. While you have put forward an amended position from the original bill, I would like to clarify what the current budget or current resources are for the commission.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would have to check with the budget papers to actually check exactly how much is paid to them. I understand they are all given an honorarium. They presumably have meeting arrangements they get, etc., so I will have a look at that.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: That is not the nature of my question. Can I clarify?

The CHAIR: Yes.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This is about resources to the commission. What has been raised with the opposition has been concerns about having enough resources to support the commission. While the government have put through an amended position because they have obviously heard these concerns as well, I wish to clarify what current resources are provided to commission members.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I take it from that it means who is allocated and what funding is given for staff and that type of thing; is that what the member has in mind?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not know the exact answer to that. I know that there are a lot of commissions. In fact, of course, under the member's previous government, they seemed to breed like mushrooms, but this is an early one. Let me give you a recent one, and that is the State Planning Commission, which I am now responsible for.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: I really do not think you are measuring apples with apples.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will tell you exactly why we are measuring apples with apples and this is why this issue needs to come into the contemporary world. When I came into government and then was given the planning portfolio, I found the State Planning Commission, which comprises I think between five and seven people under the act, to be a statutory independent body—and that is what this commission is—that did not have any staff.

How it worked under the previous government was they did not actually have dedicated staff. They had people who would from time to time come out from the department to provide that service to them. I have actually implemented a process in my division, where I am responsible for these, to actually look at making sure there are staff available for them, even if they are on secondment from a department. You can half-time or full-time employees to be able to do that.

I think there is an argument that there needs to be independence. If you are going to have a commission, whether it is a board or a commission, there need to be dedicated staff for that purpose. I do not know how the previous government operated, but this is the way I am operating in my department. If it means here that there is to be a—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I beg your pardon?

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am talking about the Planning Commission.

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just explaining to you what happened under the previous government, which of course you were not a member of, but the—

The CHAIR: Member for Cheltenham, I have asked you previously to cease interjecting. I would remind all members that when the minister is asked a question they can choose to answer that in whatever way they see fit. The Attorney-General is couching her response and will work through that example and conclude her remarks.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It seems that the model that was employed by the previous government was one which did not have a provision for dedicated staff for its bodies such as these. I can only rely on the State Planning Commission. There are a few others I have found in these departments, but nevertheless this is one of them, and I think it needed to be addressed.

During the course of the development of this legislation, the issue has been raised again about not necessarily dedicated resources but some sort of specific persons who are accountable to them to do their work. The detail, as I understand, has not been sorted out yet, hence the general nature of this clause, which is to acknowledge that they must have some resource, and they are yet to work out how that is going to work.

There are departmental people. This lady sitting next to me is from the department. She has people who work with her in the department. For many years there have been people who have been a resource to the commission, but we are now in a world where we now have this little mini-department and a commission. We have plenty of this sort of model, but this is sitting in sort of a twilight zone, as far as I am concerned, and I think it does need to be moved into the 21st century. This is part of the reassurance that has been given to say that we need to relook at that model.

The CHAIR: Before I call the member for Ramsay, the question really was about resourcing. I might suggest that the Attorney probably would not have that information available to her today, but it might be something you could pursue through budget estimates, which is only a few weeks away.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: With the greatest respect, I think that the issue about resourcing goes to the heart of why the government has amended this position, because concerns have been raised with the opposition about reducing the resources to the commission. I will agree to disagree with you about having a set person in charge because that is simply not true. That has been the situation in the past.

My question is in regard to your amendment, which says 'ensure that the Multicultural Commissioner is provided with such resources as may reasonably be required to carry out its function'. Who decides what is reasonable? Who decides what is reasonable for those resources to be provided to the commission? Who is making that decision?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think that would be a matter between the commission and the minister, who of course is the Premier. Let me say this: if the member is suggesting that the model that they had, which was that the chair of the board was also an employee of the department, then I would say that is not independent and that is a very poor model. We know who that was, and you know who that was. I do not need to get into the detail of her position.

I am not even reflecting on her capacity in her paid role and/or her chairman's role, but I make the point, to me, that is not an effective model and it should never be. How can you possibly have a situation where you have a department that has an obligation to provide advice and support and service to the minister, who is the Premier, and to the commission, and yet we have the chair and the employee as the same person? I do not accept that model at all. We can have a fight about that in the sense of a debate about it, but I think that is a disgraceful situation.

I am very pleased that we now have a level of independence in the commission, which they richly deserve. It is now a question of saying, 'Look, now that we can get this thing onto a proper footing where we have a commission, which is an advisory board to government, to support the community in that multicultural area and all the things that are in the charter, let's make sure that whoever is in the employment of the department, and that's given a budget to operate, very clearly understands what their roles are going to be.' In my view, that should occur in the future.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I seek clarification: is there to be a dedicated full-time officer for the commission under this arrangement?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, that is a matter for the commission to canvass—not with the department. It has nothing to do with the department. It is for the government of the day and the minister to make that decision with the commission as to what they require and what they say they might require. It may be that they need to have access to people in the department across a number of fields, but in my view there needs to be some independence there.

The CHAIR: When the committee is going through this stage, members who ask questions of a minister may get exactly the answer they want or they may get an answer which is nothing like what they might want, but the reality is that it is a question and answer situation.

Mr SZAKACS: Attorney, as the mover of this amendment, can you explain the importance of the words 'as reasonably required'? Is that to be determined by the minister as to what is reasonable or is that to be determined from the commission as to what is reasonable?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think it is to be a matter which is identified first by the commission as to what they suggest they might reasonably require and for that to be agreed on. Usually what happens with these types of arrangements, where there is an indication in general terms, is that it is supported by some regulatory determination or some later specification in the act if it is not agreed.

I cannot recall, for example, that the SA Water corporation legislation has a provision in it which says, 'Thou shall have a minute secretary, an adviser, a policy writer, a this or that.' That is a matter which is ultimately determined by the government, but I would suggest here that it is a matter for the commission to identify what they think they need to have in relation to resources.

They may say, 'Well, we're happy with the current arrangement, where we go back to the department and we pick out someone we think might be able to give us assistance in whatever role they might have.' There are 11 people in this department. It may be that they say, 'We prefer to have an arrangement where we can just go to any of those that we think are the most experienced or qualified to provide us advice.' It may be they want to have a dedicated minute secretary. I do not know the answer to that, and I do not think we should impose that either in the legislation or on the commission, but I think it is reasonable they identify what they would have.

What I do not think is acceptable, and I would certainly never recommend it, is that we have situation where there is a chairman of the commission who is an employee of the government. How can they possibly be an independent body in that situation? It is an impossible situation, and I think it is quite disgraceful.

Mr SZAKACS: Can I ask the Attorney, further to her last answer: you reflected that usually, reasonably or generally speaking when a clause like this is included in a piece of legislation there are further matters that are dealt with in regulation or matters that are subsequent to this. Your amendment does neither. Your amendment does not provide further clauses that would deal with this matter, nor have you proposed that matters will be dealt with in regulation. The contradiction that you just made about, 'Well, this will all be okay because there will be further clauses, there will be further regulations and everyone can just agree,' is not what you proposed in this amendment.

This amendment is very clear: it is 'as reasonably determined'. The minister has used the word 'agreement'. The commission, the department, the minister, or even the assistant minister, may look back to this debate for the minister's response. So is it the minister's view that an agreement must be reached as to resourcing to determine the final outcome?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No; as I said, that is ultimately a matter for the government. In my view, it is up to the commission to identify if they want specific resourcing. However, I think both the members who are presenting the arguments against this—presumably they are voting against this clause; I hope not because we think it needs to show some sort of intent in it—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can I just put it like this, and hopefully it will help the situation: I ask members to have a look at clause 15. If they have not read it, read it, and if they have read it, refresh their memory on it. What it specifies, I hope with some reassurance they might need, is:

The Multicultural Commission may, by agreement with the Chief Executive of an administrative unit of the Public Service, make use of the services of the staff, equipment or facilities of that administrative unit.

That is where they start; that is there, and it is proposed that it will be there. What is being added to it is that if they want to pursue this question of having their own resources—which the member for Ramsay has identified as their own expenditure and their own people that they want—it is a matter they can canvass. However, if they do not get anything else they always have clause 15.

New clause inserted.

Clause 6.

The CHAIR: I seek some clarification here. Member for Ramsay, we have amendments in the name of the member for Badcoe. Are you planning to move those?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes, I move:

Amendment No 3 [Stinson–1]—

Page 4, line 37 [clause 6(1)]—Delete 'functions.' and substitute 'functions, of whom—'

- (a) at least 1 must have lived experience as a refugee; and
- (b) at least 1 must live in regional South Australia; and
- (c) at least 1 must be a person who migrated to Australia not less than 10 years prior to their appointment; and
- (d) at least 1 must be a person aged between 18 and 30 years old (inclusive) at the time of their appointment.

This amendment is put forward because people are very concerned about the diversity of the commission members who are around the table. What we are proposing in this amendment is that, to make sure we have diversity of abilities, knowledge and experiences, of the 15 persons at least one must have lived experience as a refugee, at least one must live in regional South Australia, at least one must be a person who migrated to Australia not less than 10 years prior to their appointment, and at least one must be a person aged between 18 and 30 years inclusive at the time of their appointment.

One of the key things about this commission is that it is representative of the different cohorts and diversity of the migrant experience in South Australia. I hate to go back over old ground, but that is one of the reasons for the parliamentary declaration. We want to include the contribution of migrants, refugees and people here on temporary visas, because each and every one of those people have an input, an impact, on who we are today.

Many people here begin their time in Australia on a temporary visa and then go on to become permanent residents and potentially citizens. Some, of course, are here for many years on temporary visas, particularly those who are fighting to understand their opportunity to become a permanent resident. This matter has been raised because, very simply, not only have people raised this issue with us about representation, but it was also part of the submission process.

The Australian Refugee Association (ARA) said very clearly that it considers it crucial to ensure that SAMEAC members are representative of migrant cohorts and therefore should not all be from already established communities but should consider new and emerging communities. That was quite an important part of what they had to say. In regard to youth, they say:

ARA believes that SAMEAC should also have a youth focus to address inequality and various components of needs/issues that youth faces within the South Australian community...

They particularly touched on the topics of employment, service provision, education, health and wellbeing. Young members of migrant and new arrival communities generally face challenges in addition to those relating to settlement, and it is important for SAMEAC to ensure representation of young people from within the cohorts. It is very clear in the submissions, when looking at reform in relation to this bill, that it was expressed by stakeholders that that representation should be there.

I think it is incredibly important to have regional representation. We know that there are very strong migrant communities—whether it be in Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Mount Gambier or around South Australia—people who have contributed to the development of that region and that area. For me, I

feel it was remiss not to have in the constitution of the multicultural commission details of who should be at least the minimum to have that representation.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I thank the member for the explanation as to the significance of identifying the qualifications, if I can put it in that sense, for four of the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, experience, qualifications, whichever way you want to look at it. I am not talking about a skills base here. The four areas that you suggest should be specified to qualify them to sit on this board. Let's hope I have not offended there.

Let's just have a look. It is up to 15 persons, and that is the same as in the current act. As I understand it, the appointment being made by the minister is consistent; that has been the same all through the 16 years of the previous government. The abilities, knowledge and experience required for the effective performance of the commission are there. Let me find it and make sure I have the right amendment. I think it is Stinson amendment No. 3; is that right? I will just find it here.

It is that one must have lived experience as a refugee, one must be regional, one must be a person who has migrated not less than 10 years prior to the appointment and one must be aged between 18 and 30 years. So we have a refugee; a country person; a relatively recent migrant, if I can put it in that category; and a young person. I think they are the four areas of contribution, which I think are actually all good things to have reflected in the board.

As I have already said, I think this is a board that has struggled over a period of time to attract young people to sit on it, so in that sense I do not have any direct criticism of how the experience that would be brought in by some of these people would be useful to the board in those four areas. There is no provision for any others. It is abilities, knowledge or experience, and this is now specified by the status of their entry into the country, where they are going to live or how old they are.

Those might be some areas that are important for that board; there may be others. There are others in the submissions, but I do not know what has happened to them. There are others in the submissions where people have talked at these meetings or reflected other areas of diversity in written submissions. There is no mention here about whether any of them should be female. There is no mention about whether there should be anything by way of occupation that might be of assistance.

I am going to name the board members at present. I do not know all their backgrounds. Norman Schueler is the chair; Antonietta Cocchiaro, who has been patiently watching this debate, is the deputy chair. Is it deputy chair or deputy president?

The CHAIR: Attorney, she is going to have to be a bit more patient yet; I think we are only at clause 6.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think so. There is Laura Adzanku—I do not know her background; George Chin; Adriana Christopoulos; Maria Maglieri; Sridhar Nannapaneni; Thuy Phan; Valdis Tomanis—I know Valdis. Some of these people I know some I do not. And there is Muhama Yotham; Ning Zhang; and Ahmed Zreika. That is not the full complement because they can have up to 15 on the board and that is 12, so there are some vacancies.

I do not have any particular objection to these, but I would have to say that it would be concerning to me if it did not have some greater diversity, not only in backgrounds. As I said before, there is no way that you can have every different community group or cultural background group or language group or country of origin group because we would have 120 people—more than that probably—on the board. Clearly, we cannot have that, but it just seems to me that the gender issue seems to be completely overlooked. I am confident that the minister—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member reflects—

The CHAIR: Can you take a seat for a minute. This is not an argument: it is actually a debate. There are rules around how a debate should occur and interjection is not part of them. As I said, it is not argument: it is a debate.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The bill describes a continuation of what is the current practice, as I understand it, that is, up to 15 members chosen by the minister having a general qualification in abilities, knowledge and experience required for the effective performance of the multicultural commission. I do not think there is anything new in that.

What is new now is an amendment by the member for Ramsay to introduce four areas of qualification that four of the members should have and I am making the point that it is the diversity on this board that seems to be fairly significant. I do not know whether any of these are originally refugees or not or how long some of them have been here or whether there is more than one who are covered in these areas in relation to the current board.

I do not want to in any way reflect on the board because I am sure they are worthy people who make a wonderful contribution. I make the point that I do not understand why we would pick out four qualifications and not deal with some basic things, such as gender, if you really wanted to try to put this in some kind of specific arrangement.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: Have you read the amendment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have read the amendments. You are only identifying four people.

(a) at least 1 must have lived experience as a refugee;

I am sure this is the one: amendment No. 3 in the name of Stinson.

The CHAIR: Yes, Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I quote:

(a) at least 1 must have lived experience as a refugee;

I think that is pretty clear. I do not know how many of these people are in that category.

(b) at least 1 must live in regional South Australia;

There might be one or more who live in the city or in the country. I do not know.

(c) at least 1 must be a person who migrated to Australia not less than 10 years prior to their appointment;

I do not know if that applies to any of those.

(d) at least 1 must be a person aged between 18 and 30 years old (inclusive) at the time of their appointment.

The CHAIR: Attorney, thank you for that. That is the second time you have read that into *Hansard*.

Mr SZAKACS: Chair, more than anybody in this place I would like to deal with the amendments en bloc. We certainly have a history of being able to deal with a whole bunch of these changes together; however, we need to meticulously deal with amendment by amendment, perhaps because the Attorney has demonstrated some confusion as to the upcoming processes of the amendments that we are dealing with.

Amendment No. 6 [Stinson-1] has been filed and I am sure the Attorney has a copy. This amendment deals quite explicitly—even explicitly enough for the Attorney to perhaps understand—with the composition of the multicultural commission, determining at least half to be women. Whilst I absolutely acknowledge the Attorney's dogged commitment that this clause deal with everything at once, I can give her some comfort that, while this clause only seeks to improve the composition of the commission by including younger people, a refugee, a recent arrival and a person from the regions, we will very soon get to an amendment that mandates 50 per cent of appointees being women.

The CHAIR: I understand the sentiment of the very generous offer from the member for Cheltenham to move these en bloc. The only difficulty with that is that partway through we come across schedule (4), amendment No. 2, which we must deal with—

Mr Szakacs: It was a disingenuous offer, Mr Chairman. I am sorry.

The CHAIR: I am not used to sarcasm in this chair, member for Cheltenham.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I note the indication of the member that gender is a matter that is important. I think the Premier has already indicated that he thinks it is important, too, because, of the current 12 members, six are men and six are women.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 19
Noes 25
Majority 6

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.	Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.
Brown, M.E.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K. (teller)
Wortley, D.		

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Bedford, F.E.	Bell, T.S.
Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.	Cregan, D.
Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Knoll, S.K.	Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.
McBride, N.	Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.
Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.	Tarzia, V.A.
Teague, J.B.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Wingard, C.L.		

PAIRS

Bignell, L.W.K.	Gardner, J.A.W.
-----------------	-----------------

Amendment thus negated.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Stinson-1]—

Page 4, after line 37—Insert:

- (1a) The Minister must, before appointing a member to the Multicultural Commission, call for expressions of interest under a scheme determined by the Minister for the purposes of this subsection.

There has been some criticism in the past about the selection processes for people nominating for or showing an interest in coming onto the commission, and I think probably the best way forward is a very clear expressions of interest process. In fact, the government has already accepted this, because there is currently an expressions of interest process that is going forth. I think it closed last night, asking for people to nominate for the commission. I seek support for this amendment.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot find my notes, but my understanding is that we are supporting this amendment. As the member has said, it has already been the action of the Premier to do precisely that, to call for expressions of interest from people who would like to be considered for the purposes of serving on the commission. The government has taken this feedback on board and will implement a publicly advertised selection process, which they have done.

Amendment carried.

The CHAIR: We now come back to schedule (1), amendment No. 5, which I understand the member for Ramsay is going to move.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Stinson-1]—

Page 5, line 3 [clause 6(2)]—Delete 'backgrounds and gender' and substitute:

backgrounds, gender, lived experiences, age and geographic location

In appointing members to the multicultural commission, the minister should, as far as reasonably practicable, ensure that the membership of the multicultural commission reflects an appropriate diversity of culture, backgrounds, gender, lived experiences, age and geographic location, and should have regard to the knowledge, the sensitivity, the enthusiasm, the personal commitment, the experience and the involvement with the culturally diverse groups of each person to be so appointed.

We encourage support, and I understand the government has shown interest in supporting this amendment. We have already expressed our concern to make sure that the commission is diverse and representative, including gender and geographic locations. We ask for support for this amendment.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I indicate that we are happy to support that and, indeed, under the expression of interest that has just been issued that is precisely what has been identified for the purposes of encouraging people to stand, as to what we are looking for.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Stinson-1]—

Page 5, lines 10 and 11 [clause 6(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

(3) Of the members appointed to the Multicultural Commission, at least half (rounded down to the nearest whole number) must be women.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I indicate that we support this amendment. As I have said, we currently have 12; the Premier has appointed six women and six men, so he is ahead of the game. I am not sure how many prior multicultural ministers can say that they have done that, but we have.

The CHAIR: Nothing like being ahead of the game.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We have already had some conversations about resources for the commission. This clause obviously talks about the presiding member and the deputy presiding member. Concerns had been raised with me from current commission members that the resources were not going to be adequate under this bill and they were concerned. As raised before, there has been an amendment by the government, which we have just recently passed, to ensure that reasonable resources will be given to the commission. As such, the question here would be to ask the process by which the presiding member and the deputy presiding member will be elected.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As the member would be aware, because she has been in government before, under the current act these are appointments of the minister, and I acknowledge they have always been an appointment of the minister, and it is no different from what occurred in the 16 years under the previous government.

I have no idea how that relates to this resource question. This is about the minister appointing someone to be the presiding member, to preside at the meetings, and may appoint another member

as a deputy presiding member to preside in the absence of the member. That is the role of the minister, and I think that has been the same for decades. In the absence of any other information, I do not know how I can otherwise help the member.

From the general background, and detailed information about what is sought in relation to the contribution and lived experience, and any other experience or qualification, of the cohort of those who come in, the minister makes those appointments and the minister picks the presiding member and the deputy member. Nothing has changed.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

Mr SZAKACS: Attorney, does the remuneration as described in this clause seek to maintain the existing arrangements, or is there a view that remuneration, allowances and expenses may differ from the current arrangements?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can you repeat the balance of that question? I did not hear the last bit.

Mr SZAKACS: Is there any intention with this clause to change or alter the existing arrangements for the payment of remuneration allowances and expenses to members of the commission, or is this simply the same, or are the status quo arrangements to prevail?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I just inquired as to the amount that was paid to the presiding member, deputy and ordinary members, but I think the remuneration and allowances are to be on a sessional basis. At present, my understanding is that in practice the remuneration arrangements will be aligned with the cabinet-approved remuneration framework for government boards and committees, approved on 10 December 2007, from July 2021. Whatever the government of the person sitting next to you did back in 2007 is what is to apply as of July 2021, which seems to be on a sessional basis.

Mr SZAKACS: I appreciate that information. I was not inquiring explicitly what the current arrangements are, but it was and is whether arrangements as are currently the case will continue, or whether there is a view to change.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will read it again. In practice, the remuneration arrangements aligned with the cabinet-approved remuneration framework for government boards and committees that was approved on 10 December 2007 will apply from July 2021.

Clause passed.

The CHAIR: Before we get to clause 10, I would like to inform the committee that, with regard to the previous division, the result I indicated was 25-18; it should have been 25-19. The member for Playford was present; however, he was not ticked off. We have checked the video footage and he was here, so the official result is 25-19. We have made that correction, so that is good.

Clause 10.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I will not be going ahead with amendments Nos 4 and 5.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 2 [AG-3]—

Page 7, after line 4—Insert:

- (ab) to advise and consult with State authorities through the Minister to ensure that there is a coordinated approach to the advancement of multicultural affairs;

Amendment No 3 [AG-3]—

Page 7, after line 6—Insert:

- (ba) to advise State authorities through the Minister on the extent to which services and facilities are available to, and meet the needs of, diverse communities of South Australia;

My understanding is that, with the feedback that has been received from current and previous members of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, we are proposing the inclusion of these two additional functions for the commission.

These functions charge the commission, through the minister, with working with state government departments to ensure there is a coordinated approach to multicultural affairs in this state and to advise on the extent to which services and facilities meet the needs of the diverse communities of our state. It is to be noted that there is an amendment to amendment No. 3 with the deletion of the words 'minority groups' and the substitution of 'diverse communities of South Australia', as the latter is more inclusive and in line with the intent of the bill. Do I need to move amendment No. 3?

The CHAIR: Attorney, if I could just assist here, you moved from schedule (3) in your name, amendments Nos 2 and 3 together.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

The CHAIR: I am happy to accept that.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you. I think 'diverse communities' has already been covered. There may have been a previous draft of an amendment, which has not been covered, because it is better language to refer to 'diverse communities', which I wholeheartedly endorse.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I thank the government for this amendment. They would have heard, as the opposition did, that there were concerns that there was a watering down of the role of the commission. Rather than having an understanding that the commission could speak to all state authorities across the South Australian public sector, there was a belief that the bill proposed that they could only speak through the minister or to the minister.

The government have obviously heard what we have heard, and they have put this amendment up to make sure it is very clear that the commission can advise and consult with state authorities. Although it is still through the minister, they still have that belief that they can reach out. I know, particularly when the commission was involved, that they were there to talk about things such as health, domestic violence and aged care.

These were areas that they wanted to raise because the community raised those matters with them, and then they were able to communicate with all areas within government to raise those concerns. There was no limiting of that at that time. I welcome the amendment and I acknowledge that we will be supporting this.

Amendments carried.

Mr SZAKACS: On behalf of the member for Ramsay, I move:

Amendment No 6 [Bettison-1]—

Page 7, after line 6—Insert:

- (ba) to keep under review the extent to which the matters set out in section 4 are being achieved and furthered in South Australia;
- (bb) to raise awareness of and promote the matters set out in section 4;

This is to insert new paragraphs: (ba) to keep under review the extent to which the matters set out in section 4 are being achieved and furthered in South Australia; and (bb) to raise awareness of and promote the matters set out in section 4.

To put it simply, this section builds on the remarks that the member for Ramsay made just then about ensuring that the commission is not just an advisory body but also a body of action. We have spent considerable time in this committee already in this debate moving amendments and, frankly, dramatically improving, from the government's bill, the parliamentary declaration. What this amendment does is give the commission the authority, the capacity and also the mandate to review and pursue matters contained within the parliamentary declaration.

It is our view that the parliamentary declaration, as important as it is, is only as important as the paper it is written on if not given to a body, an authority, to pursue and to monitor. We think there is no better body than the new iteration of the commission to monitor and to review the progress of matters contained within the declaration.

As already improved, for example, it is giving power to the commission to ensure that diversity is pursued in this state, to ensure that the valuable contribution that migration has made continues in this state, to ensure that Aboriginal peoples are acknowledged in the work that the commission does. We think it is prudent to ensure that the commission does not just advise but is empowered to act. We trust the commission to do that and we commend this amendment.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think they are all commendable objectives and I do not have any issue with them. But the reason I am going to indicate that we are not supporting this amendment is that, if there is going to be an obligation of the commission to do these things, it should be in their charter or in the terms of their function in the act.

What is being proposed here is that these two inclusions that are proposed are to be raised in the parliamentary declaration, and that is a thing that the parliament signs up to. Yet, we are adding into this a provision for what the commission is going to do in relation to its obligation which, in my view, should either be in the functions or in the charter. I think it is entirely in the wrong place, so I cannot support it.

Mr SZAKACS: While I appreciate that the Attorney has a view around this being in the wrong place, the functions are the only place for this to be. I reiterate that this is for the commission to keep under review the extent to which the matters set out in the declaration are being achieved and furthered in South Australia. Further, this gives a function to the commission to raise awareness and promote the matters that this parliament thought fit to contain within the declaration.

This does not provide a new set of content. It does not provide a new set of subject material that the commission is setting out to do. What it is simply saying is that in these four walls the parliament has declared X, Y and Z to be of significant importance, so we would like the commission, in the body of work that they do, to review and to keep an eye on ensuring that what we say in this place is taking extent and giving it authority and action outside these four walls.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is basically to be the enforcer of ensuring that the parliamentary declaration is actually implemented, presumably by parliamentarians. So if anyone does not sign up to this you might be in all sorts of trouble. There is no penalty for not doing it. Again, I suggest that that is actually what is inappropriate in this area.

Its role may well be to raise awareness and promote a number of matters that overlap these two areas, but the commission's role is set out in the functions and they are clear in relation to what it is doing, including promoting unity, understanding and harmony, amongst other things. These are all good things, but a lot of these are repeated in the parliamentary declaration. The parliamentary declaration is in another section, to put in the statute what we are signing up to as a parliament.

Now we have an enforcement role, it seems to me, being attempted here. I just cannot support it. We will end up with this circular obligation here and it just is bizarre to me. In any event, for those reasons I cannot support it, but I do not in any way diminish the fact that the paragraphs from (a) to (i) actually cover the important aspect of making sure that we advise ministers and that we identify the needs, the aspirations and contributions of South Australians with diverse backgrounds, increase awareness—all the things that are in its functions are already there.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Bettison-1]—

Page 7, after line 9—Insert:

- (da) to raise awareness of the harm that racism and other forms of discriminatory behaviour can do to multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia;

The intention of this amendment is to add to the functions of the commission to raise awareness of the harm that racism and other forms of discriminatory behaviour can do to multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia.

When I read a lot of the submissions from people looking into the review of this act, an act that had not been looked at for many decades, quite a few of the submissions raised the issue of racism. I was somewhat surprised that the bill did not identify this as one of the roles of the

commission. In fact, when I have raised this, commission members themselves have said, 'Yes, I do think this is something that the commission should have a function to do.'

Many people think the debate over racism has been completed, that we are accepting of our multicultural society. Unfortunately, it is simply not true. We still have concerns and, in fact, back in March I spoke on Harmony Day in this house, when ASIO put out a report stating that they were concerned with the ever-increasing nationalist right wing presence in Australia.

For many of those people who are attracted to that type of subset, it is about white supremacy, which is actually the complete opposite to what many of us in this house, and I hope all of us, believe in. It is partly why the commission exists—because we think that this is important. We think that it is important to be proud of our multicultural society. We think its diversity is our strength and that is why this amendment is in there today. The Australian Refugee Association (ARA) talked about this in their submission. They said:

As a member of the Stop Racism Taskforce...ARA's commitment to a just and equal society is ongoing. Through our work with the Taskforce, ARA has been able to recognise the strong need for SAMEAC to also be more involved in addressing racism and discrimination within the wider Australian community. We urge SAMEAC to develop stronger relationship with communities, organisations and initiatives such as the Taskforce and better advocate against all forms of discrimination perpetrated against multicultural communities in South Australia. ARA also believes that in addition to the Stop Racism Taskforce, SAMEAC—

or SAMAC, as it will be—

should also be closely working with the Equal Opportunity Commission, to address discrimination and harassment and promote equality across South Australia, including government departments, mainstream services and local business.

Not only has this been raised with the opposition but it was detailed quite clearly in these submissions when we were looking at the review of the bill. I look forward to the day that we do not need a function of this kind, but we are not there yet and we must not be complacent. That really is what the conversations I have had with many people have been about: having this as part of the commission.

We must not be complacent. Not everyone agrees that multiculturalism adds to our strength. When we want to talk about interculturalism, there are people who are not there yet, so it is very important for me that, in their communication with the community, one of the key functions of the commission, who is there representing the diversity of South Australia and telling our migrants' stories in action, is to raise awareness of the harms of racism.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, I find myself completely agreeing with the member as to the sentiments of racist behaviour and conduct. I just remind the house that actually it is against the law. The Equal Opportunity Act 1984, which of course postdates this legislation—the Equal Opportunity Commission has a very clear role in that—prohibits discrimination on a number of grounds, including race, in a range of public areas, including employment, education, membership of an association, disposal of an interest in land, accommodation, superannuation or the provision of goods and services.

The Equal Opportunity Commission has a statutory role—and I said this in the second reading contribution—and it is their responsibility to educate and inform the community of their rights and responsibilities under the equal opportunity law. So I totally agree with the member in relation to racism. I agree with her that it is abhorrent. It is actually against the law. We have a dedicated agency to act on it, to ensure that it is enforced and to educate the community in relation to that.

I read the ARA contribution several times actually because I was looking for some indication that there be a role of SAMEAC. I do not think that is what it says at all. If the whole of paragraph 3 is read in their submission, it in fact suggests and invites SAMEAC to work with them, because they are a member of the Stop Racism Taskforce, to support that sentiment. It then goes on to say:

ARA also believes that in addition to the Stop Racism Taskforce, SAMEAC should also be closely working with the Equal Opportunity Commission, to address discrimination and harassment and promote equality across South Australia, including government departments, mainstream services and local business.

Clearly, SAMEAC has a role and it is another agency's role to deal with both the prosecution of a breach of the Equal Opportunity Act, where racism is alleged as a form of discrimination, and indeed the educative role. That is their job.

I want to reinforce the fact that what has happened here is that we have had a commission that was established, or we actually had a representative in relation to multiculturalism—I think they

were called a director before we had a commission back in the seventies, but I could be wrong—and it developed into a commission in 1980. In 1984, we had new legislation on equal opportunity that dealt with gender and a few other things back in those days, but it has very much expanded since then, and they have that job.

I have spoken to members of the commission too, and it seems that they agree and acknowledge that the Equal Opportunity Commission has that job, as I suggest the ARA do. They are saying, 'Look, we should join in the sentiment in relation to this but we acknowledge that they should be working to make sure.'

Let's just use a practical example here. If a circumstance were to arise where a member of the multicultural commission, who may be attending festivals and events and celebrations of people in our multicultural community during the many contributions they make, witnessed an example of conduct which would be in breach of this, which was to exhibit some racist behaviour, then of course we would expect them to act—not to go out and have an education program about it but to report them to the relevant authority.

They are in a key position as commissioners, mindful of and familiar with the laws, dedicated to ensuring a multicultural/intercultural cause and ensuring that illegal conduct is not allowed. I would hope that every single member of the commission in such a senior role would make sure of that within their own communities with which they are culturally familiar and/or others that they visit. I know that they are all really busy in doing this job and we thank them for it, but that is another agency's job. This is a very clear job to do: make sure government agencies are doing their job and that there is a shared commitment to what these objectives are in this legislation and report back to the Premier, no less, if it is not happening.

What is a separate job is dealing with illegal conduct, and we have agencies to deal with that. If they think that it is actually unlawful or criminal, then of course it goes to the police. If they think there is any discrimination for someone in this long list of categories—employment, access to schools, all these things—then they know what their job is, too, and that is to send it to the Equal Opportunity Commission. We do not want to overcomplicate this. I just suggest, with respect, that the Australian Refugee Association is not calling for what is in this amendment at all.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: While I acknowledge what the Attorney says, that racism is illegal, it does happen. I think there is an opportunity for the commission to provide education and awareness of the harm that racism causes. I think it was very clear from what ARA said that they need the commission to advocate. They have been part of this Stop Racism Taskforce, they acknowledge the role of the Equal Opportunity Commission, but they call upon, they welcome, they encourage the commission to raise awareness about the harm of racism.

We can agree it is illegal, but we have some way to go and I think it is incredibly important that this is one of the functions of the commission. I think it is very clear that not all Australians believe in multiculturalism and interculturalism and that people of varying diversity do suffer from racism every day. We would like to think that it does not happen, but it does, and in particular, as I said in my second reading contribution, our Asian community has suffered greatly since COVID. They have raised with me many, many times how life has changed for them.

At this point, it might be about COVID and our Asian community. At another point, it could be another group. But what we need to do is continue to raise concerns about the harm of racism. I think it is incredibly important that this should be a function of the commission.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would ask the member, if it is not in paragraph 3, I have looked at it again, and there is no provision here that this group has an educative role on racism. That is not what is sought. It suggests very clearly, 'advocate against all forms of discrimination perpetrated against multicultural communities.' We are not talking about racist acts: we are talking about discrimination.

Mr SZAKACS: The Attorney will no doubt understand that the capacity for the commission to work with peak agencies like the Australian Refugee Association would limit it to the functions of the commission but, further, enabled by the next clause, which clause 11—Delegation.

Whilst many peak agencies and bodies in this space want to have a greater role or believe in their capacity to play a greater role in education or awareness raising on various matters, it is the function of the commission that needs to be inserted first. I can foreshadow very happily our support for clause 11—Delegation; that is, the capacity for the Multicultural Commission to delegate to a specified person or body, or to a person from time to time, any of the functions of the commission.

Further, all I can say is thank God the Attorney is not in charge of other education functions or awareness functions of the government. I can just see it now: 'Don't speed—it's illegal,' 'Don't take drugs—it's illegal,' 'Don't coward punch—it's illegal.' It is not the point, Attorney. The point is that it is the job of a government, it is the job of a commission, to raise awareness.

The Attorney has said extensively in her contribution on this clause, 'We don't need to give the commission any powers to raise awareness about the dangers of racism, and we don't need to give the commission any ability to function as an intermediary about the dangers of racism, because it's illegal.' That is a very 1960s mentality, perhaps a time when the Attorney was a bit more comfortable with the law of this state and perhaps a bit more comfortable operating in, but the truth is that we have moved a long way past that.

When it comes to drug education, when it comes to road safety, when it comes to the king hit, which we now call a sucker punch, we do not just set out to tell young people, to tell at-risk cohorts, 'Don't do it—it's illegal,' or, in this case, 'Don't be racist—it's illegal.' We actually say, 'Let's talk to the communities about the dangers of racism. Let's talk to communities about the profound impact that racism has.'

We have heard in this place contributions from the member for West Torrens—I have sat here in this chamber with him—talking about the profound impact that racism has had on him. I have spoken with members of the commission about the profound impact that racism has had on them. For the Attorney to say, 'Racism is bad, racism sucks, but let's keep it out of this act,' is just mind-boggling.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

SUPPLY BILL 2021

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 26 May 2021 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***LAND TAX**

442 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (4 May 2021). When were land tax bills sent to landowners for land liable for land tax as at 30 June 2020?

- (a) When were bills sent to individuals?
- (b) When were bills sent to companies?
- (c) When were bills sent to trusts?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Land tax invoicing commenced in the same week as previous years (i.e. the second weekend of October 2020). The Land Tax Invoicing Schedule effective for the 2020-21 financial year has so far consisted of three separate land tax billing groups, with billing runs occurring on 9 October 2020 for companies, associations and natural persons, on 16 October 2020 for natural persons and on 30 October 2020 for companies and associations.

However, due to the volume of company, individual and trust exceptions to be reviewed and processed, and the complexity of system developments required to process land tax related to complex ownership structures, there are a number of ownerships including trust ownerships that have not yet received Land Tax Assessments. Consequently, RevenueSA is continuing to issue land tax assessments.

SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS, MOUNT GAMBIER

In reply to **Mr BELL (Mount Gambier)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education): I have been advised:

Grant High School is undergoing a \$7 million capital works upgrade.

- Key scope for the upgrade includes:
 - construction of a new building to house performing arts, general learning areas and a new canteen;
 - refurbishing an existing building to provide additional learning areas including a science laboratory and art room;
 - new student courtyard hub with covered outdoor areas for individual and group study;
 - removing aged transportable buildings with asbestos.
- The project architect is the Brown Falconer Group and the project builder is Kennett.
- Construction commenced in July 2020 and is currently anticipated to reach practical completion in August 2021.

Moorak Primary School has been allocated \$1.855 million to deliver a modular preschool facility:

- The facility will include activity areas, withdrawal space, kitchen, administrative support areas, toilet amenities and an outdoor play area. The building is designed to meet the National Quality Standards.
- Tender evaluation for the construction contract is currently underway.
- The project is currently anticipated for completion in December 2021.