

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 10 June 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.

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: SURGICAL IMPLANTATION OF MEDICAL MESH

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:01): I move:

That the 44th report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Surgical Implantation of Medical Mesh in South Australia, be noted.

On behalf of the Social Development Committee, I have a number of people and organisations to thank. Firstly, it goes without saying: thank you to the individual witnesses and their families, who have given this committee their time and insights and provided accounts of their journeys with medical mesh, which have at times been understandably traumatic for them. We were told by South Australian women that this pelvic mesh has had a debilitating impact on their lives. For many women, they have been devastated also by the long wait times for help.

Through their written and oral submissions, the committee has been able to understand the deeply personal nature of the damage mesh can cause in the human body, how the experience of this for many sufferers needs to be given proper recognition and an appropriate response by the relevant authorities. The committee would also like to thank our state's pelvic mesh clinic and the staff who work at the clinic who provided oral evidence and written responses to many questions taken on notice.

The committee would like to thank the professional colleges, medical associations, non-government sector, universities and research institutes and their learned representatives, whose evidence was educative and much appreciated by the committee. Lastly, the committee thanks the advocacy groups who have assisted many of the mesh-affected women and men in this state and supported them through pain and in making their submissions to this inquiry.

I also thank the Presiding Member, the Hon. Dennis Hood, in the other house; the member for Newland, who chaired the committee for a period of this inquiry; and the committee members and secretariat for their work on this review. I would also like to mention and thank the member for Torrens, who moved this motion for this inquiry to be undertaken and has been a passionate advocate for mesh-injured South Australians.

I am pleased to be noting the report today on behalf of the committee. Briefly, the Social Development Committee started the inquiry into the surgical implantation of medical mesh by advertising across the state and calling for submissions in July 2019. The committee received 69 written submissions and held 15 hearings, with the report being tabled today the result of a very lengthy inquiry dating back to July 2019, so almost two years.

During this time, and largely as a consequence of the report of the Community Affairs References Committee in the Senate on the number of Australian women affected by transvaginal mesh, many changes have occurred in the regulations and the use of medical mesh. Some of that committee's recommendations are still to be fully implemented, but the majority have been, both federally and in South Australia.

After taking into consideration the evidence presented by the many stakeholders and examining some of the emerging national and international policies and regulations concerning the use of medical mesh in pelvic organ prolapse, stress urinary incontinence and hernia, the committee has made 17 recommendations to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

I will not go into any more detail this morning, but there is so much more I could say, and many of us were brought to tears listening to witnesses, except to say the report has now been

publicly tabled. I do recommend the report to members of this chamber who have an interest in this important area and indeed to members of the public who may be interested. I think the report will provide a good basis for understanding the issues and for looking at what I believe will be a very overdue and worthwhile path ahead. The committee has made some strong recommendations. The inquiry was held in a multipartisan fashion, with much more focus on getting a result for people who have suffered.

I think the final point to make here is that there is no doubt at all that, whilst this particular form of surgery has been successful for some people, there are a significant number of people who have suffered intensely as a result of these implants or devices being inserted into them, and the response from the medical profession as a whole has been suboptimal, not just in South Australia but right across the world.

The committee attempted to take the best possible evidence it could in order to, firstly, perform an overview of the situation and outline some of the terrible suffering that has occurred as a result of these procedures but also to provide 17 recommendations on what should be done from here. I am pleased to inform the chamber that in many cases these recommendations have already been partially taken up or at least been seen as an obvious next step by those towards whom the recommendations are directed. The report is comprehensive and I commend it to the house. I look forward to contributions by other members.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (11:07): In moving the private member's motion for an inquiry into issues related to the surgical implantation of medical mesh in South Australia, I said:

We know that the consequences for some women have been severe, and we also know that there are men now being impacted by the implantation of medical mesh...It is not everyone, just as it is with the medical mesh that women have had implanted...

The majority of these people will go on to have good results, but those adversely affected—and there are tens of thousands around the world—say the risk is too high.

Significantly, the Therapeutic Goods Administration has lifted the rating of mesh from medium to high risk. I said in that opening speech that we need to deliver not only for the women already affected but for those women—it may be your wife, it may be your daughter, it may be your mother—who could still be impacted by an adverse reaction resulting from this procedure.

Today, I want to acknowledge the courage and the selflessness of all the women and men affected by medical mesh implantation who have stood together in South Australia, Australia and around the world. I want to acknowledge also their families. I want to thank all the lived experience of the mesh injured who provided evidence to the inquiry, knowing how emotional and traumatic it was for them to relive their journey but who did so in the hope that it would make a difference. I hope today that you feel that it was worthwhile. I trust that the evidence from the inquiry and that recommendations contained in the report will go some way to delivering a positive outcome.

I want to thank committee members the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Emily Bourke, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the member for King and the member for Newland. I would like to place on record a thankyou to the secretariat, Ms Robyn Schutte and Ms Mary-Ann Bloomfield. I would also like to thank the academics, the researchers and the members of the medical profession for their evidence and for their participation in the inquiry.

Importantly, today I want to acknowledge the women in South Australia and around the world whose voices went unheard for so long. In the chamber today, for the noting of this report delivered by the parliament's Social Development Committee inquiry, are some of the women and men whose lives have been impacted by the devastating adverse reactions to medical mesh: Kim, Tracey, Yvonne, Evelyn, Penny, Norma, Valerie and Dean and their families, each of them revealing deeply personal stories of their horror journey and the impact on them and their families.

Others affected and who played a significant role are Gwenda, Vicki, Kirsty, Eunice and Cynthia. I also want to place on record a special thanks to Rebecca DiGirolamo for her commitment to spreading awareness of this in the media, through the *Sunday Mail* and *The Advertiser* newspapers and also to the ABC for their reports. As a result of media coverage, contact was made with my office and with the committee secretariat by mesh-affected people not aware of the inquiry and by others who had suffered for years with symptoms, not knowing the cause.

I was contacted by these men and women who, after hearing about this inquiry and seeing it in the media or hearing by word of mouth, are finally able to understand what many doctors and specialists have been unable to identify: that their mesh may be the cause of their pain and suffering. The committee heard that some people did not even give fully informed consent prior to the implantation of medical mesh and many of the people who contacted me following the media reports supported this.

The first time I heard about mesh was from a constituent, Tracey, who is here today. Tracey left a message with my trainee. She wanted me to return her call. I had not had an opportunity to get back to her, but a couple of days later I was doorknocking and I doorknocked Tracey's door. She opened the door, grabbed my hand and said, 'You need to hear what I have to say.' Tracey told me, 'I'm not a number, I'm not a statistic, I am a woman who was just 29 years old when mesh ruined my life. After the birth of two children, I suffered stress urinary incontinence and 2006 saw the beginning of my harrowing journey.'

She told me that mesh stole her life. It stole her children's happiness and it almost stole her marriage. She said, 'It stole my mind and my body and my ability to trust another human being.' The damage physically, emotionally, financially and psychologically was far more damaging than the very reason why she had the surgery in the first place. Tracey recently travelled to Melbourne where, at a cost of thousands of dollars to herself, she had the mesh removed in the private health system. She told me that her pain has significantly reduced, but there still remains some damage that she hopes will be repaired in the future.

Kim is a mother of four, a career paramedic and a registered nurse. She shared her experience about the effects transvaginal mesh has had on her life, the life-altering impact on her and her family physically, emotionally and financially, impacting on both her personal and professional life. Kim had the mesh implanted in a hospital in South Australia, but she had to travel to the US, at her own expense, to have it removed. Kim said that mesh has impacted on every aspect of her life. Kim is an active advocate and has worked tirelessly to have the voice of mesh-injured women heard, and along with this she has the lived experience so that many of the mesh-injured will be in contact with her through their support organisations that they have set up. The same goes for Tracey.

Yvonne was not fully informed prior to mesh being implanted. The procedure has negatively impacted and altered every aspect of her life. She told me that going into surgery she was fit and active, a much-needed wife, mother and grandmother, and that she was full of hope. Due to adverse surgical injuries, she awoke bewildered and broken. A bladder perforation left her unable to void and catheter dependent. She developed a foreign body reaction to mesh, and she felt like she was dying a slow and agonising death, which at times, she says, would have been welcome. Mesh stole her dignity, her ability, self-esteem, confidence and independence. She is saddened when she reflects on life before mesh and life now.

We have women here in South Australia and around the world who have been telling these stories. In evidence, we heard similar stories, that after months and months of going to doctors and specialists with all sorts of symptoms and no record of the mesh implantation coming forward they were told it was in their head. Some were given medication because they were accused of being hypochondriacs and told they just needed to settle down. We heard evidence that it was not until the husband's penis was grated during intercourse, as if by a cheese grater, when there were physical signs, that the medical profession actually saw the impact that the mesh, which was coming through the woman's vagina wall, was having.

These recommendations that we have before us today need to be given the genuine and serious consideration that they deserve. We do not want this report to be one that is put on the shelf and ignored. We want this report to be one that will be taken into serious consideration and to have the recommendations by the committee implemented. There is already work being done, but there needs to be even more. The pace at which it is being done needs to be much quicker. We need to take it seriously and we need to deliver, not just for the women already affected but also for those who may be affected had this information not been made public. No evidence provided to this inquiry could reliably show how many people in South Australia have had an implanted mesh device or how many people have experienced adverse effects from an implanted mesh device.

There are 17 recommendations before us, and I would like to take time to go through them, but as I look at the clock I realise that we are not going to be able to do that, so I just want again to say thank you to everyone who submitted evidence. I want to say thank you to the women and the men who have stood up and delivered deeply personal stories. I hope that these 17 recommendations will be implemented and that they will impact significantly on your future and also the future of others who have been negatively impacted by medical mesh.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:17): I rise to support the noting of this very important report from the Social Development Committee in regard to the impact of medical mesh, pelvic mesh, that has been experienced by so many South Australians. I echo what the member for Torrens has said in thanking those survivors of mesh for the bravery they have shown in speaking up, not only on behalf of themselves but on behalf of other South Australians who have been impacted by what had previously been an unspoken issue that so many people had been faced with.

There are a significant number of South Australian women and some South Australian men who have been outrageously adversely affected by these implants. It has impacted their quality of life on a daily basis, and we have not given them the support and the help they need to deal with that issue. Thank you to all those people who have stood up and have forced this inquiry and this set of recommendations to happen today.

Secondly, we would particularly like to thank the member for Torrens, who has really taken up the fight on behalf of those people who have been impacted and who has been the leading advocate now in South Australia, in our parliament, on this issue and has pushed for this inquiry to happen. If it were not for the member for Torrens, this inquiry would not have happened. We would not have revealed the shocking state of affairs that so many people are facing and we would not have these recommendations that are now before the parliament. We will now see what the government's response to those is.

The member for Torrens has talked about the impacts and the process by which we got to this state where people have had these awful implants ruining their lives. I would like to take a bit of time to talk about the fact that we are now failing to help people who are in this difficult situation through the lack of support that they are receiving through our public health services at the moment. It is something that the committee examined in some detail and it also considered evidence from families and public health services. The report observes:

1. the Clinic [the SA Pelvic Mesh Clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital] still does not have a credentialed, properly trained and experienced Urogynaecologist employed at the Clinic. This means the Clinic is unable to meet one of the key parts of Recommendation 13 of the Senate Inquiry, which is to be able to give many of its patients what they most want and need—full surgical removal of their mesh devices. Further, the Clinic is 'dealing with a backlog, of five to 10 years of patients'

Five to 10 years of patient backlog is completely unacceptable. It goes on:

2. the women with the most serious complications will still be required to be assessed by a highly experienced surgeon inter-state as the proposed Urogynaecologist being recruited to SA will not be able to operate in the most complicated cases

Yet again, even when we do recruit this person, we are not going to be able to provide those services here in South Australia. The report continues:

3. it is not clear why the threshold for acceptance is so high and women are being turned away when they are in terrible pain. Because of the dedicated services offered by the SA Pelvic Mesh Clinic, the Committee considers this may be the best place for these women to receive their treatment, in South Australia where they also have family support
4. allied health service clinics for patients to receive treatment from physiotherapy, psychology, urology and pain management specialists are not full-time and a patient may not receive back-to-back appointments in a single month. This means patients may have to wait weeks, or months for their next appointment as they move through the Clinic's schedule of appointments
5. while efforts are now being made, appointment times for regional and rural patients are spaced out with difficult timeframes to be met, meaning patients have to travel long distances while nursing injuries, pain and discomfort, on numerous occasions. For most regional women, the time between appointments with allied professionals is too long.

Disappointing, or perhaps alarming, are the accounts from mesh injured women who have accessed services at the Clinic and have allegedly been treated with impatience, irritation, or disrespect by some of the staff at the Clinic.

The Committee has made a number [of] recommendations to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to give consideration to addressing some of the problems identified about the Clinic's services in this report, urgently and into the near future.

So these poor people in this awful situation are not getting help. There is a backlog of five to 10 years. You cannot get the help in South Australia and, even when you try to get the help, you are treated with impatience, irritation or disrespect by some of the staff at the clinic. That is completely unacceptable, yet that has been well known now through the course of this inquiry over the past two years since it was instigated, and seemingly nothing has been done by the government to address these concerns that have been repeatedly raised by victims through this process.

We now have these recommendations on the table and the government needs to stop delay, stop inaction and actually address these recommendations. The recommendations state:

...the RAH [be] appropriately staffed to support South Australian women undergoing full and partial mesh removals, including post-operative staff... Investigate the potential for developing a 'hub and spoke' model of services, similar to the one being developed by the Queensland Pelvic Mesh Service...

Further:

- (a) Urgently develop a policy to release existing funding (that has been previously identified for approved Mesh Clinic patients to travel to Victoria for assessment for full removal of their mesh implants under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Royal Women's Hospital), so that these patients may seek care and surgery in Victoria without additional suffering.

It should not be acceptable that we have to send people interstate. The member for Torrens and I have spoken to many people who have had to travel overseas to get their treatment. At the moment, they are being denied any treatment in South Australia at all, so we need to help them in any way that we possibly can. The recommendations continue:

- (b) Following the successful establishment of an MOU, those women who were, or are, on the SA Pelvic Mesh Clinic waiting list for full mesh removal surgery and have proceeded with surgery, be assessed for compensation so they are not financially disadvantaged.
- (c) As soon as practicable commit additional funding to the SA Pelvic Mesh Clinic so that the Clinic can increase the services the clinic can provide to mesh affected women. This funding could provide for additional staff including: urogynaecologist surgeon(s); nurse consultant; physiotherapist(s); counsellor(s); lived experience advocates; social worker(s); pain management professionals to provide services to mesh injured women and assist with lodgement of adverse events reports to the Therapeutic Goods Administration.

- 15. Provide funding for the SA Pelvic Mesh Clinic to re-establish the Consumer Advisory Group of the Clinic to be led by appropriately remunerated lived experience staff—

re-established, because it was de-established. It continues:

- 16. Whilst a 'hub and spoke' model is being examined, urgently consider implementing a program of 'mobile services' to regional and rural mesh injured patients on a twice-yearly basis. Patients should have access to all services they would ordinarily have access to when they attend clinics in Adelaide—

Both the member for Torrens and I have spoken to many people who are in regional areas. Already, we know there are barriers to getting access at the Royal Adelaide Hospital Clinic and that is of course even worse if you live in regional South Australia. Finally:

- 17. To inform services provided by the SA Pelvic Mesh Clinic, initiate a review to be led by people with lived experience of mesh injuries and contributed to, by a Consumer Advisory Group, of the available services and continuity of care for mesh affected patients who have had a full mesh removal but still experience ongoing pain associated with mesh and mesh related injuries.

There are a whole series of very important and very precise recommendations that have come out of this very long inquiry, which has heard from the experts and has heard from the people affected. These should be put in place now. We should not have had to wait to get to this point to take action, but this is where we are now, years down the track.

We need an urgent response to the government in relation to these recommendations. Will they be implemented? Will we improve services for women who have been affected by these awful implants and suffer outrageous pain on a daily basis? We can help them, but we need to have the will and the leadership from the government to finally act on what is widely known now.

I would like to thank everybody who was involved in providing evidence to this committee. You have made a difference in raising our attention to this issue. I know that certainly the member for Torrens and I and others will keep campaigning on this issue because you have been very poorly served so far and we cannot let that continue into the future.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:27): I would like to make a few brief remarks on this important report from the Social Development Committee. I would like to initially thank the other members of the committee for their work on this issue: the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Connie Bonaros in the other place, the member for Torrens and, of course, the member for King. I would also like to acknowledge the work of the committee staff, Robyn Schutte and Mary-Ann Bloomfield.

Most importantly, I would very much like to thank those who contributed to the inquiry by providing evidence, particularly those mesh-affected women who shared their deeply personal stories and struggles. It was very quickly apparent in some cases how catastrophic the impact has been on their relationships, their mental health and so many aspects of their lives. This impact became quite clear when you saw how much of a ripple effect there was, with partners who were also deeply impacted coming along to the hearings and supporting their partners.

There was one particular hearing, I think when we were doing it online because it was in the midst of COVID, when a mesh-impacted woman was providing evidence on her story, her struggles and the difficulties she was facing. There was an impact on not only her partner but also her daughter, her daughter's partner and, in fact, the entire family, who were deeply impacted by this issue. It really shows how much it impacts the daily lives of these women.

It was clear from the evidence provided that women often were not completely aware of what the potential risks were going down this path and, in some cases, not even clear that mesh would necessarily be involved. If there were complications down the track, the symptoms were initially quite non-specific, such as abdominal pain or pain within the pelvic region that was not clearly understood, so it often took time to work out what the issue was.

There were numerous visits to doctors where they tried all sorts of different things, not thinking initially that it was mesh. To make it even worse, when those impacted women suggested that perhaps it was mesh, they were often fobbed off, ignored or their concerns were dismissed. Clearly, there was this real sense that they had not been listened to and that they had not been taken seriously, which I can only imagine would make dealing with the complications of mesh even worse than they already were.

Another complicating factor is that there were often not very good records about whether or not mesh was actually used, so it was very difficult to go back and work out who had mesh implanted as part of their surgery. In fact, in Queensland, when they reached out to women to alert them to services that were available to help them deal with mesh-related injuries, because they did not have records of who had had mesh and who had not they sent out thousands of letters to everyone who had had surgery within a particular region of their body.

Women would come in, and then they would have to work out from there whether they even had mesh. That really led to quite a long blowout in the time to deal with it because of the sheer number of people coming in and the lack of good records. The TGA changed their rating or level they apply to that as a medical device, which now has higher reporting requirements, but clearly those who had this implanted prior to that are still very much being impacted.

There are some very important recommendations as part of this report, and I would commend members to have a look at them. A number of other members have addressed many of these. I can say to those who have been impacted that, in conversations I have had with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Hon. Stephen Wade, he absolutely takes these issues seriously.

There is a lot of work to do in this area; there is no question of that. Whether it is ensuring that we have appropriately qualified people here in South Australia to do the sorts of surgeries that need to be done, as well as setting up arrangements to have surgery done interstate, there is a lot of work to do, but I am confident that the issues are being taken seriously and that the government will work as quickly as possible to address them.

In conclusion, I would once again really like to acknowledge and thank those women for their bravery in their contributions to this inquiry. I can imagine that it would have been incredibly difficult to do. I genuinely hope that those who gave evidence felt that they were heard, that they were listened to, that they had been taken seriously and that real action will come about as a result of this work. I can certainly say that, for my part, I will continue to advocate to ensure that mesh-affected women have access to the supports and health services they need and deserve as soon as possible.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:34): To the mesh-injured women and South Australians, particularly those here today, some of whom are my family friends, I thank you for your evidence, courage, bravery and advocacy. You highlighted incredibly clearly to the committee the urgency and dire need for more support by the South Australian government and the need to provide funding so that those of you on waiting lists can have operations. We have heard you, we believe you, we feel deeply for you and we have made really strong recommendations. Thank you to the member for Torrens, the member for Newland and the member for Kaurana for your contributions this morning, and I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: ESSENTIAL PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY CHAIN SECURITY IN THE CONTEXT OF EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:35): I move:

That the ninth report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into essential production and supply chain security in the context of emergency circumstances in South Australia', be noted.

On 13 May 2020, the Economic and Finance Committee resolved to investigate this issue, primarily in light of the COVID-19 pandemic and, to a lesser extent, the 2019-20 bushfires. However, the inquiry sought to safeguard continuity of essential production and supply chains during other potential emergency circumstances in the future.

Between 23 September 2020 and 31 March 2021, the committee received 16 written submissions and heard evidence from 32 witnesses at nine hearings. In February 2021, the committee was privileged to conduct one of those hearings in Mount Gambier to help understand the perspective of the Limestone Coast community. The committee also conducted site visits to the Woolworths Adelaide Regional Distribution Centre at Gepps Cross, on 21 October 2020, and the Kimberley-Clark Mill at Millicent, on 9 February 2021.

The committee heard evidence from essential producers in the forestry, viticulture, horticulture, livestock, dairy, seafood and pharmaceutical industries. Supply chains that supported essential producers by freighting, distributing or selling products also contributed to the inquiry. Community-based organisations from the Limestone Coast Region, the Local Government Association, Regional Development Australia Limestone Coast and other business groups also described the experience of cross-border communities living and working under emergency directions and restrictions.

The lack of serious issues encountered during this inquiry is an absolute testament to the South Australian business community's resilience, resourcefulness and cooperation during the pandemic. One of the most important outcomes of the inquiry was the way that South Australians turned the negative situation of a major emergency into positive benefits for essential producers, businesses and their supply chains. I felt great pride in hearing local success stories of profitable new commercial opportunities, particularly using e-commerce as an alternative retail strategy. The committee also learnt of new partnerships as like-minded businesses from different industries shared their knowledge, skills and resources on new ventures.

The inquiry examined the impacts of emergency directions, such as the border closures, on South Australian exports, imports, freight, retail, distribution, inventories and the labour force. The committee found that prior to the COVID-19 pandemic many South Australian businesses relied

heavily on international and interstate export and import markets. The pandemic exposed this over-reliance as a vulnerability when businesses lost access to the markets that underpinned their supply chains and revenue streams.

Overall, the transport and logistics industry adapted well to emergency circumstances due to its flexibility, adaptability of transport modes and heavily regulated environment. However, businesses relying on airfreight to transport products were heavily affected by increased costs and fewer flights. Some businesses benefited from collaborations with the federal government to subsidise international airfreight.

Supermarket retailers provided evidence that they could not always meet unprecedented consumer demand for popular items, such as toilet paper. The committee found goods shortages to be caused by panic buying rather than due to retailer or distributor supply chain issues. The COVID-19 pandemic also highlighted supply shortages in the pharmaceutical industry. Classification of essential sectors, travellers and workers under emergency directions was a major issue for businesses, as it determined who could work during lockdowns and cross borders with relative ease to undertake tasks such as servicing equipment or managing contracts.

Border closures at times thinned recruitment pools, as international and interstate employment markets closed to South Australian primary producers, particularly in the viticultural industry. Regional businesses experienced many of the same impacts as metropolitan businesses, but the COVID-19 pandemic brought a unique set of challenges for our cross-border communities.

During our visit to the Limestone Coast in the South-East, the committee listened to the experiences of people with economic and social interests spanning the South Australian and Victorian border. We heard time and time again from businesses that the pandemic exacerbated existing difficulties attracting and retaining labour in the area and that jobs, from the technical to the unskilled, often remained unfilled, partly due to a lack of affordable housing.

The inquiry highlighted that the way the South Australian government implemented its emergency directives also at times impacted essential producers and supply chains. Hearing firsthand from those businesses about how emergency directions were communicated and delivered was instrumental to the success of this inquiry.

The committee made 35 findings and 11 recommendations in its report to address these issues. To counter over-reliance on outside markets, the committee recommends encouraging businesses to diversify into a broad range of export and import markets. It recommends continuing access to successful road and freight collaborations with the federal government and other jurisdictions.

A recommendation to establish a retail supermarket task force with representation from all major and independent supermarket operators is aimed at coordinating responses to panic buying and other sudden changes to supply or demand. A recommendation to review the national medical stockpile will encourage greater sovereign capability in pharmaceutical manufacturing.

The committee dedicates three recommendations towards the easing of pressure on regional South Australia: firstly, to consider measures to address the labour supply issues exacerbated by both national and domestic border closures and a lack of affordable housing; secondly, to consider limiting the geographical scope of future emergency directions; and, thirdly, to consider working with the Victorian government to create and implement border bubbles to minimise the impact of border closures on businesses and communities straddling both states.

As Presiding Member, I believe these recommendations will futureproof essential producers and our supply chains against emergency circumstances. More importantly, they will help us to ensure that South Australians continue to receive their food and medicine, that businesses continue to operate and transport their goods to and from markets and that vacant jobs will stand a better chance of being filled.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to extend my gratitude to the organisations, the businesses and community groups that submitted evidence to the inquiry. I would also like to thank the witnesses who travelled to Parliament House or presented evidence to the committee via teleconference. I would particularly like to extend my gratitude to the local businesses and groups

that devoted time from their busy schedules to present evidence at our hearing in Mount Gambier. This regional perspective was absolutely invaluable to the committee's findings.

I do note that, while not primarily involved in the issue of the China tariff regarding wine, this was something that certainly was addressed through many submissions to the inquiry. It was an issue that interlaid and overlapped many of the discussions that we had. It is important to recognise that as we note this report.

It is also important to note that since the finalisation of the report there has been an emerging issue in regard to timber shortages within the construction industry. Obviously, the committee is only able to identify and report on issues that were ventilated through the committee process and that existed at the time. I note that the South Australian government is working constructively with the relevant stakeholders within those industries to address that issue.

Can I thank the members of the committee on the government side, the members for Chaffey, Schubert and Newland, and on the opposition side, the members for Enfield, Lee and Wright, for their contributions to the committee during this inquiry. I also thank our secretariat who do a fantastic job both in ensuring that the committee is able to hold hearings without any issues but also for their research and good work in ensuring that we continue to present the best possible information for this parliament to consider. With those remarks, I recommend that the parliament adopt and note this report of the Economic and Finance Committee.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (11:45): I rise briefly to support the comments by the member for Colton and show my appreciation to him and my fellow committee members for putting this report together. I also want to thank Dr Jo Hocking and Adam Marafioti for their support in preparing the report. It showed the resilience of South Australian businesses through bushfires and COVID. Through the recommendations we picked up a number of issues particularly affecting regional South Australian businesses, including the housing shortage in regional South Australia and labour supply issues. As the member for Colton said, the China issue was raised, and it will continue to have an ongoing effect on South Australian businesses. We hope that matter is resolved promptly.

I want to express my appreciation to all the South Australian businesses who adapted through the bushfires and particularly through COVID and who managed to get us through to the point that we are at now. Again, I commend the report to the house and thank the member for Colton for bringing it to us.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:46): Quite simply, I thank the member for Enfield for her contribution to the debate today. I think it is an incredibly important point to make, and it is important to end on this note, that the resilience of our South Australian small business owners through this period has been unprecedented. Their dedication and commitment to ensuring that their small businesses continue to support both their employees and, in general, the economy of this state makes them very truly the backbone of our economy. Their work during this period is well respected on all sides of this house.

Motion carried.

Mr COWDREY: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HIGHGATE SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:50): I move:

That the 117th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Highgate School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

As you are aware, Mr Speaker, Highgate School is located on Hampstead Avenue in Highgate. The Department for Education has advised that in 2017 the school implemented a French-Australian bilingual program, which has the support of the French Ministry of Education under the auspices of the French Embassy in Canberra. Students participating in the program learn from a combined Australian-French curriculum, incorporating both countries' national curricula.

Highgate School was initially allocated funding of \$5 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program. This funding allocation was confirmed on the change of government in March 2018. Capital works are required at Highgate School to provide additional

accommodation to support the anticipated growth in student enrolment numbers, accommodating approximately 850 students on the Highgate School site by 2022. There is also aged accommodation on the school site that requires demolition and replacement with modern educational accommodation.

The proposed scope for the Highgate School redevelopment project will include the construction of new buildings providing general learning areas, serviced learning areas, breakout spaces, teacher preparation and withdrawal spaces, amenities and storage; the construction of two storage sheds; demolition of two buildings; demolition of site infrastructure; landscaping and paving; and new outdoor learning spaces, including resurfacing of an asphalt play area. It is anticipated that the proposed Highgate School redevelopment project works will have commenced and be completed later this calendar year.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation in relation to the project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and does meet the criteria for the examination of projects contemplated by the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament, by way of my report, that it recommends the proposed scope of works I have outlined.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:53): I thank the Public Works Committee for its consideration of the report into the project, worth \$5 million, at Highgate School that is being undertaken this year. This is a project that forms part of the Marshall Liberal government's \$1.3 billion record infrastructure investment in our public school system in South Australia, seeking, as we are, to ensure that our schools are offering world-class facilities to go alongside the world-class teaching and learning being delivered by our teachers and our leaders in our schools.

At Highgate School we truly do have world-class teaching and learning going on. The principal, Nicola Brelsford, is an experienced principal in the public education system in South Australia, an extremely well-regarded principal. Indeed, I know her former school, Norwood Primary School, was sorry to lose her, although they are doing very well under their new leadership too. At Highgate they have very much welcomed her leadership.

The French bilingual program was introduced under the previous government but underfunded, in that it was funded for only one class to go forward. The demand, the need, with French nationals coming to South Australia with their families, many of them involved in the submarine program—which will be increasing in the years ahead—alongside other people living in the area, means there is a particularly high level of interest in that French program.

This government doubled that to two classes being provided for and, going forward, I think that will provide a much stronger cohort of French speakers with a solid bilingual education ultimately going into high school programs in the years ahead. The teaching and learning in the Highgate School bilingual program is, of course, matched by high-quality teaching and learning in the mainstream program at the school. This is a school that has a solid history in performing arts. I remember that when I was there in late 2018 the quality of the kids' performances we saw was very strong. I know the member for Unley continues to enjoy the good relationship with the school.

I want to commend Nicola Brelsford and her team for leading this project; Totalspace Design, the architects; Brimblecombe Builders for the work they are doing; and the governing council. The governing council is one of the most active and engaged governing councils of any school in the state. There are a few really engaged governing councils in our public schools around South Australia but the Highgate School governing council is right up there among them.

I commend those volunteers in particular for the contribution they are making to the school, including to this project. I cannot wait to see it completed at the end of the year, and I know that it will enhance the ability of the teachers, the staff and the educators at Highgate School to deliver their excellent programs in the years ahead.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:56): As I earlier remarked in this place, but I think it bears repeating, the minister has had carriage of one of the most significant public capital works programs in any department in the state's history, and this project is but one example. It is an important one, of course, for this school community and also an important one for our relationship with the French community, ensuring that we have appropriate language skills available to us as we see through a significant submarine contract. But, of course, this is a school that is very well respected and regarded within its own community and one that we are keen to invest in and support for the future.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:57): I move:

That the 118th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Mount Gambier High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

I am cognisant of the time and I will make sure I do not detain the house. Mount Gambier High School is located on Brownes Road, Mount Gambier within the City of Mount Gambier. Mount Gambier High School was allocated funding of \$6 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program. The redevelopment will consist of demolition, new works and refurbishment of existing facilities to accommodate up to 1,000 students on the high school site, and also to cater for enrolment growth through the transition of year 7 to high school.

Mount Gambier High School will see works to ensure the construction of two new single-storey buildings providing general learning areas, various ancillary bases and outdoor learning spaces; refurbishment of science laboratories over two levels; replacement of the level 1 walkway balustrade; partial refurbishment of the hall to include a student hub adjacent to the existing canteen; demolition of transportable accommodation; and landscaping and civil works. Construction for the project commenced during the later part of last year and earlier this year, and we expect to see completion of those works later this calendar year.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects contemplated by the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works and also commends the school and the school community on ensuring that they were able to win funding for these works.

It is a very substantial and significant investment. I also acknowledge the commitment of the local member to ensuring that this investment has been made, and I recognise the school council and the school leadership group. As I mentioned earlier, and again it bears repeating, the minister has seen through an enormous capital works program right across the state. This is an essential school in the Mount Gambier community, one that is deeply loved and has an extraordinarily successful educational offering, and we are very pleased to be recommending this investment.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:59): I must take the minute that remains in the time allocated to comment on this body of work, because the Mount Gambier High School development, \$6 million, is going to be fantastic when it is completed later this year. I know that the Treasurer, who is a Mount Gambier boy, is deeply interested to see how it concludes.

I also advise that my senior adviser, Gary Costello, was the principal at this school for a period of time, and after visiting the school I know that he is still engaged in the lives of pretty much everyone in Mount Gambier. We are very keen to see the work completed. We are very confident that Grieve Gillett Andersen, Kennett Pty Ltd, and the staff and students, the leadership of Mount Gambier High School, are doing a great job and I look forward to seeing the completed works.

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Procedure***APPROPRIATION BILL 2021**

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(12:00): I move:

That on Tuesday 22 June 2021 standing orders be so far suspended as to enable—

- (a) the Premier to have leave to continue his remarks on the Appropriation Bill immediately after moving 'That this bill be read a second time';
- (b) the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas) to be immediately admitted to the house for the purpose of giving a speech in relation to the Appropriation Bill; and
- (c) the second reading contribution on the Appropriation Bill be resumed on motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(12:01): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Treasurer be permitted to attend at the table of the house on Tuesday 22 June 2021 for the purpose of giving a speech in relation to the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

*Bills***ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 June 2021.)

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurua is on his feet, I understand.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: He was, he is and he will be.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (12:02): Exactly. I hope to provide a continuing contribution on my feet in relation to this important matter. As I was saying yesterday, this is a bill that is very similar to the legislation brought by the Attorney-General in the parliament in the last few sitting weeks. It is a bit of *deja vu*. This is very similar to the bill introduced late last year by the Attorney-General and has since been defeated in the Legislative Council.

One of the key reasons it was defeated was that the proposal involved changing the rules for the election so close to the election, changing the rules effectively in the last quarter. We are now even later in the four-year parliamentary term than we were then and the Attorney is now seeking to substantially change the electoral rules,.

As far as I am aware, the electoral campaign period, as far as the Electoral Commission and Electoral Act are concerned with regard to funding and disclosure requirements, kicks off from 1 July, so we are 20-odd days away from that regime starting. Clearly, I think it is unlikely that this bill would be passed through both houses of parliament and assented to before then.

What we would be doing is changing the electoral laws after that campaign period, according to the Electoral Act's funding and disclosure system, had already started. We would be well into the period before the election when substantial changes would be made very close to the Electoral Act period and very close to the election, certainly within only a matter of months before the writs would be issued for the next state election in February next year. Those writs would be issued, of course, for the election in March.

It is a bit shocking that, despite the Attorney hearing those concerns from members in this place and the other place about changing the rules so late, we have continued to have this bill reintroduced now with some notable issues absent, but substantially the same legislation. This has

been an issue where the Attorney is saying she is relying upon advice from the Electoral Commission; however, that advice has been around for some time.

In fact, I believe it was tabled by the Attorney on 28 February 2019, so well over two years ago. In fact, over 830 days ago is when the Electoral Commissioner's work was tabled, but we are only getting this legislation again now. It is going to be debated and considered by houses of parliament likely when we are well into that official campaign period, as far as the Electoral Act in relation to funding and disclosure starts, from 1 July.

So why was there such a delay in terms of the Attorney acting if she is so concerned about these issues, from February 2019 until now? You have to wonder why she has sat on this report for so long, did not take action when it was provided to her in 2019, but now waits until the shadow of the election to substantially seek to change the rules.

Even when the previous bill was introduced, it was so unfinished that the government sought to heavily amend it in the other place. There were parts of it that had been missed, and there were parts of it that had not been considered properly, which shows what a shambolic process this has been from the Attorney-General.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I suggest that the member is reflecting on a vote in the other place and that is disorderly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will listen carefully.

Mr PICTON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I thought the standing orders say that you cannot reflect on a vote in this place, but I am happy to be corrected if I am wrong.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bear with us, we are just seeking advice on that. Continue on, member for Kaurua.

Mr PICTON: I will continue and we will come back, and if I am allowed to I will reflect—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Certainly, I will inform you of what you are allowed to do.

Mr PICTON: —even more so, if I am allowed to. I think it is always good to test the Attorney—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kaurua, standing order 120 states:

A Member may not refer to any debate in the other House of Parliament or to any measure impending in that House.

So it is not clear whether that is reflecting on a vote or not; anyway, I will listen carefully. Let's see how we go.

Mr PICTON: My reading of that standing order 120 is certainly that it is appropriate that you could say that there were amendments filed and it looks like what we had was a pretty shambolic process by the government, where they did not even have their own legislation in fit and proper order when they were introducing this the last time. That is presumably why the Attorney-General is so precious about my referring to that now that she is seeking to use standing orders to try to prevent me from pointing that out.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: It's disrespect for the Legislative Council.

Mr PICTON: Well, I think the Minister for Environment can tell us a bit about disrespect for the Legislative Council.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the member for Kaurua! As the Speaker has—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, order! As the Speaker has noted a couple of times in recent weeks, conversations across the chamber are particularly distasteful and out of order, so that will cease, and, please, member for Kaurua, do not be tempted to respond to

interjections. You are free to continue your contribution now, without casting any aspersions on other members.

Mr PICTON: I do have to raise a point of order, and I ask the member for Chaffey to withdraw his offensive comment that he made across the chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was aware that the member for Chaffey was interjecting. I am not aware of what he said, but you are saying, member for Kaurana, that you took offence to whatever was said?

Mr PICTON: Yes, I took offence. The member for Chaffey called me a gutter snake, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Given that that term is unparliamentary, I will ask the member for Chaffey to withdraw that comment.

Mr WHETSTONE: I will not withdraw and apologise. I did not call him a gutter snake.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Given that the interjection was responded to—my recollection is that it was responded to—it has more than likely been captured by the *Hansard*, so let us continue on, and I will look at that *Hansard* when it becomes available and come back to you.

Mr PICTON: Just incredible. Thank you, Deputy Speaker. This is clearly a process which has been shambolic in relation to the government when they last introduced this legislation. They did not have the legislation in a form that they even believe themselves could be passed by the parliament. There were parts of it that had been missed. There were parts of it that had not been considered.

We are, of course, pleased that this legislation no longer contains some of the worst elements that it was proposed to contain when the Attorney-General brought it to the house before, particularly in relation to optional preferential voting. It was a real failed thought bubble from the Attorney-General. It was really aimed at trying to kill off any potential new independent candidates ever seeking and winning election to this house of parliament.

Unfortunately, that does not mean that the remaining parts of this legislation proposed by the Attorney-General are all good. The government are again trying to pick and choose what electoral reform they will bring on, clearly to benefit them. Some of the issues in relation to this legislation include reducing the amount of time to enrol to vote—that is clearly a significant concern in relation to this legislation; allowing any class of voter prescribed in regulation to vote over the telephone; and allowing the counting of pre-poll votes before the close of the polls. The first recommendation of the 2018 election report, which was tabled, as I said, more than 830 days ago was:

That the Electoral Act (1985) (the Act) be amended to enable eligible electors to enrol up to and on polling day.

Mr BROWN: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PICTON: That first recommendation was clearly that the act be amended to enable eligible voters to enrol up to and on polling day. That would clearly give effect to the most potential franchise of voters at the election. If we did not have a barrier to enrol, we could make sure that anybody who wanted to, who was eligible to, could be on the roll and vote on election day. I would have thought that you cannot miss it; it is recommendation No. 1, and the further explanation takes up the entirety of page 15.

The rate of enrolment of young voters is declining: 38.9 per cent of 18 year olds were not enrolled at the 2018 election, along with 25.4 per cent of voters between 18 and 24. When you consider that the issues at play in state elections will impact future generations for their lifetime, it is a staggering figure that one in four under 24 year olds are not able to vote—let alone whether they vote or not—because they are not on the electoral roll. We have this presumption that everybody is voting. We have universal franchise. We have compulsory voting, so there is a presumption that everybody is voting. Clearly that is not the case, particularly when it comes to young people, where almost 40 per cent of 18 year olds and 25 per cent of 18 to 24 year olds are not on the electoral roll.

Why is the government trying to make it harder for people to get on the roll for the election in those weeks before the election rather than making it easier, which is what the report was recommending? Is this a deliberate delaying tactic by the government? Are they making that decision because they think they are not likely to get a large share of those young people's votes, and that perhaps those young people are concerned about climate change and concerned about the future of our economy and their jobs.

We have a significantly high youth unemployment rate in South Australia, one of the highest, if not the highest in the country consistently. Perhaps the government are making a decision that they do not want many of those young people on the roll because they are not going to get a significant percentage of their votes. They have not only decided to go against the recommendation of the Electoral Commission but they have gone in the complete opposite direction, reducing the amount of time to enrol to vote and therefore making it harder for young people to get enrolled to vote in future elections.

In the six days before the 2018 election, almost 25,000 South Australians enrolled to vote. That is a huge number of people. That is the equivalent of one electorate, one of us here in this chamber representing those 25,000 people who enrolled to vote in the six days before the election. If you assume that it was evenly spread over the six days, it is probably about 4,000 new enrolments a day. If the government has their way, they could conceivably see 16,000 South Australians miss the opportunity to vote because of the reduced time for South Australians to enrol to vote that they are proposing in this legislation.

South Australia has a long history of universal suffrage. We were the first place in the world to allow women both the right to vote and to run for parliament, and the second place in the world, after New Zealand, where women had the right to vote. We have just recently celebrated the 125th anniversary of that milestone. In this chamber we have an amazing tapestry put up, I believe in 1994, to mark the centenary.

But here we have the government going in the opposite direction, trying to make it harder for people to enrol to vote for seemingly no reason whatsoever. Of course, this is nothing new. As I mentioned yesterday, we have had a long history in South Australia where the conservative forces have tried to make it more difficult for people to vote and have tried to make voting unequal across the state.

The Playmander that was in place across South Australia for decades upon decades deprived an equal share of the power of people's votes, which meant that clear majorities, not just in the two-party preferred vote but in the primary vote, could not elect governments in this state because you had people who were in some areas, based on where they lived, getting many multiples more the power of their vote than other people in the state.

We then had, of course, the discussion around the fairness clause and it actually achieved the exact opposite of what the Liberal Party said that its intentions were as part of that. Now we have another example of the Liberal Party trying to disenfranchise voters, presumably for their own gain. I believe it is absolutely shameful that that has been proposed.

In recent days, we have even heard about the sort of Americanisation of trying to internally branch stack the Liberal Party, signing up hundreds of members, and allegations that we should not regard differences between church and state. These are very worrying trends that we are seeing from the Liberal Party in terms of how our democracy would operate. It is a clear Americanisation after what has been happening in America.

Clearly, since the last presidential election, we have seen in America moves across states to try to disenfranchise voters there. These have all been pushed by the conservative side of politics to make it harder for people in low socio-economic areas and people of different racial backgrounds to vote. It is absolutely disgusting what is happening there. Have a look at an article recently in *The Washington Post* entitled 'How GOP-backed voting measures could create hurdles for tens of millions of voters'. This was by Amy Gardner and others on 11 March this year:

The GOP's national push to enact hundreds of new election restrictions could strain every available method of voting for tens of millions of Americans, potentially amounting to the most sweeping contraction of ballot access in the United States since the end of Reconstruction, when Southern states curtailed the voting rights of formerly enslaved Black men, a *Washington Post* analysis has found.

In 43 states across the country, Republican lawmakers have proposed at least 250 laws that would limit mail, early in-person and Election Day voting with such constraints as stricter ID requirements, limited hours or narrower eligibility to vote absentee, according to data compiled as of Feb. 19 by the nonpartisan Brennan Center for Justice. Even more proposals have been introduced since then.

Proponents say the provisions are necessary to shore up public confidence in the integrity of elections after the 2020 presidential contest, when then-President Donald Trump's unsubstantiated claims of election fraud convinced millions of his supporters that the results were rigged against him.

But in most cases, Republicans are proposing solutions in states where elections ran smoothly, including in many with results that Trump and his allies did not contest or allege to be tainted by fraud. The measures are likely to disproportionately affect those in cities and Black voters in particular, who overwhelmingly vote Democratic—laying bare, critics say, the GOP's true intent: gaining electoral advantage.

I would suggest that what we are seeing here is very similar. We have a proposal that is exactly the opposite of what the Electoral Commissioner has recommended, which was to make it easier. This is the opposite of what the Electoral Commissioner said, where they said we should make it easier for people to enrol to vote. Now we have a proposal that is making it harder for people to enrol to vote.

How is that improving our democracy? I think we have a very good democracy in South Australia, and I think that making it harder for people to enrol to vote is clearly a step backwards, one that this parliament should consider and scrutinise the reasons for very carefully, particularly when you consider who might gain advantage out of making it harder for young people to enrol to vote narrowly before an election. That, I would submit—

Mr BROWN: Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PICTON: As I was saying, what we are seeing is a clear drive from this government and this Attorney-General to make it harder for people to vote, which is very similar to what we are seeing in the United States, where there are many proposals that will make it difficult for people to vote, trying to reduce the eligibility of people to vote and trying to make it a lot harder. Previously, the government have put forward proposals that would reduce eligibility in relation to people who have been prisoners, and now we are even seeing it in relation to people enrolling to vote.

It is clear that when you are looking at measures in relation to enrolment, any electoral scholar will tell you that they would impact people of low socio-economic status and people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities more than higher income or Anglo-Saxon people. That is clear if you look at any statistics in relation to the people who are more likely to be enrolling later in the piece. The other key factor is people who are younger, when you look at that high percentage of people who we know are already not on the electoral roll.

If you look at other states, they are going in the opposite direction of what is being proposed here in South Australia. We see state after state making it easier for people to enrol to vote where there is enrolment up to election day, just as has been proposed here by the Electoral Commissioner, yet we have the Attorney-General inexplicably going in the opposite direction.

We do not think that we should be following the similar moves that we have seen in the United States and elsewhere to erode those elements of our democracy that make it easy for people to enrol to vote; I think that would be a significant step backwards. We know that there have been issues repeatedly through our history in relation to who has been entitled to vote and, clearly, a stain on our history has been in regard to the eligibility of Aboriginal South Australians and Australians to vote. They were denied the right to vote from the early days of Federation until the 1960s.

By reducing the time to enrol, we risk disenfranchising many groups: young first-time voters, new Australians, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and many others. We should be looking to expand our participation in representing our democracy and not going in the opposite direction.

There is also a significant change that is being proposed in relation to this bill when it comes to assisted voting, which was used for sight-impaired electors in South Australia for the first time in 2018 using electronically-assisted software called VoteAssist. The Electoral Commission said that it was successful and welcomed by sight-impaired electors. The problem was that it was very costly,

and changes were made in parliament late enough that it needed to be rushed. As a result, we understand that it was used only by 100 or so voters in the last election.

I note that a provision was added to the act and commenced in June 2017. Even if this bill is rushed through this and the other chamber it will commence even closer to the next election than the legislation that happened back in 2017—again, trying to move the goalposts of the election very close to when the election is actually going to be happening, and certainly within that electoral period, which starts from 1 June, according to our new laws.

I think that everyone in this place supports the idea that voters with a disability have access to assisted voting if they need it. Under the current postal system, many voters who are overseas struggle to have their votes counted on time. I suspect that the 2022 election will have far fewer electors attempt to vote from overseas than we have seen in the past given the impacts of the COVID-19 worldwide pandemic and the number of ex-pat Australians who have returned to Australia since that has begun. However, I am sure that there will still be some significant number of former South Australians living overseas who will be keen to vote in that state election.

The Electoral Commission says that they prefer telephone-assisted voting rather than the specially designed computer terminals with the VoteAssist software to reduce the cost of a wider rollout. These are noble ambitions, but the problem is that the wording of this bill does not actually mention people with a disability, with the exception of sight-impaired electors, and it does not mention people who are trying to vote overseas.

The Attorney is saying that we should effectively trust her with regard to the eligibility of who is being intended for these measures as to whether they are people with disability or overseas electors. What the bill says about the people who can access assisted voting is any sight-impaired elector or any class of elector prescribed by regulation.

Not only will we be moving the goalposts right before the election but we are then handing the power to the government of the day to determine who should be able to use that, rather than the parliament determining that ourselves. Those are very big questions to put in the hands of the government of the day by regulation in terms of what class of electors should be able to use assisted voting by telephone, or other means, to do that. I would argue that I think that is something that the parliament should determine the eligibility of and not be left to the Attorney-General who may, right before the election, change the regulations to include classes of electors that her and the cabinet determine is best rather than that process going through the parliament.

There is no restriction on the class of elector prescribed by the regulation, so if the government were so minded they could make extremely large classes of electors eligible for assisted voting. Alternatively, they could make very few voters, other than sight-impaired people, eligible for assisted voting. We do not know. The government have said that this gives them the flexibility to deal with new classes of voters as they arise, which is the sort of standard thing you hear from the government when they want to have the power to do something and not have the parliament consider the particular classes.

What passing this clause will mean is that, despite whatever the government might say now, we must be okay with the fact that it could mean that any class of elector could access electronic voting without a decision of the parliament, particularly when you consider that those regulations may well be put in after parliament rises, so there would be no opportunity for a house of parliament to consider disallowance of those regulations before the election. We have a very big gap between parliament sitting usually at the end of November and our election in the second half of March. That is a significant period of time without parliamentary oversight in relation to the potential disallowance of regulations.

We have also seen this government in this term show that they are more than willing to reintroduce almost identical regulations the next day if their first set is disallowed. We have had this farcical situation in the other place where regulations have been disallowed and disallowed only to be then reintroduced in exactly the same manner by the government the very next day.

Because we are talking about voting, it might necessarily happen when parliament is not sitting. This gives the government typically two to three months to introduce regulations that will apply to the upcoming election, then the parliament will not sit again before the election or even consider a disallowance motion. If the government wants to allow more people with disability or overseas

electors to access assisted voting then that is what the government should be proposing in this legislation, rather than putting it in regulations that would leave that decision up to the cabinet and the Attorney-General of the day to propose.

Finally, I will speak to some concerns that have been raised in relation to the counting of pre-poll votes before the closing of the polls. Knowing how many votes have gone to which candidate before the election day has the potential, if those counts are leaked, to have a real impact upon how electors vote. This is therefore, I think, a question we need to get more information from the government on as we consider this legislation.

The government claims the protections will be put in place via regulation to stop the vote count becoming public knowledge. The problem is that we have no detail once again of how that is going to operate in practice or what protections are going to be put in place. Once again, we just have to trust that the government is going to get it right and leave it in their hands, rather than this being proposed and enacted in legislation.

Of course, we on this side of the house are not sure that the government will get it right. The government has already made its fair share of mistakes. Again, the government can easily change the rules without an opportunity for them to be reviewed by parliament. The opposition would be much more comfortable if the government had set out protections in this bill so that we could see what protections are being proposed.

When the opposition was briefed on this bill, the Attorney's department could not outline what those protections would be and in subsequent communications only pointed to the safeguards New Zealand had in relation to early counting and pre-poll. Their one line explanation was, and I quote, 'In preparing regulations, regard will be had to the safeguards set out in the New Zealand legislation.'

That does not give a lot of confidence to this house that the government knows what they are proposing, nor that they can give assurances as to exactly what those protections will be before we are asked to give another blank cheque to the government to write their own rules, potentially without any parliamentary oversight before the election. We are being asked to accept the vibe that they are essentially going to look at New Zealand's model, except for the key safeguard that protections are set out in New Zealand's legislation. They are saying that they are going to look at New Zealand's model but in New Zealand they are legislated. Here it is just going to be regulated and it is going to be up to the Attorney-General to consider.

There are other issues in relation to this bill where we need to seek further information, such as the Electoral Commissioner, who has the decision-making power for misleading information, being stripped of that power and it being given to SACAT. How is that going to work in practice? I think that is an important question. Why is SACAT the appropriate body to consider those matters? I think we need to get a proper explanation of that.

I have recently been subject to a SACAT matter for the first time. For two years I have been trying to get an FOI document from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, and the Ombudsman has ruled that I should have it, but now CALHN and the government are taking me to SACAT to appeal the Ombudsman's ruling. It is an interesting process, and it has certainly opened my eyes to the fact that this is not a very fast process in relation to how some of these matters operate. It has been a couple of months so far and we are still at a directions hearing.

Mr Knoll: Welcome to opposition.

Mr PICTON: This is about SACAT. If you are dealing with an issue in terms of the electoral campaign, I imagine particularly with a misleading statement—no matter which side of parliament would be concerned by that—you would want a swift decision. How would the process work in relation to SACAT? Would it be dealt with in a timely way that would be appropriate for the election? Would it take months and months to get to a decision point or would it go on and on?

We have seen a recent decision by the Electoral Commissioner in relation to a piece of material that I believe was being distributed in the electorate of King by the government. I am not sure if it was the government or the member for King who authorised it. I think perhaps it was authorised by the Liberal Party and their director, Sascha Meldrum, but I stand to be corrected if that

is incorrect. It basically suggested that the Leader of the Opposition had some secret plan to demolish entire suburbs—complete fantasy stuff.

The Electoral Commissioner has ruled that that was misleading information and the Liberal Party has now been forced to distribute information to households apologising for the misleading information that they provided to the community. That is an important thing that has happened where the Liberal Party have gone out of their way to mislead and frighten residents in the north-eastern suburbs about something that is completely wrong.

If this is now going to be taken from the Electoral Commissioner and given to SACAT, how long does that decision take to get made? Is it three months, four months, five months, six months or a year? If this happens three weeks before the election campaign, you would expect that there would be a need for very swift decision-making so that the information can be corrected and voters can be provided with accurate information before they had the opportunity to vote, particularly given that this bill is also seeking to expand early voting as well, which is even more reason why there would need to be quick decision-making.

I think we need to get an explanation as to what time frames would be involved in SACAT decision-making because certainly my very brief experience with it so far in relation to an FOI Ombudsman appeal is that it is taking a very long time indeed. I certainly would not want that to continue in relation to some of these important electoral matters as well.

There is also the matter of removing the function of the Electoral Commission to encourage people to vote on election day. It is strange that the government would be removing that function of legislation, which I would have thought would have been a noble thing to happen. I look forward to seeking further information as to why we would not want to encourage people to vote on election day. It usually takes place through advertisements online, on the television, in newspapers or in public notices to encourage people to vote and to tell people where their local voting booths are to make sure they come out and partake in that festival of democracy—democracy sausages as we now think of it. Why are we stripping that requirement from the Electoral Commissioner to undertake that role?

In conclusion, I would go back to where I started to say that this is a bill that is changing the rules very significantly right before we are about to have the election. I think parliament needs to consider very carefully whether or not we believe that this is appropriate timing a few months before the election. The Electoral Act's funding and disclosure requirements will have already started by the time this legislation would likely be passed and enacted, if it was to be. That process would already be underway and we would be only a few months away from when the writs would be issued and a few months away from the next election.

The government have had this information that they are apparently relying upon for over two years—almost 2½ years. They are acting on it right in the last quarter before the next election and they are significantly differing it from some of the recommendations from the Electoral Commissioner, particularly when it comes to the enrolment to vote, which is an absolutely crucial part of our electoral system. We should be making sure our franchise is universal. With those comments, the opposition will be opposing the bill. We look forward to further debate both here and in the other place, if it was to get there, and consideration of the detail of these issues, and questioning these particular clauses in the committee stage of the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for MacKillop, I would just like to go back to a couple of points of order that were raised during the contribution from the member for Kaurua. In the first instance the Attorney-General raised a point of order regarding a vote in the other place. The Attorney's point of order was not unfounded. The standing orders in this place are a little bit vague on this. I am referring to standing order 120 which states:

A Member may not refer to any debate in the other House of Parliament or to any measure impending in that House.

I am going to take it that that means a debate in the recent past as well. Primarily, that is in place to avoid quarrels between the houses. It does not preclude reference being made to debates being undertaken some time ago. Even though I have not ruled on the point of order, it is not unfounded and I want all members to hear my view on that.

In relation to the member for Kurna taking offence at the interjection from the member for Chaffey, I refer members to standing order 125, which states:

A Member may not use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to another Member. Subject to Standing Order 137, if the Member referred to takes objection to what he/she considers to be offensive or unbecoming words, the Speaker requests the Member uttering the words to withdraw them.

Member for Kurna, you raised that immediately in accordance with standing order 126, so I am going to revisit that and, regardless of what was said, the member for Kurna took offence at that. I am not wanting to encourage precious behaviour in this place because there is general argy-bargy in the day-to-day operations. However, given that the member for Kurna did take offence at whatever was said by the member for Chaffey, I am going to ask the member for Chaffey again to withdraw and apologise in accordance with the standing orders—regardless of what was said.

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And apologise, please—withdraw and apologise and then we will move on.

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw and apologise. Sir, just to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, that is enough. Thank you. Member for MacKillop.

Mr Whetstone: You can't give as good as you get, can you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, you are called to order. In fact, you are warned.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave it at that, member for Chaffey, otherwise you will be removed.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:48): It gives me great pleasure to stand and support the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2021. I have 20 minutes, right up until lunch, to put some positive notes and influence to what is being proposed here, other than what we have just heard over the last three-quarters of an hour.

This whole proposal and movement are to bring the electoral process into the modern 21st century. I will take us back—and I am sure others will remember—to when I was a young lad and elections were quite an exciting time for little tiny places like Reedy Creek and Mount Benson where there were electoral polling booths. The local communities would get together and sometimes have barbecues where all the gossip of the district was heard by people getting together around these little halls, and the election was on for young and old.

Those times and those tiny little places have gone by the wayside. Most of them are derelict and lucky to still have an audience for maybe the odd Christmas function, and the election systems are now a different proposition with the new modern technology that is out there. I think the new bill is bringing us forward along those lines.

The whole process is obviously to improve the administration and to streamline and modernise the processes of an election. It is also hopefully going to be more consistent with the options in other jurisdictions around Australia, and hopefully that will happen for South Australia, and meet also the community expectations.

One of the things that I have seen in my short term in this place is the fact that these pre-polling booths are getting more and more popular with the busy way of life we see today. Some of these polling booths around the country are taking 20 to 30 per cent, maybe heading towards 50 per cent, of all the votes for the election day prior to the election day.

I think it really is important that these votes cast in the early polling booths are able to be counted on the night; otherwise, I think that the election day votes will not give us the direction and the result that I think most Australians would be looking for and particularly South Australians. I think what is being rolled out here absolutely highlights that. It will be for the better for everyone, and I am

sure that voters will pick this up and probably over time will take more of an opportunity to do the pre-polling.

I will give you another incident down in our region. Our state election falls very close to a major event in the centre of the Limestone Coast called the Lucindale field days. Between 20,000 and 25,000 people attend on a Friday and Saturday, heading towards 40,000 and 50,000 people. A Saturday state election during that process can be really, really tough for those who want to get to the field day as well as vote. I know once this was all put together for the first time on one of the elections and it caused mayhem for that little town of Lucindale. Not only holding the Lucindale field days, as they do, but trying to take the votes through the Lucindale school at the same time caused massive queues and delays.

Now we see a lot of people saying, 'Rightio, I want that election day free, I've got busy things on, my life is busy and I want to vote early.' They can vote up to 12 days earlier at pre-polling booths. I think that is one of these marvels that hopefully this process picks up and supports.

I am sorry I am not going to be able to see the *Hansard* from the member for Kaurna's speech, but I just want to take up some of the points that he raised and the way that he has portrayed it as quite negative. He might have concerns. I get that. He is allowed to have concerns, because on this side, we are in government; he is in opposition. He might be wary about where we are going and how we are rolling out these types of processes. Let me tell you, this government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will cease interjecting, and they certainly will cease interjecting from out of their seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: He is not in his seat. Members on my right will cease interjecting. The member for MacKillop has the call, and he is entitled to be heard in silence.

Mr McBRIDE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. In regard to this process and the concerns raised by the member for Kaurna, he talks about the delays of why the Attorney-General has taken so long to act on this. He does not talk about it being one or two years; he actually expresses it in 800 days and more, which just exacerbates the argument he is trying to pretend, that his side in government would be a whole lot more effective and efficient than we are. I question whether that would be the case.

The second point I want to raise is about the fairness clause. He talks about these sorts of processes being made late in the day towards our 2022 election in March. How late do you have to go when you remove the fairness clause in November 2017?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is called to order.

Mr McBRIDE: That was very, very late in the day in changing the electoral process.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurna is called to order. He will cease interjecting, particularly from outside of his seat.

Mr McBRIDE: In fact, it was so late in the process there was no chance for the opposition even to do anything about it. I really highlight this because, when there has been a bad process in place, sometimes we become ingrained and entrenched. He mentions forming government with a minority vote. In other words, in 2010 the opposition won 52 per cent of the vote and were not able to form government, and in 2014 they won 51 per cent but were not able to form government and then in 2018 we won 50 to 51 per cent and were able to form government because of a fairness clause. The Labor Party then comes out to criticise that process. It really does make one wonder how and why they think that is good representation of the voters of South Australia.

We know South Australia has a very close margin in terms of forming government. We are a community of nearly equal division, so an election can be about the mood of the day. There are no major election outcomes—unless you have a State Bank debacle; that will change things for you.

But generally the votes in this state are very close. The member for Kaurna criticised the process of the fairness clause and was part of the party that unravalled it. That is quite undue. To bring it and then say that the process is a problem is quite unfair.

Another thing the member talks about is other jurisdictions, and he is fair. He talks about the United States as an issue and as having issues. I agree, but they do not have compulsory voting. We must allow, and should always allow, every South Australian to be able to participate in the election process, no matter how that is. I am seeing in detail here that electronic voting—or phone voting, as has been pointed out—can take place. Knowing that people are in particularly remote areas, in hospitals and in aged care, voting has always been a difficult process. I hope that, with this sort of move and this bill that I am supporting, those processes are not lost but enhanced and made better for all South Australians.

The other issue that I have here in my notes but which was also picked up by the member for Kaurna is the South Australians who are interstate at the moment or maybe even overseas. Again, I am hoping that, through this electronic process and through the phone polling process, that it is made easier for South Australians to participate in the election. I would have thought that, if the Labor Party saw a process that made it easier to put a vote in and have a faster outcome that gave an outcome and a decision on election day, they would have been supportive of that process.

However, in the last two or three elections Labor formed a government with a lower majority of election vote outcomes. If you think that process is better and you would like to return to those old days, then maybe that is why you have the greatest problem with what is being advocated here today.

There is much talk about the election process for those who may be in Indigenous communities—and I will talk mainly about my regional areas. I know that election day and pooling resources for pre-polling can be quite difficult. I know that, prior to the 2018 election, trying to man pre-polling booths could be quite arduous. There are no huge streams of electors coming in all at once; they usually generally trickle in over the full course of the day that the pre-polling booth is open. I do know and did see that the community and the constituents, of all seats I would have thought, appreciated the pre-polling process. I think that that process is not only going to be rolled on for many more elections taking place in the future but that the participation rate is going to increase.

I think this bill should and will pick up the fact that pre-polling booths are going to become more important. The fact that we were not able to capture those votes on election day as well as we could have for an election outcome was a concern earlier, and I think that addresses this.

We have compulsory voting in this state, and we are seeing, in and amongst our community, that not everyone is captured by the political process. Back in my earlier days, working in Port Adelaide, I saw that at least 20 per cent or maybe 50 per cent of the population was not engaged in the news, the headlines and the political talk of the day. I think everything we can do to promote, to make it easier, to highlight that we have a state election on and that they can participate at a time that suits South Australian constituents will be a real positive for our state. I welcome this bill, I support it, and I wish it wholehearted support throughout this place.

Mr BROWN (Playford) (12:59): I rise to speak on this bill. As the member for Kaurna has so eloquently pointed out earlier, the opposition has a number of concerns about this piece of legislation. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

*Ministerial Statement***OPERATION IRNSIDE**

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:00): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: During the early hours of Monday morning, a senior SAPOL detective radioed the phrase 'execute resolution' which sent more than 450 SAPOL officers into action, resulting in the largest number of arrests for serious and organised crime offences ever seen in this state on a single day. As members are likely aware, these arrests were the result of the state's biggest covert police operation, Operation Ironside.

I take this opportunity to thank SAPOL for their incredible work as part of Operation Ironside, a combined investigation with the Australian Federal Police and international counterparts. I wish to thank and praise the many law enforcement personnel who have been involved in this extraordinary operation and who have put in countless hours of their time to ensure that these investigations have resulted in such an unprecedented and outstanding success.

Operation Ironside commenced in October 2018 and involved the use of an encrypted communications network, known as ANOM, used in Australia by organised crime groups. Such networks are commonly utilised among criminal syndicates in an effort to avoid detection by law enforcement agencies. Since early 2020, SAPOL has been working with the AFP as part of Operation Ironside.

The operation in South Australia began with a focus on members of the Comanchero Outlaw Motorcycle Gang (OMCG) and their close associates who were suspected of serious criminal offending. As Operation Ironside evolved, criminal offending of other individuals attached or associated with other criminal syndicates were also targeted.

Over 70 arrests were made by SAPOL as part of Operation Ironside as well as major seizures of illicit drugs, including 50 litres of fantasy, 90 kilos of methamphetamine, 354 kilos of cannabis and 10,000 ecstasy pills. Industrial clandestine drug laboratories were also located, including one with the capability to produce up to 50 kilos of methamphetamine per week. Firearms, luxury vehicles, cash and other assets valued at over \$11 million were also confiscated.

In addition, SAPOL interrupted two alleged murder attempts by members of the Comanchero OMCG and a number of attempts to cause serious harm to others. On occasions, this required a 24-hour policing response to ensure the safety of the alleged victims. The scale of Operation Ironside is truly extraordinary and has resulted in the significant thwarting of alleged criminal activities within South Australia, interstate and overseas.

Those persons arrested during Operation Ironside have been charged with serious offences, including conspiracy to murder, large commercial trafficking of controlled drugs, large commercial manufacture of controlled drugs, firearms trafficking or possession, and money laundering. Many of these offences carry a penalty of life imprisonment.

While the operation remains ongoing, the series of arrests and seizures carried out this week demonstrate the monumental efforts of SAPOL in stopping the scourge of violent and serious organised crime in South Australia. The sheer magnitude of the illicit drugs seized by SAPOL is incredible, and we are all much safer knowing that these illegal drugs will not be on our streets.

The Marshall Liberal government is grateful for our hardworking police, which is why since coming to government we have invested more than \$170 million in additional funding for SAPOL to ensure that they have the tools they need to keep South Australia safe and strong.

SAPOL has been integral in South Australia's fight against COVID-19, and that fight continues, which is why today we announced that, as part of the 2021-22 state budget, we will be investing an additional \$23.6 million for the recruitment and training of 114 extra protective security officers (PSOs) to reinforce SAPOL's successful COVID-19 response.

We have worked closely with SAPOL throughout the pandemic. In 2020, we provided \$21.2 million in funding for SAPOL to recruit an extra 72 cadets and 54 PSOs. Today's announcement increases the total number of additional officers to 240. This resourcing boost will

allow SAPOL officers to be redeployed to frontline policing, with the additional PSOs to assist at medi-hotels and undertake a range of other COVID-19 duties.

Operation Ironside highlights the exceptional work of SAPOL in fighting crime and protecting the community. This was one of the most critical and important operations in breaking serious and organised crime in South Australia to date. On behalf of the state government and all South Australians, I thank the officers involved in Operation Ironside and our entire police force for their efforts and for keeping South Australians safe.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:06): I bring up the 149th report, entitled 'North-south corridor Torrens to Darlington enabling works and utility services relocations project'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 150th report, entitled West Beach Facility Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

VACCINE MANUFACTURING CAPABILITY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Why is South Australia falling behind in the race to become a national provider of mRNA vaccines? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Earlier this week, the Queensland government committed \$20 million to its mRNA vaccine capability. This follows a \$50 million investment from the Victorian government into their capability in April and a push for the New South Wales government to build a vaccine manufacturing industry last month.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): I am disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition hasn't been following this in the media. We have a very good opportunity here in South Australia with BioCina, which purchased the Pfizer facilities here in South Australia. It is the only TGA-approved mRNA facility in the country.

We have had extensive discussions with the federal government. We have been working with this company since 2018, courting them and making sure that this is an appropriate place for them to invest.

There is no doubt that we do need to have mRNA vaccine manufacturing capability here in Australia. This previously wasn't the case. We haven't had an ability to respond like they have in other parts of the world. Whether it be with the Pfizer vaccine or whether it is with the Moderna vaccine, we haven't had that ability to respond. Of course, we have with the AstraZeneca and that is now being produced here in Australia.

One of the things that I think the Prime Minister has been very clear about is that we do need to have sovereign manufacturing capability in key areas. We were one of the first states in the country to respond with the production of masks, with Detmold Medical. This is a company that we assisted to set up and operate as quickly as possible. This was something that they weren't manufacturing before. Detmold do manufacture a range of paper and cardboard products, which are manufactured here, developed here and, in fact, exported around the world. They have manufacturing around the world.

I think we have been able to demonstrate that we can move very quickly and we, similarly, are moving quickly with regard to this. Mr Speaker, you may be aware that I have been in Canberra twice recently, and on both of those occasions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we were working hard to speak to the federal government about the opportunities with regard to this vaccine and other opportunities for our state. Some states may choose to prosecute everything via the media. I think that we can point to our record in terms working with the federal government, cutting out the fake fights that existed under those opposite, working diligently to deliver for South Australia.

A classic example of that, of course, is the decision made by the federal government with regard to the establishment of the headquarters for the Space Agency. I know every other state around the country was talking about it in the media. I know every other state around the country was saying, 'We're going to commit this money to it.' Well, I know which state actually got the deal: it was South Australia. We put in a compelling and competitive bid for the federal government to consider.

I note that there are other states out there at the moment talking about bringing international students back. We have been working with the federal government on this matter for months and months and months—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we have put in our proposal to the federal government almost two weeks ago—in fact, two weeks tomorrow. We are hoping that we will get a positive approval. We are very keen to bring international students back safely to South Australia.

Mr Picton: What about the vaccines? That was the question.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is another example of the way we are trying to optimise the situation that we face in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. We know that this is affecting economies around the world, but we made a decision here in South Australia to do everything we could to keep our economy safe and our economy strong and that's precisely what's happened.

We now have more people employed in South Australia than pre COVID. In fact, we have a record number of people who are employed in South Australia and we have a record number of job advertisements in South Australia. That's because we have looked to every single opportunity, whether it be vaccine, whether it be protective equipment opportunities that come out of it—every single opportunity to chase down to maximise the benefit to our state.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the Minister for Trade and Investment, I call to order the member for Wright, the member for Playford and the member for West Torrens and I warn the member for Kurna.

VACCINE MANUFACTURING CAPABILITY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): I thank the Premier for his response in regard to international students, but has the Premier committed any financial support to local vaccine manufacturing capability here in South Australia and, if so, how much?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): Obviously the Leader of the Opposition has come down in the last shower. If we were in a detailed negotiation, we would hardly tell all our competitors exactly and precisely what we were offering. We conduct those conversations in private. We conduct them focused on getting an outcome for the people of our state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that our record speaks for itself. We have been able to secure extraordinary investment into South Australia. We have been able to demonstrate that we can actually negotiate complex negotiations. One example that you may be interested in, sir, is the negotiation which was concluded on Monday this week when South Australia took the lead in making sure that we could get the EnergyConnect project up and across the line. This is a project that took three years but will be delivering benefits to South Australia over a long period of time.

You might note from that negotiation that we did commit significant funds for that project, but we did not go on and on and on about it in the media every day. I think in many ways—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —this really does identify and highlight the difference between our two sides of politics. We have and we continue to conduct negotiations with the federal government—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The standing order I rise on is standing order 98, and that is about debate. Unless the Premier is about to educate us on the transmission of the vaccine down the interconnector, this is purely debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will cease interjecting. I will rule on the point of order. I do not uphold the point of order. The Premier is responding to a question in terms of both the process of government engagement and the process of investment in response to a question that was directed to the topic of vaccines and otherwise seeking a response in terms of the government's engagement on that topic. In that sense, the Premier's response is contextual. The Premier is directing his answer to the question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The question was very clear: how much are we putting on the table and to tell all the people involved in the other parts of this negotiation exactly what we are doing, and I am saying that we have had extensive negotiations with the federal government. I have been over there twice in the last two weeks—that's now on the record. We point to a record of success in terms of complex negotiations, both with the federal government and with other bodies like the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) to get a multibillion dollar project up again, one which many other people around the country and many other people around the world have been watching.

Of course, it is and it does create a contrast with those opposite who wanted to conduct their negotiations via the media. This is sometimes appropriate, but in this instance we want to put the people of South Australia first. We are interested in outcomes, not just bluff and bluster like we see from those opposite. The Leader of the Opposition—

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

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: the Premier is no longer answering the substance of the question but entering into a debate about the conduct of other people and assigning a motive.

The SPEAKER: The question was certainly directed to the government's actions. I uphold the point of order and direct the Premier's response to—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned. Interjections, particularly in the course of my ruling, are intolerable. I am very conscious that the house adjourned after 1.30am earlier this morning and I am conscious that members have been working very hard and continuously over the last 24 hours or so. That's no excuse for disorderly conduct. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The federal government have made it clear they want mRNA manufacturing capability in Australia. I have made it very clear we want that here in South Australia. We've got the capability to do that. I have heard others out there in the media saying that we could

get this up and running in the next couple of weeks. That is not correct. Nobody in Australia could get it up and running in the next couple of weeks.

Even with the South Australian proposal, it is going to take a minimum of six months, but that is far in advance of the offers that are being put forward by other jurisdictions because we do have TGA approval and we do have FDA approval for these types of vaccines to be manufactured right here at the facilities in South Australia. They don't exist in other states and the vaccines that we are talking about, the mRNA vaccines, are quite different from those that are manufactured at CSL, who are manufacturing the AstraZeneca.

We do need to have a variety of vaccines. We did originally think it was great to have both AstraZeneca and Pfizer being available in Australia. We had that ATAGI information that was provided that said, 'AZ is perfectly safe for those over 50, safe and effective,' but for those under 50 they wanted to move to Pfizer. We do need to have this type of manufacturing capability in South Australia. I want to assure this house and the people of South Australia that we are looking at every and all opportunities to make sure that we can have that facility in South Australia.

VACCINE MANUFACTURING CAPABILITY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier now met with BioCina chief executive, Ian Wisenberg, as I have, to discuss their local mRNA vaccine manufacturing capability?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19): Wow! I think that probably the deal is almost pretty much done now. The Leader of the Opposition—the guy who closed the Repat, the guy who downgraded hospitals, the guy who's got no skills with negotiation whatsoever; in fact, I am yet to understand what his skills are. He was a good union boss, apparently; they were his skills.

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

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is called to order and the member for Wright is warned. The member for West Torrens on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The two standing orders I raise are 98 and 127. The first one is 98: the Premier wasn't answering the substance of the question at all and instead launched into an attack—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The second is 127: the Premier immediately made personal reflections on another member of the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! I listened carefully to the question. First of all, there's no point of order pursuant to standing order 127, and it has been a matter that has been addressed on a number of occasions already this week.

In relation to the point of order on standing order 98, the question in its terms sought a comparison in relation to whether a meeting had occurred. It was nonetheless directed primarily to what the Premier had or hadn't done, so I don't uphold the point of order for the time being. The Premier is addressing the question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much. You are quite right, sir, the question was all about the contrasting style in terms of negotiation. As soon as the debate became a little bit heated, the real leader of the opposition jumps to his feet to try to defend the current Leader of the Opposition. The reality is they've got nowhere to stand on this issue. Having a meeting is not conducting a complex negotiation. We had been working with BioCina before they even came—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to Australia. In earlier answers, I made it clear that we have been working—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with these people since 2018; 2018 is quite a long way in front of the last couple of weeks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —has jumped on the bandwagon on this issue. He is all at sea. They have lost the team up there in the dream factory, they have lost the brains trust that was able to quickly tweet down changes to questions that might enable them to be a little bit more nimble, a little bit more flexible in question time.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They have given up the will, but we haven't. On this side of the house we are very keen to make sure that we take all and every single opportunity. There is a lot of money on the table from the federal government, not only with regard to the mRNA vaccine manufacture but also with the modern manufacturing initiative—I think \$1.3 billion. These are great opportunities for South Australia.

We haven't given up on manufacturing. We're doing everything we can to advance manufacturing here in South Australia, like our excellent investment down at Tonsley in the Line Zero project, which is delivering a huge opportunity for South Australian companies to get into the supply chain for those future frigates in South Australia. There is a huge amount of work happening down at Tonsley—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in manufacturing. I know that the Minister for Innovation and Skills—

Mr Boyer: We watched your mob chase Holden out.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —had a very important meeting with people with regard to manufacturing last night. Of course, I met with the new federal minister responsible for this area of government expenditure in the last week and a half, and it was good to understand the federal government's interest in making sure that we can get as much manufacturing sovereign capability here in Australia going forward.

That is a partnership, and that is something those opposite don't know. They want to talk about the contrasting negotiation skills. One of the things that we have done in big contrast with those opposite—just continuing that theme introduced by the Leader of the Opposition—is to develop skills, a skilled workforce to address those skill deficiencies that we were left by those opposite, and I am very proud to say that we have worked with the federal government. We were the first to sign up to

the Skilling Australians program in government. More than \$200 million is now committed to apprenticeships, traineeships—modern skills to support manufacturing. We are very interested—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The leader rises on a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Standing order 98, sir. The question was incredibly specific. I was simply asking the Premier whether or not he had met the BioCina chief executive. I would simply ask him to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The leader has recited a part of the question. I have addressed a point of order in similar terms. I don't uphold the point of order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We continue to work and look for every single opportunity out of this global pandemic. The rest of the world is still reeling from the effects. South Australia has more people employed now than we had pre COVID. We've got more job advertisements in South Australia than we had in the history of the state. We've got more young people involved in apprenticeships and traineeships—in fact, more than 37½ thousand people. This gives more evidence to you, sir, and to this house that we will take every single opportunity to advance this state. mRNA manufacturing in Australia is a priority for the government and is a priority for this government here in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Flinders, I warn the Minister for Trade and Investment, I call to order the Minister for Energy and Mining and I warn the member for West Torrens.

SCHOOL AND PRESCHOOL MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is backing South Australian businesses through the preschool maintenance program?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:25): I thank the member for the question. The member for Flinders knows, as do members on this side of the house, that the government is very committed to seeing both enhanced job opportunities for South Australians and a contribution towards that generational lift of educational facilities across our state as a result of the Marshall Liberal government's investment in school and preschool infrastructure and maintenance projects.

Last year, as everybody knows, we were confronted by an extraordinary set of circumstances, which had an immense impact on employment opportunities for people across the world and here in Australia. Indeed, the government had to take swift action to ensure that we were able to keep as many people in jobs as possible and to keep as many small businesses and tradies as possible in consistent work so that when we were able to come out of the pandemic we would be able to come out stronger than before and so that when the federal government's JobKeeper program, for example, was going to come to a conclusion, as surely it was going to, we would be able to come out with significant jobs still in our economy and, potentially, as has turned out to be the case here in South Australia and almost nowhere else in the world, even more jobs than before.

One of the programs the government put into place was investment—I think we called them COVID-stimulus grants—in preschool and school maintenance programs. These were investments initially of \$20,000 to every public preschool in South Australia and then subsequently in the budget in the second half of last year a further \$30,000 to every public preschool in South Australia, alongside a grant of \$20,000 to \$100,000, depending on their circumstances, to every public school in South Australia. These are projects that are entirely up to the discretion of the site leader but usually in consultation with and in addition to the facilities manager and the governing councils of the sites.

Across South Australia throughout this year, we are seeing many of those projects now completed and many more currently underway. The member for Flinders may be interested to know some of the particular examples of work that has been underway in his electorate. Of course, while this program was a jobs program and has kept people in work and has kept small businesses, suppliers, tradies and local workers in jobs, it has also provided a unique opportunity to lift the facilities in our public education across the state.

The sorts of things that might be going on in the member for Flinders' electorate, for example, include the Streaky Bay Children's Centre creating a new playground and nature play area, the Koonibba Aboriginal School upgrading their kitchen and installing a new island bench with a gate in the kitchen area of the children's centre and an arts sink, and the Port Lincoln Children's Centre having landscaping, upgrading to the parking area for staff and flooring to be polished.

Across South Australia there is a big variety of tasks underway. About 30 per cent of sites are reporting they are undertaking painting projects and about 27 per cent of sites have undertaken landscaping as part of their work. New nature play spaces and new playgrounds to encourage stimulating and creative and exploratory play are going on at hundreds of sites across South Australia.

There are sites that are using this money to install new air conditioners and sites that are using this money to install new interior or exterior blinds, enhance decking, install fencing and new staging areas—whatever the sites have needed. These are the sorts of jobs the sites have wanted that will enhance the learning and wellbeing of the students at these sites but that were not necessarily at the level where that had to be done.

This is a great program that the Marshall Liberal government has delivered. It has been providing jobs, it has contributed to our economic recovery coming out of the pandemic and it is giving our children, our next generation, a contribution towards the world-class education facilities they deserve—and the Marshall Liberal government is delivering for them.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that no state government resources, including staff, were used to prepare, coordinate and conduct his assistant minister's 10-year anniversary celebration? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On 29 May this year, the Assistant Minister to the Premier, the Hon. Jing Lee, held a 'humble' \$180 a head fundraiser gala dinner at the Adelaide Convention Centre.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30): Not as far as I'm aware, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before I call—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! Before I call the member for West Torrens, I call to order the member for Schubert—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: When there is silence, the member for West Torrens has the call.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Was a database of multicultural groups held by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet or the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission used to invite people to the fundraising event held by the Premier's assistant minister, the Hon. Jing Lee?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:31): I think this gives a very clear insight into the way the previous government operated. Most people would appreciate that the Hon. Jing Lee has been an outstanding advocate for Multicultural SA. There is not a function I go to where I don't get people telling me about the incredible contribution she has made over her time in this parliament and before.

I think it's fantastic that we live in such a diverse and respectful multicultural state, a place that values that great diversity we have in our state, and one of the champions of that diversity is, of course, the Hon. Jing Lee. It was disappointing recently when she stood for the presidency in the Legislative Council that the Labor Party, who quite often get out there saying—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Labor Party are always talking about diversity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are talking about gender, but when they get put to the test—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: When they get put to the test they are found wanting.

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's a disgraceful situation that Labor didn't support the government's candidate—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for that very important role, but it does talk to the way they are always looking—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for politics in every single situation. The member for West Torrens just hit the nail on the head with his very question, basically giving us a very clear insight into the way they ran government when they were on the treasury bench. Can I just say that we on this side of the house—

Mr Malinauskas: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —run government in a very different way, in a very, very different way from those opposite—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do everything we can to value—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —multicultural affairs in South Australia, to celebrate multicultural affairs in this state. We are very grateful to our multicultural leaders in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. The member for Playford will leave for 30 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A. The member for Torrens is called to order, the member for Badcoe is called to order, the member for Chaffey is warned for a second time, the member Ramsay is called to order and the Deputy Premier is called to order.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, I think the nature of the question gives us a great insight into the way the opposition acted when they were on the treasury bench—and, of course, it has continued in opposition. We know that Rhiannon Pearce, the candidate the Labor Party has for King, is a current staffer. We know that the candidate for Adelaide is Lucy Hood and we know that stands in incredible contrast.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the minister!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We know that members of the Leader of the Opposition's office turn up in those fake moments when you are walking down the street—interesting people on those Meet Pete type advertisements that you see popping up all the time on your Instagram feed. It shows how desperate they are.

But we will not be diverted. We will focus on the things which are important for people in South Australia, and one of those things is supporting our diverse multicultural communities in South Australia. I have to say a massive thankyou to each and every one of them. They worked very hard during COVID. There were some very worried and anxious people across our multicultural communities in South Australia when COVID hit.

I am very grateful to the leaders, the community leaders and the imams we had within the Muslim community who worked with their faith communities, with their diverse communities, to identify the types of things they should be doing and could be doing to help South Australia through the worst of the coronavirus. I take my hat off to our diverse multicultural community in South Australia. I don't look for opportunities for politics in it all day every day like those opposite.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left, members on my right! I warn the Minister for Energy and Mining. Again, I am one of those members who was present here until the early hours of this morning, and I am conscious that all members have been working very much through the majority of the hours of the last 48 hours in particular. That is no cause for ongoing interjection. The member asking the question is entitled to be heard in silence. The member answering the question is entitled to be heard in silence.

COAST PARK

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:37): My question is to the Attorney in her role as Minister for Planning and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is partnering with local councils to deliver the Coast Park project?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:37): I certainly am delighted to inform the house as to that project, the Coast Park project, which in my memory started back with David Wotton, who was a minister for environment 30 or 40 years ago. Successive governments have developed it over a period of time, but I am very pleased to inform the house that it's leaping ahead.

We have \$7 million already on the table from this government since 2018 to do key sections: \$2.441 million to the City of Marion for the marina coastal walkway, which is a three-stage project over three years; and, in 2019-20, another \$2.65 million committed to the City of Onkaparinga for the Witton Bluff Base Trail. The Minister for Environment has given me a full briefing on what this does, but it deals with an existing gravel path from Christies Beach to the bluff and continues a new boardwalk pathway around the base of the cliff to the Port Noarlunga foreshore. I am told that will get started in August this year.

Throughout the project, the City of Onkaparinga will regularly engage with the Department for Environment and Water to ensure potential impacts on the surrounding coastal environment are appropriately managed. I again thank the Minister for Environment for his work in ensuring that the coastal protection authority was fully involved in the decision for the development of that.

Another \$2.1 million goes to the City of Onkaparinga for the Port Willunga North Coast Park trail. That will deliver a further 2.8 kilometres. This sounds a bit like the Main South Road: they left the hard bits for us, but anyway we are ploughing ahead. So that's the first \$7 million. That's all on top of another—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I hope the member for Lee is interested in this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: You would think so.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I thought the member for Lee would be interested. He does enjoy a little bit of the coast of South Australia in his electorate, as do many in this place, so I would hope that they are interested in this. Certainly, the member for Colton is very interested in this. I know that he works hard in his electorate on that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will cease interjecting.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Even Jake Hall-Evans, who is our candidate down there in the seat of Lee—he's a dynamo—is very active on this. I thought the member for Lee actually was quite interested in this, but when this week he suggested in the parliament that the government is 'walking away', to quote him, from completing the Coast Park project, I was stunned because he has actually written to me supporting the input to that. Indeed, when the City of Sturt—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —handed back their \$3.5 million that we had given them out of the P&D fund and asked us to do it, we got the Department for Transport onto it—thank you, Mr Wingard for that—to actually get it started. I want to confirm to the house that, notwithstanding that statement, the \$6.5 million, consisting of a \$3.5 million open space grant and \$3.25 million from the City of Charles Sturt, has the effect, in two-stage Linear Park changes that both require Linear Parks Act amendments, to establish the Linear Park and Coast Park project, and of course it involves extensive consultation.

In fact, a number of residents who I think live in the member for Lee's electorate have been into the Attorney-General's office and we have sat around the table with Department for Transport officials to actually work out the program and work out some issues in relation to design, the medium which the pathway is going to have and the like. I do thank him for doing that. The design and architecture division in the office have finalised the design for stage 1. That will be uploaded in the next couple of weeks, and we thank all those in the community who have supported us in developing that.

The preparations are underway already for stage 2, with consultation, as the community in his electorate—perhaps he doesn't speak to people in his electorate, but they have been into our office and we have worked this out with them. That will commence later this year. I am pleased to say that as of 1 July there will be another round of P&D funding which will be advanced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for answering the question has expired. Before I call the member for West Torrens, the member for Lee will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw honourable members' attention to the presence in the gallery of members of the Royal Commonwealth Society, who are here today as guests of the Minister for Environment and Water. Welcome to you all.

Question Time

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Did the proceeds of the Jing Lee 10-year anniversary dinner go to the Liberal Party, and was that made clear to everyone who purchased a ticket? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition has sourced copies of email invites to the 10-year anniversary of the Hon. Jing Lee 'humble' \$180 a head, per person, anniversary dinner, and there is no reference to the Liberal Party or the function being a Liberal Party fundraiser on any email or any document. The opposition has also spoken to attendees who were not aware the event was a Liberal Party fundraiser and have told the opposition they wouldn't have attended if they had known.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42): These are matters for the Liberal Party, of course, and I suggest that the member for West Torrens directs his inquiries there. We don't make inquiries of the Labor Party here in question time when we find out that the Leader of the Opposition is having a bowling night with pizza, raising money for the Australian Labor Party.

I think it's pretty much known by most people here that there is an election next year. Political parties can, if they conform with the various statutes that we have in place here in South Australia, raise money—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to support activities, and we encourage that. Of course, I was at that event. It was a very good event. I think you probably could have picked up a ticket and come along; you would have seen some very good moves on that dance floor.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: A lot of people were out there. I don't want to comment on my own style, but it was a good event. I wasn't involved in the sale of those tickets, but what I do know is that Jing Lee does an outstanding job representing the multicultural communities here in South Australia. They absolutely love her. They adore her. She wasn't supported by the Labor Party for the presidency. They talk a lot about diversity and they talk a lot about gender. They are out there on a daily basis talking about gender and diversity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but when they are put to the test and they have the opportunity to advance that cause they are found wanting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell will cease interjecting. The member for Reynell is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: the Premier is not answering the substance of the question. He is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Has the Premier concluded his answer?

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

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for West Torrens, I call to order the member for Mawson and I warn the Deputy Premier.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:45): My question is to the Premier. How many of the groups that attended this Liberal Party fundraiser event also rely on the Hon. Jing Lee MLC for funding support in her role as the Assistant Minister to the Premier for multicultural affairs?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:45): Again, this is the sort of grubby innuendo that we have become used to from the member for West Torrens. May you never leave that role. May you never leave this parliament.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We love having you here.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I take offence at what the Premier said and I ask that he apologise and withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has indicated that he has taken offence at the remarks of the Premier. In the circumstances, I ask the Premier to withdraw.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to withdraw that remark. I am not happy to withdraw the remark that I want him to stay as long as he wants to because we love having him in the Labor Party on the opposition benches. It is a reminder of what would happen if they ever got back onto the treasury bench ever again in the future.

The innuendo in that question was absolutely clear for everybody to hear and we take offence at that. The reality is that we have worked very hard to unwind the situation that we inherited from those opposite to very clearly define now how we allocate money within that portfolio around four key areas, making sure that we have independent input into the decisions made. Last year, there was some discretion within my agency because we had allocated money for existing commitments around festivals and events, and many of them had to be cancelled last year, and so we did need to be nimble with regard to those events.

In some cases, they were used to offset some of the costs already incurred, and in other instances we were able to, by negotiation, keep that money within that organisation for other worthy projects that might support their community during what I think was a very tough year. The reason why we got through last year was because we had an excellent working relationship with our various communities, including culturally and linguistically diverse communities in South Australia, and we were very, very pleased—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to support them. We think that this is a hallmark of South Australia. When we look around the rest of the world, there is a lot of division when it comes to harmony around multicultural communities and multicultural activities. That is not the case here in South Australia, but I make this warning to this parliament: we must never, ever—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —take that for granted. We must work diligently to make sure that we are always leaning in to the opportunity for greater inclusivity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in this state and that is what we have done since coming to government. I take responsibility for this portfolio. I must say I am ably supported—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —by my assistant minister, Jing Lee, who supports me not only with regard to multicultural affairs but in fact in a great amount of the work that I do. I am very grateful for the work that she does. I think the multicultural community and the broader community in South Australia is very grateful for the work that she does. Long may it continue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Chaffey, I warn the member for Schubert, and I warn for a second time the member for Cheltenham.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:49): To the Minister for Water and Environment: minister please update the house on the benefits of the Marshall Liberal government's practical approach to our changing climate.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:49): I thank the member for Chaffey for his—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat for a moment. The leader is warned. Interjections of that nature are intolerable and will cease, and there will be consequences should that warning not be heeded. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I am glad that the member for Chaffey on this side of the house takes practical action towards climate change seriously, unlike the locker room thuggery and comments from the other side that we see time and time again, particularly from the Leader of the Opposition, which we had a prime example of a moment ago. Anyway, on to the good news—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: You see, he hates good news about climate change.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Climate whingers versus climate doers over here, because not only do we have our incredibly—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —important interim target to reduce emissions by 50 per cent by 2030, giving us that go-to action—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —with that powerful target but we are also getting on with a whole range of practical actions towards building resilience across our landscape, building a cooler, greener city so that we can adapt to a change in climate here in South Australia and also getting the big infrastructure solutions in place in order to ensure that we are not only positioned really well to deal with the change in climate but actually to have an economic benefit from exporting power to other states—our clean, green renewable power—and really setting the example in Australia, if not internationally, as to what a low carbon or decarbonised economy can look like.

That is why the announcement just a few days ago of the interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales is so important—because it really futureproofs our capacity to strive forward into that place of international leadership. We know we've got that very high penetration of renewables in South Australia—but that can lead to risks within our energy production, within our grid, when it comes to grid stability if we can move that energy to other jurisdictions.

That is why it is such phenomenal news that we have been able to secure a pathway forward for that interconnector. That work is underway now, and it is a testament to the leadership of the Minister for Energy and Mining and the Premier that we have been able to get that piece of exceptionally good news.

That is a foundation stone in our journey towards a decarbonised economy here in South Australia. It will make sure that we've got that strong, clean, green brand, and the opportunity to have advanced manufacturing based around that clean, green economy, which we know countries right across the world are looking to not just for leadership, knowledge and intellectual property in this area but also critically for products that are manufactured in an environment like ours.

That will lead to a premium price for them, it will create jobs here, and we know that in recent years as a state we have been able to decouple from emissions reduction, not needing to mean our reduction and economic capacity. In fact, emissions reductions in this state has seen at the same time increased economic growth, job creation and a real road map for the rest of the world as to how to do this and do it well.

Traditionally, we have been able to do this in a bipartisan sense in South Australia. The policy arena in this area was quite seamless when we came to government. It is very sad that the opposition with their carping and whingeing have walked away from that policy of bipartisanship when it comes to climate action, but we will continue to get on with it, and we will build that resilience across our economy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for West Torrens, I call to order the member for Davenport—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Did any state government agency, board or authority purchase any tickets to the Hon. Jing Lee 10-year anniversary dinner?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54): I've got a busy job as the Premier of South Australia. I am not actually the ticket salesman for a Liberal Party event. Again, I think this goes to a great indication of what went on in that former Labor government. Of course, I have no knowledge of—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the specifics of who attended. I've got no information that would suggest that that is the case. But it is interesting that they have run out of questions. Obviously, it was a late night last night. Not all of them were in the chamber; in fact, very few of them were in the chamber at some points in time and—

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

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is now reflecting on who was in the house during a debate of the same session of the parliament. It is disorderly, sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Premier will not reflect on the presence of members in the chamber.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Whether people are in the chamber or not in the chamber, I am sure they are all paying attention to the debates. It does give them an opportunity, when we are sitting here late, to maybe write some questions. Maybe what they did last night during those long hours, right through to 1.30 in the morning was to sit down and read *Hansard*—I took a flick through it myself—because it seems that the line of questioning that the member for West Torrens has today is exactly the same as they had in the Legislative Council yesterday. This is the problem: they've got everybody out at fake rallies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They've got everybody in the office out at fake rallies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and nobody is writing the questions. Nobody is writing the questions except for the Hon. Russell Wortley. So Russell Wortley is now running the question time strategy down here. I think the Leader of the Opposition is in safe hands.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for West Torrens, I warn the Minister for Innovation and Skills.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier instruct the Liberal Party and the Hon. Jing Lee MLC to reimburse the cost of tickets purchased to any organisation that complains to the Premier or the government that they were unaware that the Jing Lee dinner was, indeed, a fundraiser for the Liberal Party?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:56): I refer the member for West Torrens to my previous answers on this matter.

APY LANDS POLICING MODEL

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:56): My question is for the Minister for Police. During the minister's visit to the APY lands in April, what exactly did community leaders and the APY Executive say about the proposed new APY policing model?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:56): I thank the member for the question. The member is correct: recently, I did take the time to visit the APY lands, and I would encourage members of this place to do so whenever they can. As the member may be aware, there is obviously an APY staffing model that has gone out for consultation.

It is a very diverse, unique part of the state. We as a state government are working very hard to make sure that we continue to provide SAPOL with the resources that they need to patrol that part

of the state very professionally. I was there. I attended with several police officers. It was a very worthwhile visit. Obviously, the member would be aware that the staffing proposal has gone out to PASA, who have provided some feedback. I believe that SAPOL are continuing to work with them and I am quite confident that they will work out a much better staffing proposal that will continue to service the APY lands in a much better manner.

While we were up there, we visited a whole range of different stations and it was a real privilege to be able to get out there on the beat, talk to some of the officers who are definitely involved in what I would say are some of the most unique situations, very complicated, complex cases that they deal with. We know from recent examples that it's a continual thing that governments work very hard on to make sure that we reduce the level of Aboriginal incarceration. There are a number of programs that we put in as a government to continue to drive that over-representation of Aboriginal people in incarceration, to drive that rate down, but also to support—

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat for a moment. The member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: My point of order is in regard to relevance. The question was about what exactly community leaders and the APY Executive said about the APY proposal, not about what other police officers said about it.

The SPEAKER: I take that as a point of order pursuant to standing order 98.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member Light!

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light will cease interjecting. It is incumbent on the Speaker on receiving a point of order to rule immediately on the point of order. I am endeavouring to do that. That's made the more challenging when interjections continue across the chamber. The minister is in the course of answering the question. I am listening carefully to the minister's answer. The minister will be responsive to the question. I don't uphold the point of order for the time being. The minister has the call.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: This is a very serious issue, and the member for Elizabeth talks about community leaders. I ask: has he given any examples of any community leaders? No, he has not. There are many community leaders on the APY lands.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: There are many community leaders on the APY lands. Community constables, the people who get out and about and talk to people on a daily basis, these are certainly leaders. SAPOL officers out there patrolling some of the most complex of cases are leaders in the community. These are people who, quite frankly, other agencies look up to and work with on a day-to-day basis.

Can I say that SAPOL have conducted consultation with relevant stakeholders on the new proposed staffing model up on the APY lands. It's a very serious issue. I am not sure why there are pot shots being taken by the opposition on this issue.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: All I can say is I could not be more proud of the community leaders that we have in South Australia Police for what they do on the APY lands. I would encourage the member for Elizabeth, if he hasn't been up there, to actually take the time and get up there and have a look at the great work that they are doing up there, some of the most complex areas of policing that have been undertaken.

We are continuing to invest with SAPOL. As I said, there is a new proposed staffing model up there that I'm confident that PASA will be happy with and that other community leaders up there will be happy with. As I said, there are a range of community constables who do fantastic work up

there, and the SAPOL officers up there continue to do an exceptional job. If there are any concerns of any community leader, although they weren't provided, I would be happy to take them—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —on board and discuss them with the member.

Time expired.

APY LANDS POLICING MODEL

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:01): My question is again to the Minister for Police. Did the minister meet with the APY Executive Board or any community councils when he visited the APY lands in April this year?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:02): I thank the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I thank the member for Elizabeth for the question. SAPOL organised my visit. I was a guest of the commissioner and I met with—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The police commissioner.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: And I met with various community leaders on my trip. As I was saying, SAPOL have been undertaking consultation regarding a proposal to change the way that police are deployed to the APY lands. It is a very unique opportunity to do positive work up there. I understand, in fact, that the shadow minister and also the shadow attorney-general in another place were also provided a briefing in relation to matters up there and the proposed model.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am confident that what has been proposed will certainly ensure a more resilient and also a sustainable APY lands workforce. It will implement a centralised pool of trained members to undertake regular deployment into the region and also support a residential workforce. A key benefit of the model will be quantum change in certain approaches.

There will be better cultural competency training well beyond what is currently being offered. It won't reduce staffing levels, but it will ensure that a consistent staffing level is maintained. As I said, SAPOL has certainly consulted with PASA and certainly consulted with the community. As I was saying, if the member for Elizabeth has any evidence of people who would like more information or would like more consultation or would like to meet with me, I certainly am more than happy to take the time to make myself available.

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat.

Mr ODENWALDER: I ask you to bring the minister back to the substance of the question. I asked him whether he had met with the APY Executive Board or any community councils.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr ODENWALDER: I don't need another explanation of the model.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was in its terms quite specific. I direct the minister to the specific question.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: As I pointed out, I was a guest of the police commissioner, but I would say that I met with various community leaders up there.

If any member in this place has been to a place like Fregon and to a place like Ernabella and taken the time to invest in communities like these, these are complex communities. They require a lot of attention from governments, whether it be from the Department for Correctional Services or from SA Health, from SA Police or from the Department for Education. It is certainly incumbent upon decision-makers to get up to these parts of the state and do what we can to try to assist.

I met with various community leaders while I was up there. I don't have a list in front of me, but I'm happy to discuss more details with the member for Elizabeth. I can't reiterate enough that if there are any—

Ms Stinson: Did you meet with the APY Executive or not—yes, no?

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

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —people who would like to talk about the proposed model that's up there in areas like Fregon or Ernabella, I would be more than happy to discuss these issues with the member. That would be much more productive than going through the entire itinerary of the visit, which was a very productive and worthwhile visit. Anyone who would like to discuss matters up there, whether it's in the Department for Correctional Services or South Australia Police, I would be more than happy to sit down with them in a productive—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —yes—and I would be more than happy to sit down with them and discuss these matters. As I said, SAPOL have been undertaking consultation regarding a proposal to change the way that police are deployed to the APY lands. I am confident that, by the end of the consultation, once the new model is implemented we will see much better outcomes on the APY lands.

APY LANDS POLICING MODEL

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:06): My question is again to the Minister for Police.

Members interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: I am still angry, John.

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

Mr ODENWALDER: Can the minister understand how community leaders on the APY lands would be angry and confused about why he travelled thousands of kilometres—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ODENWALDER: —spending taxpayer funds—

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth will resume his seat. The Minister for Energy and Mining rises on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The member for Elizabeth has told us twice that he is angry, but that doesn't allow him to put argument into his question, and standing order 97 prevents him from asserting that anybody else is angry in his questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order has been raised pursuant to standing order 97. I will allow the member for Elizabeth one opportunity to rephrase. He, I am sure, is well aware of the procedure should he wish to seek leave.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Police. Why did the minister spend taxpayer funds to travel thousands of kilometres and not speak to one single community leader?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): In light of the time, I am happy to answer that question on behalf of the government. I am the minister responsible for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. As such, the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act is actually a piece of legislation I look after. I have extensive consultation with people on the lands on a range of issues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe, member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and I have only recently met with the interim chair, Bernard Singer; with the Anangu director of APY, Rex Tjami; with the chief executive, Richard King; and senior members there. They represent the diverse views. The issue regarding the new policing model was not raised with me. I am happy to go back and seek some feedback on this issue, but the minister provided a comprehensive briefing to the cabinet on his visit. He encouraged many of us to go up there.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He canvassed a huge number of views while he was up there. We were very pleased to get that feedback.

RURAL HEALTH WORKFORCE STRATEGY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:09): I have a question for the minister representing the Minister for Health. Can the minister update the people of Narungga on the progress of the Rural Health Workforce plan? With your leave, and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: In July 2019, the Rural Health Workforce plan was released and it recommended, amongst other things, three salaried GPs for Wallaroo Hospital starting in 2020 and a business case for a centrally run locum service. What is the progress on these initiatives?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:09): I thank the member for the question and I thank him for his advocacy for the people of Narungga. I remember well when I spent some time on Yorke Peninsula with him in the first third of last year. In fact, I think it was the last regional trip I did before we stopped going out so much as a result of the pandemic. I spent a couple of days with the member for Narungga.

While we were spending time visiting the schools in his electorate, having a look at some of the excellent educational programs that were in store and meeting with principals and preschool directors at a dozen of those sites, I also remember very much that, when we were going past each town, the member for Narungga would be able to highlight the health services that were on offer and bring to my attention some of the opportunities for improvements.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: We spent some time talking about the service provided by a close friend of my family, the late Dr John Flett, and what he had done for the Kadina hospital in particular. I know that the member for Narungga and his family are engaged very much in those services. The member for Narungga particularly—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sorry?

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Before I was interrupted, the member for Narungga was asking about the Wallaroo services particularly. I am pleased to advise the member for Narungga and his community that a salaried medical model of care for Wallaroo Hospital was approved by the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network governing board on 5 May, a month ago.

The model of care will replace the current locum staffing arrangement with the salaried model, which will provide a varied skill mix to the communities of Wallaroo and surrounds and enable patients to have services closer to home. Recruitment for stage 1 of the model of care will commence shortly for an additional three salaried rural generalists—these are new positions—to work with the current two locums.

These positions will manage the emergency department, inpatients and some specialised procedural work at Wallaroo Hospital. The Executive Director of Medical Services of the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network has met with general practitioners in Wallaroo and Kadina, who have agreed to continue to provide procedural services to Wallaroo Hospital. Stage 2 of the model of care will see additional rural generalists working at Wallaroo Hospital to manage the emergency department, obstetrics, anaesthetics, surgery, internal medicine and paediatrics, thereby replacing the locums currently providing services at Wallaroo Hospital.

The agreed changes to nurse rostering at Wallaroo Hospital have been successfully implemented following a trial conducted between October 2020 and January 2021. The trial proceeded without incident, and it was agreed to implement the revised rostering practices, which would be reviewed at three, six and 12 months. I am advised that no issues were identified at the three-month review. I hope this gives some comfort and confidence to the people of the member for Narungga's electorate.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:12): My question is to the Premier. Will the government hold a royal commission or independent inquiry into SkyCity Adelaide following their recent statement on and AUSTRAC's concerns of, and I quote, 'management of customers identified as high-risk and potentially exposed persons'? Does he now consider it a mistake to have dismantled the office of the independent gambling regulator when so many probity issues have now arisen with Australian casino operations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:13): In response to the member's question, I have perused a number of questions and answers that have been provided in the other place in relation to this issue. Just to be clear, the issue of the Hon. Patricia Bergin SC's inquiry, on which she prepared a report, was back in 2014, at a time that preceded this government. Nevertheless, the Independent Gambling Authority was actually in existence at that time. There was a concern raised that its being dismantled subsequently may have caused—just to be clear, this issue was raised back at a time when it was actually in existence.

Since that time, just to explain to the house, there have actually been two royal commissions instituted in relation to other services that are provided in Australia as a result of her report. For the benefit of members who haven't read this report, it essentially looks into the whole question of organised crime, and money laundering in particular, that may operate in casinos. They are a place at which there is a high level of movement in relation to cash and therefore can be vulnerable to that type of behaviour.

AUSTRAC, the Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre, is the federal regulatory agency that monitors those transactions and obviously has to try to detect and respond to any criminal abuse in the financial system. Of course, that relates to trying to deal with money laundering, and to deal with that they have a number of programs and guidelines they expect casinos to operate under. Some of those relate to the Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act and the Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Rules.

Those things culminated in a disclosure by SkyCity recently that they had had a request from AUSTRAC regarding some investigations as to whether there was customer due diligence and whether there was compliance with some of those guidelines; in particular, to be able to identify what they call these 'persons of interest' or PEPs, as I think they call them colloquially in all the language that occurs with this. They are basically politically exposed persons.

I don't know whether there have been any in South Australia or who they are. That would be like asking the police officers investigating Operation Ironside to tell us who they might be investigating before they arrested them all the other day. We don't do that. We let those agencies get on with that work.

In the meantime, our Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, as soon as he was alerted to this report, started looking at the matter himself. He has a role in relation to obligations under the Casino Act and agreements for compliance, and he keeps a check on things. For example, just in recent years this parliament passed laws relating to note acceptor reforms in poker machines—I think there are something like 800 poker machines in the Casino—and with that came an obligation to have electronic detection in relation to facial recognition technology. They have to monitor the implementation of those so he has an active role, and I think on a daily basis his agents go through and check in relation to casino compliance.

He has continued to work with AUSTRAC in relation to their inquiry. Once it appeared that AUSTRAC said, 'Look, we're taking over the investigation,' he announced, 'Well, we won't be reviewing this ourselves.' Obviously he is continuing to support and assist AUSTRAC in relation to their investigation.

If and when something comes from that that we need to act on or support the prosecution or implementation of any action, of course we will do that as a government. However, at this stage we are awaiting that investigation. If there is anything to come from that we will, of course, act on it.

Time expired.

LEITECH AUSTRALIA

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister explain to the house how the government is working with local companies such as Leitech Australia that provide innovative energy technology solutions that help to reduce carbon emissions, grow their businesses, and create jobs?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:17): I thank the member for Waite for his question. The member for Waite meets many local businesses and he wrote to me, as the Minister for Trade and Investment, and said that this was a really good local business he had the chance to meet with personally, and invited me to go and see their manufacturing factory.

It was great to join the member for Waite there as well as Leitech's director, Simon Hornsey, who is a constituent of Waite—which is, of course, how they made the initial introduction—and who showed us around the facility. The business itself was established in 2015, a small family business, and manufactures LED lighting. These LED lights help businesses to reduce their energy costs by being much more energy efficient than older style lights, and that is a big opportunity for Leitech. They also look at power factor correction units as well as solar systems.

Energy efficiency is not the only way businesses such as Leitech can reduce their energy costs. Just bringing down the actual cost of energy is also very important, and that is why it was great news on Monday this week when Project EnergyConnect was given the green light. That was fantastic news, and it provides great opportunities for further renewable energy investment here in South Australia.

We have already seen the lowest wholesale prices in the nation here in South Australia: in fact, future price contracts as well are the lowest in the country, as AEMO reported in its latest quarterly survey, and that will further reduce costs. Already the average household is saving \$269 per year, and it is even more for businesses, because many of those businesses are using energy in greater quantities than households.

So that's great news. It is also going to bring out further investment into this state—potentially 16.4 gigawatts of generation capacity into South Australia worth \$15 billion. This is fantastic. That will help stabilise energy prices, give more confidence to businesses here and, of course, allow them to reduce their energy prices.

Leitech themselves, as I said, are building LED lights here. At the moment, they have set themselves a target of 20 per cent of their product mix to be sourced locally. That was set in 2019, but of course with all the supply chain disruptions that have occurred because of COVID, a lack of international travel has really caused them to relook at what their supply chains are to see if they can manufacture even further in South Australia.

That was the great news that they were able to provide the member for Waite and myself. They are really keen on looking at that. They are looking to produce potentially 80 per cent as a target for product mix to be manufactured here in SA, which is fantastic news. They are looking to do that towards the end of 2022. How are they going to do that? There are labour costs in other countries in cheap labour. That's one of the reasons why things are done offshore.

What we are finding more and more is that if companies invest in their plant and equipment here, advanced plant and equipment, they can reduce their cost base significantly and allow them to compete for manufacturing here in Australia with those cheaper labour force countries. That's great news for South Australian businesses and great news for people looking for jobs as well, because as more businesses are stood up here, such as Leitech, we will be able to create more jobs here in South Australia.

Thank you, member for Waite, for the invite. That was really appreciated. I look forward to working with more companies like Leitech to see them grow their business here in South Australia.

EPLANNING SYSTEM

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister inform the house when the planning portal clock will be reinstated? Is there any reason why the clock was removed from the planning portal? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: The planning portal operates with a clock that allows applicants and planning consultants to follow the time left for approving authorities such as councils to assess and make decisions on development applications. I have had a number of planning consultants contact my office saying that the clock has not been showing on the portal for the past two months, and without the clock operating, applicants and planning consultants are unable to hold the approving authorities to account.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:22): I thank the member for the question. I haven't had the same concern raised with me and I do have regular meetings with industry and also with the department to ascertain, since 19 March, how that portal is going. I know there was one incident when there was a short time of several hours in relation to the transmission of services on that portal.

Otherwise, I haven't heard of the removal of the clock or time. I am receiving regular reports as to the compliance of the obligation to have turnaround times within the turnaround times which are now a matter of days, mostly five days, and they are being done in three days. But certainly, I will follow that matter up and get back to the member on that.

Grievance Debate

STATE ECONOMY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): During the course of this week, we did receive good news from The Economist Intelligence Unit that confirmed I think what we already knew and that is that Adelaide is one of the most livable cities in the world. It has been for a sustained period of time that we have always been more or less in the top 10 of the most livable cities in the world. Adelaide has always been in the top rankings of Australia's most livable cities. Yet again this week that was affirmed by The Economist Intelligence Unit achieving No. 3 within the rankings.

I do think it is true that that has coincided with a degree of sense of self-confidence amongst the South Australian people and Adelaideans that we have performed well during the course of the COVID crisis. We have collectively stood up to the plate. We are also seeing the windfall of an

unprecedented opening up of the commonwealth purse strings with a massive fiscal stimulus in the economy.

I had an interaction very recently with a gentleman who worked for a car yard. He worked in the used car section. He explained to me firsthand, in a way that I thought would make him happy but was actually more a sign of anxiousness, that he had sold a car during the course of the week for \$30,000 more than it was originally purchased for, despite the fact that it was three years old and had 60,000 kilometres on the clock. I said, 'That's fantastic, mate; more commission for you.' He said, 'Yes, but I know it's not going to last and I'm worried about what is happening next. I'm worried about what is around the corner.'

What this gentleman knows and understands is that it is imperative that any government is always focused on the future and doing the work to not just assess the opportunity but translate that opportunity into practical policy that will deliver a long-term dividend to the community. Indira Gandhi, former Indian Prime Minister, once said that there are two types of people, those who do the work and those who take the credit, and you are better off being in the first group because there is a lot less competition.

What we see on the other side of this house is a lot of competition, because they seem hell-bent—the Premier in particular—on trying to take the credit for other people's work rather than focusing on doing their own. Time and time again, we see that example. We heard it this morning on ABC radio: the Premier rushing out to try to claim leadership over the voluntary assisted dying legislation, which of course was principally led by the Hon. Kyam Maher and the member for Port Adelaide.

We have heard during the course of this week mentions and references to big investments in hospital infrastructure, which these guys had absolutely nothing to do with. As the member for King will well know, the Modbury Hospital \$90 million development was principally organised by the former Labor government. The Minister for Education was banging on about a \$1 billion investment in education. They had nothing to do with it; that was locked and loaded in budgets long before they came to government.

The Minister for Infrastructure has talked time and time again about projects that again they had nothing to do with the initiation of, and we are still waiting for them to start rolling out their infrastructure program—all talk, no action. The South Australian community know it when they see it. They know the difference between leaders who are trying to claim the credit for others' work and the leaders who are actually doing the business of setting up a policy and grabbing the opportunity that we have at hand.

When this parliament reconvenes in a fortnight's time it will be budget day. It will be the last budget handed down before the next state election. I think the whole state collectively hopes that this government starts to deliver on some serious work and has a policy in place that addresses the issues that we know exist and are real, and none are more real than the absolute crisis that exists in our health system. It is no longer enough for this government to point to the Lyell Mac, the Modbury Hospital or The QEH redevelopments; they have to now speak to their own policy, and we need people and we need staff. The cuts have to stop and the investment needs to be made.

Just as I stand, reports are out that the Women's and Kids' Hospital is at 157 per cent capacity in the emergency department right now; people are waiting right now. They need a budget that responds to this crisis. Stop taking credit for other people's work, start doing your own and try to get our health system back on track.

Time expired.

AMOS, MR B.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:28): I rise today on a very sad issue from a Port Augusta community perspective, from a Flinders Ranges perspective and from my own perspective. I rise to talk about a friend who died recently and whose funeral I attended. It is a delicate thing to do, because we all go to lots of funerals and we do not talk about all of them, so this in no way is meant to exclude any other friend or loved one I do not do this about.

However, I do want to talk about this man, a man who was 44 years old, an Aboriginal man and a friend. He was not a super close friend. I am not trying to overcook this in any way, but he was a friend. We talked regularly and swapped texts regularly. But, more than that, he was an extraordinary leader in Port Augusta, in the Davenport community, in the Flinders Ranges and my home district.

I will say his name. I know that at times it is not appropriate to say the name of an Aboriginal person who has passed but, given the fact that his name was used very freely at the funeral by lots of Aboriginal people—it was written and spoken—I do not think that is inappropriate in any way.

Community Constable Bradley Amos, a husband, a father of three young adult sons, passed away. There was a very large funeral and an enormous amount of love and respect shown and shared for him and his family last Friday, and Port Augusta—I said community constable, but in fact I think senior community constable was his rank—and police were there in full force, and I mean that in a very good way. There was an extremely large contingent. I think almost every single local Port Augusta and Far North local service area (LSA) officer who could be spared was there. The police commissioner was there, former superintendents who had led the police in Port Augusta were there, and there were many other people there.

Brad was a leader. Brad was one of those people who, when he came into the room, the room lit up. He was one of those people who, when he was around, everything was better. He was one of those people who was not just about fun. He was a person who was a genuine leader of young people, middle-aged people, old people. Everybody looked up to him for what he had to offer. He was an extraordinary contributor to the South Augusta Football Club. He was a person who was very proud of his Aboriginal culture. He was a person who also fitted in through the structure of the police force in South Australia and was a respected officer in that way.

He found a way to walk a life that is extremely difficult, that is, the life of an Aboriginal community constable in the police, where you are challenged—and I do not say that I know this from personal experience, but certainly by observation and discussion with many friends—as the person in some ways representing the police, in some ways representing Aboriginal people, at times doing police work with Aboriginal people, at times doing police work with non-Aboriginal people and at all times being loyal simultaneously to the police force, to your community and also to your broader Aboriginal family. Bradley found a way to do that.

He was one of those people who could give an incredibly serious look. He might look at you and you would really wonder, 'Gee, what have I done, or what has somebody else done? What has made him look and feel that way?' Sometimes he meant it, sometimes there was something very serious on his mind, but sometimes he was just doing it to mess with you, and sometimes he would give a big beaming smile immediately afterwards and you would feel a bit silly that you were tricked or whatever.

One of the very last texts I had from Bradley Amos was a big emoji heart. I only mention that because that was the calibre of the man. He was a fierce competitor on the football field, he was a loving man to his friends, he was a leader in our community and he will be very sorely missed.

LIBRARY FUNDING

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:33): The written word is something for which many of us have a deep love. Whether we employ it to text a loved one, to pen a poem, to write an essay, to read a novel or, indeed, to type up legislation amended in this place, the written word is a thing to behold. Its power is immense. It is the way we convey our opinions, our dreams, our questions and our emotions. The written word has started wars and indeed it has ended them. Whether it is in English or any other language, the written word is indeed a beautiful thing.

For many of us, our respect and love for the written word, and indeed our innate thirst for knowledge, probably began at a library. It may have even started at the toy library with our very first baby books, and little by little with each book that we borrowed as a child, then a teen, then a student, then into adulthood, we realised the power of words and books and stories and libraries.

It is little wonder then that I have received dozens of beautifully written letters in recent weeks about local libraries and the threat libraries are now facing under this Liberal government. The letters I have received articulate the passion that my community feels for its public libraries, and I have

enjoyed hearing about the very special experiences and connections that my constituents have had through our libraries. Mia of Clarence Gardens wrote a charming letter to me. She says:

My two daughters and I have visited the library almost every week of their lives. They are avid readers...the library has always been a welcoming and inclusive space...allowing them to access diversity in their reading interests.

She went on to compliment the staff at Mitcham Library, saying they go above and beyond with a welcoming smile, especially during COVID when the family was homeschooling, and also in sourcing rare books in the *Babysitters Club* series for her tween, a series that I used to read myself when I was 11 or 12 years old. I do wonder what Kristy, Mallory, Anne-Marie and Claudia are up to these days. Pauline of Glandore wrote to me, saying.

Community means sharing—giving and receiving knowledge, but more importantly companionship and hope.

She described how the Hamra Library in the City of West Torrens benefits her wellbeing. She is a volunteer and teaches English to migrants there. She has also learned how to use computers and loves seeing the mothers and babies group reading and singing together.

Cate of Clarence Park tells me that, as a retiree with a limited income, she uses her local library to continue her education and connect with the community. She is particularly grateful for the One Card system, which is now under threat, she says, under this government. Peter from Clarence Park wrote:

I am 75...and I have loved libraries all my life, even more so [now] today as we have no internet. Give us a break! There is little enough for the community to use without...payment. Please reconsider the impact of cuts in this area.

Iris of Black Forest wrote to me, 'Libraries are about so much more than just books.' I agree wholeheartedly, though, of course, as a former journalist I hardly need convincing. Writing and reading was my trade for so many years and one that I owe to an early love of reading instilled in me at public libraries. My family certainly did not have the means to quench my rather insatiable appetite for books as a youngster and, even if they did, the fact that we were moving around the country quite a bit would have meant we could not actually bring all the books with us.

People in Badcoe are concerned about the outcome of the current funding agreement being negotiated by the government with the Local Government Association and, considering the cuts we have seen across government and the privatisation of services, such as our public transport operations, I can understand why they are worried.

A few fast facts: there are more than 130 libraries in this state and there are more than 9.7 million visits annually, supported by over 20 million online library visits each year. The Value of Libraries study by the LGA last year found that more than 50 per cent of us are library members, including me, and also that for every dollar invested in public libraries \$2.80 in benefits are generated.

I would like to thank every one of my constituents who are fighting the good fight for our libraries, and I would like to thank the incredibly passionate people who work in our libraries and who cultivate in each of us a similar love for literacy. I would like to thank the LGA for its campaign to ensure ongoing sustainable funding for our libraries. I am with you in this fight, and I will do all I can to ensure proper funding and a long and prosperous future for our libraries so that future generations develop the same adoration for the written word as me.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:38):

I take this opportunity in parliament today to speak about World Environment Day and the great work that people in my community are undertaking. Environment protection and conservation are high priorities for many in my local community, and we are so lucky to have schools in Morphett that are really engaged with environmental protection and how we can do our part locally.

St Mary's Memorial School in Glenelg is one of those schools, and the year 4s have recently been focused on sustainability and what they can do to help the environment. As I have mentioned previously in this place, I hosted a Clean Up Australia Day event in March this year along the Glenelg and Glenelg South beaches, and students from St Mary's helped in our efforts to keep our beaches and coast park clean.

Recently, I was fortunate enough to attend the St Mary's year 4 sustainability assembly, where they talked about what the class is doing. The class has been watching documentaries on the topic, such as *War on Waste*, and have been undertaking activities in class. Students Blake, Scarlett, Olivia and Oisin explained at the assembly that one of these activities was a bin audit, where the class collected all the bins from around the school, emptied them out and sorted the rubbish into various categories.

These categories included hard plastics, soft plastics, organics, paper and cardboard, tissues, pencil sharpenings, and drink containers. The class discovered that all around the school classes were not using the correct bins for recycling waste. They then decided to do something about this. They broke up into small groups to discuss how they could create awareness around the school regarding recycling.

Sienna and her group, called Care for the Earth, created a PowerPoint presentation and a game to teach other kids about what rubbish goes into which bins. Tilly and the Green Thumbs decided to make recycled artwork with plastics from the rubbish bins. Isla and the Wild Girls designed and printed T-shirts, tote bags, stickers and magnets to sell, with the proceeds going towards a rainforest charity. Other groups included Jake and the Bin Pizzas, who created a game, Finn and the Sustainable Monkeys, Ryan and the Team Trees, Brodie and the Waste Warriors, Tyler and the Sustainability War Bros and Isabelle and the SDF, which stands for Sustainability Defence Force.

A special mention has to go Grace, Arla, Rachel, Alex, Addi and Portia from the Eco Girls. They wrote me a letter as their local member of parliament and hand-delivered it to my office. The Eco Girls wrote that, while the school has recycling bins in the yard, the bin audit showed that a lot of the rubbish went into the classroom bin that went straight into the red bin, so they asked if I could help provide them with recycling bins in their classroom.

After doing some investigation, I found an SA company called Bin Shift, that provides small-scale cardboard recycling bins that could sit in the year 4 classroom. I purchased a starter pack for them and presented it to them at their assembly. The pack was made up of four small cardboard recycle bins and also some bio bag liners, which are certified compostable. Two of these bins were mixed recycle yellow bins for items that can be recycled, such as metal, glass, hard plastics, paper and cardboard. These are all valuable resources that need to stay in the recycling loop so we can help create our circular economy.

The other two bins were soft plastic bins that are to be filled up with the scrunchy, soft plastics so much of our food is wrapped in. Soft plastics should not be put in the normal yellow recycling bin; they can only go either in the landfill bin or, even better, the soft plastics bin so they can be taken to a REDcycle bin at participating Coles and Woolworths stores to be recycled.

After only a few weeks in operation, I am pleased to report that the use of these recycle bins in the classroom has been very heavily undertaken, such that the nightly cleaner has asked who is cleaning the bins in the year 4 level, as there is regularly no rubbish in the standard waste bin. Well, the answer is that all the year 4s have diligently been putting their soft plastics, paper, food wrappers and bottles in the recycle bins. Congratulations to all the St Mary's Memorial year 4s. Keep up the good work.

COVID-19 INDIA

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:43): I rise to speak briefly about the extraordinary human tragedy that has been unfolding in India due to this COVID-19 pandemic. With India and its people, we know we share so much in common. Australia shares the great aspirations of democracy with the great nation of India, and India, the largest democracy on this planet, this year celebrates its 73rd anniversary of independence.

Thanks to our great and most amazing story of migration and multiculturalism in this state, we are lucky enough to call 40,000 South Australians of Indian birth local residents. We know that between 2011 and 2016 the greatest proportion of people arriving in South Australia from overseas were from India. It is with this great connection, but also deep understanding and empathy, which I know all of us in this place have with members of the Indian community, that we reflect on the tragedy currently unfolding in India.

To better understand this tragedy and to hear directly from members of the community, the Labor Opposition recently engaged with a significant number of leaders of the diverse Indian

community here in South Australia. Along with the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Ramsay, and including Senator the Hon. Penny Wong, Labor's shadow minister for foreign affairs, we convened a meeting of leaders of this community to hear from them directly about the most recent and acute tragedy unfolding in India and in the course of the entire last 14 months and how that has been affecting uniquely members of the local Indian community.

They spoke very clearly, articulately and passionately about things that mattered to them. They told us they felt isolated and disconnected, with deep concerns for members of their community. They spoke of the immense hardship international students had faced. Many of those students were stuck in Australia, effectively unable to leave and stranded without the ability to work or to receive government assistance.

We know that members of the Indian community and other multicultural communities stepped up during this time to look after their own communities. They delivered enormous amounts of food and financial relief to members of not only their own community but others within our multicultural communities.

At this round table, members of the local Indian community also spoke about the significant effect the separation of carers, most often grandparents stuck in India, had had on their families. They spoke about how that has impacted their capacity to fully participate in the economy, to fully care for their children and to participate in South Australia's diverse life in a way that they would like to.

They also spoke about feelings of being abandoned by the federal government. The decision to limit and impede travel from India to Australia was a difficult one. On balance and in the face of a significant pandemic emergency, it was a decision that was widely supported by the community. However, the decision to criminalise the return of an Australian citizen was met with confusion, dismay and anger. It was considered unnecessary, over-reaching and politically opportunistic, announced at a time when the Prime Minister was under immense pressure over his stalled, delayed and botched national quarantine response and vaccine rollout.

Despite all this, and in spite of all this perhaps, the Indian community spoke most passionately about their desire to help back home in India. They spoke about the need and the want to assist financially, to work with members of the South Australian community to fundraise and to help back home. I am very pleased to congratulate them on their coordinated efforts on the weekend just gone in the holding of their first Garba Night, an event coordinated by 33 separate Indian organisations to raise money for their communities back home.

In the brief time that is left, I want to very clearly put on the record my dismay at the treatment of Priya, Nades, Tharnicaa and Kobika, Sri Lankan asylum seekers stuck in purgatory on Christmas Island. I spoke about the human tragedy unfolding in India, but we have a human tragedy unfolding before our eyes. My pleas to the Prime Minister are very clear: stop the madness, stop the cruelty and bring them home.

HISTORY MONTH

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:48): I am pleased to report to the house that the month of May, as members will recall, was History Month and the History Trust of South Australia reported to me that the 17th History Festival proceeded extremely well. Members might recall that last year the History Festival had to be cancelled at late notice, which was a serious disappointment to all of us and the History Trust.

The History Festival attracts a significant number of its audience from amongst older residents in our community and it was obviously, in retrospect, the right thing to do. People who might have been vulnerable to the pandemic could not have been exposed to the risk in good conscience and so the 2020 festival was cancelled.

That was a great shame, because for many years the History Festival in South Australia has been growing and growing. It started in 2004 as History Week and then became a month, so significant was the community's response. In 2018 and then 2019, we had record numbers of events, record numbers of community organisations putting forward their events and record numbers of

participants. Well over 100,000 South Australians were involved in attending History Festival activities throughout the 2019 festival.

The 2021 History Festival, I am very pleased to report to the house, had more than 380 event organisers getting back on track organising events, whether they be local history groups, sporting organisations, universities and institutions, significant South Australian businesses or local councils—organisations large and small celebrating the uniqueness of whatever their organisation or local community has to offer to our great state and collectively helping to bring together an understanding of what it is to be a South Australian in 2021. Knowing where we come from informs us of where we are and who we are, and helps us to do better in where we are going.

I was pleased that a number of events focused on recognising our Aboriginal history here in South Australia. Also, because of the relationship between the History Trust through the Migration Museum with many multicultural communities, it is not surprising that there was a particular focus at many events on multicultural South Australia. Some 620 events took place through the month of May and were enjoyed by many tens of thousands of South Australians.

The theme this year was that of change, and what more appropriate theme could there be in an extraordinary time such as this? Change for the better, change for the worse on a big or small scale, and everything in between; and event organisers were encouraged to plan around this idea, although many of the old favourites that every year attract many interested people—whether they be the cemetery tours or tours of tunnels in unusual places, or war bunkers in South Australia—were very much taken on board.

Events happened almost everywhere in our state, right across the great expanse of South Australia: in rural towns, in metropolitan Adelaide, in cities and suburbs, in museums and libraries, in boats, trains and buses, in heritage buildings, on the street, by the beach and in nature. I commend all those hundreds of organisations who took the time and trouble to organise those events for the broader community's benefit. Many of these events were free events available for all South Australians to learn a bit more about their state, a little bit more about their local area or potentially reach out and learn more about a different area.

If people are hearing about the History Festival for the first time, I hope they put it in their diaries for May next year because this year we have also moved to an online program. We were able to provide information to people who did not have access to a web portal if they were interested in the History Festival, but that online program also enabled a very easily searchable and modern approach for finding out about events.

I am looking forward to seeing the work the History Trust will continue to do in the years ahead. This is its 40th year. Indeed, I think Murray Hill was the Minister for the Arts in the Tonkin government who conceived and worked with David Tonkin to bring that about. It was announced on Proclamation Day in 1980, and it passed through both houses of parliament before the middle of 1981. So it was probably about 40 years ago to this sitting, or maybe off by a couple of weeks, that it took place.

Forty years of the History Trust. They have done a fantastic job, and they continue to evolve. I congratulate Elizabeth Ho and the trustees; Greg Mackie and the staff; and all the volunteers who have made the 2021 History Festival a great success. I cannot wait to see what they do in the future.

PORT PIRIE BOWLING CLUB CENTENARY

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:53): Today, I would like to talk about the Port Pirie Bowling Club and centenary, which was held last year. As a long-serving community person and now as the local member of parliament, it is my great privilege to be able to talk today about the centenary celebrations of the Port Pirie Bowling Club.

Who would have thought in 1920—when the first president, Mr Frank Tonkin, presided over the installation of seven rinks with electric lights and a pavilion—that these facilities would still be used by bowlers 100 years later? This celebration was supposed to take place last year but because of COVID-19 it did not occur. A book was written on the centenary of the club, but again that launch has not taken place at this particular point in time.

Eight years later, in 1928, the club membership was open to the general public and thus started the great journey that this club has experienced ever since. In 1933, a proposal was put

forward by the club to form an association. In future years that would become fiercely competitive, but after every game there would always be time for fellowship, a few yarns and quite a few beers. In 1935, the first greenkeeper was employed at the rate of £3 13s per week. That was a lot of money in those days and I remember people talking about—though it was not in my day—the very first greenkeeper there and the work he did.

In 1937, the club allowed Port Pirie ladies to be admitted as associate members, which was a very bold and courageous move in those days, and 1954 saw the acquisition of adjacent land and a further seven rinks, bringing the total rinks to 17. Another innovative move came about in 1968, when the wearing of shorts was permitted, even though it was originally—

Ms BEDFORD: Risky!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Yes, very risky in those days, in 1968, even though it was only originally for night-time practice—white shorts, long white socks and shirts to be tucked in. That move was very adventurous at the time and was quickly overruled by the Australian Bowls Council. How things have changed to this day. Now coloured apparel is allowed, which shows that any association needs to be forever on the lookout for new and innovative opportunities. I know this club has an absolutely fantastic uniform that is very colourful and has the sponsors proudly displayed on the back.

Looking at the club today and looking back over the last 100 years, the vast improvements are very evident. Looking back over the many years and to the many great people who undertook official positions, as well as volunteers, it proves that if you are determined to improve your association's future and that of the sport then you just do it. This is very evident from the many people who have held official positions on the local association board and also those who have held senior positions with the RSABA, as well as executive memberships and state selectors, or won major sporting association sports medals. Most notable were Brian Condon and Lance Leak, who achieved one of our nation's highest awards, the Order of Australia.

In March 2019, I was very honoured to be involved in achieving funding towards the Port Pirie Sports Precinct, with \$5 million from the federal government and also \$5 million from the local council. This in turn enabled the Port Pirie Bowling Club to greatly improve their amenities, together with new synthetic greens that were opened on 31 March 2019. This club is a really great testament to other associations and many will try to emulate the success that this club has achieved.

I mentioned a bit earlier the numerous achievements of many past and current members of the association. These have included J. Jenkin, M. Grant, W. Boucher, H. Young, B. Richards and B. Jenkins being presidents of the North Western Bowling Association, also with J. Evans being chairman of the state selectors in 1990 and Brian Lines also being a state selector. Brian Lines and Lance Leak also received Australian Sports Medals and, on top of all that, Brian Condon and Lance Leak received OAM medals for their achievements. These achievements are not bad for a country volunteer-run bowling club. I must also admit that they always paid tribute to their fellow bowlers in their awards and they never looked for any special accolades.

I am tremendously proud that I have been one of the club's patrons for many years. This has been a privilege and something that I hold in very high esteem. I congratulate Richard Lines on his great work in researching information for the printing of the book celebrating the club's centenary and all the contributions others, both past and present, in the association have made not only to the book but also to the history of community involvement at the club there. I also pay tribute to the Port Pirie Regional Council for the great work they have done allowing the croquet club to join in on the grounds there at the bowling club.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:58): Today, I would like to speak about World Environment Day. My community needs no excuse to share the hard work and commitment of green-thumbed residents and volunteers who work week in and week out in our fantastic gardens, national parks and reserves to compassionately help to conserve and enrich our natural environment. I would like to take this opportunity to shine a light on some of the efforts recently seen in the electorate of Waite for the betterment of our local environment.

Green, leafy suburbs make my electorate a unique and beautiful place to live. We are truly blessed with so many areas of natural bushland, parks, gardens, reserves and protected heritage sites. It appears almost each space is fortunate to have its own dedicated team of volunteers, be that the Belair National Park and the Friends of Old Government House, Wittunga Botanic Garden and the Friends of Sturt Gorge Recreation Park, Shepherds Hill Recreation Park and of course the Friends of Brownhill Creek, Waite Arboretum and their fantastic friends group and the work they do through the Waite Conservation Reserve, Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare or indeed the Blackwood Reconciliation Group.

There are so many dedicated Landcare groups, schools, council staff, national park rangers and botanic gardeners who are regularly seen out amongst nature, planting native species, helping to eradicate feral pests (which are a huge issue, especially up in Belair National Park and the Mark Oliphant Conservation Park), cleaning up litter and volunteering as a local tour guides to promote the fantastic history of nature conservation in our community.

As the local MP, I have been proud to assist these groups and individuals not only by volunteering but also by securing major funding for our natural assets. Most recently, we have seen a \$3.5 million investment in the Sturt River Linear Park Trail, a collaboration between the state government, the City of Onkaparinga and the City of Mitcham, to bring this nature walk to life, connecting communities from Coromandel Valley and, hopefully one day, to Glenelg North, with a plan to eventually connect the Hills to the coast. I hope to see more opportunities to connect people and nature through further investment in the Open Spaces and Places for People Grants.

Belair National Park is one space that has received a lot of attention recently. From the planning of the old golf course to funding for weed control and wayfinding, there is so much happening in the park. Indeed, I would like to see some further improvements in this fantastic national park as well, especially around Playford Lake.

As I have mentioned in this place previously, the Minister for Environment and Water recently shared the good news about the happenings in the wonderful Wittunga Botanic Garden. I was glad to join with him and so many others in the community to officially celebrate the fruition of this important investment, which featured new native gardens, improvements to the lake, a viewing platform and a nature playground as well, which is so well used these days by the young people in our community.

Just two Sundays ago. I was doing the Blackwood Reconciliation Walk from the Blackwood roundabout to Karinya Reserve straight past Wittunga. At about 11.30am on the Sunday morning, the new nature play area was brimming with young kids everywhere having a great time. It was fantastic to see so many people using the Wittunga Botanic Garden.

Of course, there is Brownhill Creek Recreation Park and the rejuvenation of the Wirraparinga Loop Trail, and the clearing of woody weeds, native tree planting and the Kurna seating and welcome place, as well as the ongoing engagement with Kurna elders that Ron Bellchambers and the Brownhill Creek Association do. In fact, last Saturday I was going for a run up Brownhill Creek Road and there was Ron Bellchambers with a group of volunteers out there again doing their weeding for the Saturday morning.

The other big project happening there is the Kurna shelter tree. That project will be completed in 2021 and moving on to stage 2, which will be looking at retention of the eroded creek bank with bluestone to safeguard the shelter tree and installing a Kurna-carved balustrade that will allow for the viewing of that important birthing tree.

It is so important that as a government we work to invest in the environment in our communities and continue to collaborate on projects that will rejuvenate and protect open space. As I have mentioned here so often, there is the Blackwood Action Group, the Rotary Club of Coromandel Valley, and the 20 Metre Trees project, which raised plenty of awareness about the importance of our environment, keeping our communities green and protecting the important tree canopy of my community.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (16:03): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 22 June 2021 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr BROWN (Playford) (16:04): As I was saying before I was interrupted, the opposition as indicated by the member for Kaurua has some concerns with the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. I will get to those in a moment, but first I would like to respond to a few things said rather characteristically by the member for MacKillop in his contribution.

It was rather characteristic because those of us in this chamber would know that the member for MacKillop is a man of contradictions. I think his contribution to this debate was folksy yet learned at the same time and relaxed yet forceful at the same time, as he is wont to be. I think one of the things he did say that I would really like to respond to, and again this is something he raised, is this issue of the fairness criteria in the legislation introduced by the previous government just before the last election.

Again, I think it is worth stating in this place that we in the Labor Party do not feel it is something that should be taken into account, the fact that some members of this place—and I draw attention to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and also the member for MacKillop—are so popular in their local electorates that their margins are so supernumerous that they should have an impact on the state as a whole.

I know modesty prevents you from saying so, Mr Deputy Speaker, but the numbers bear it out. You are incredibly popular in your local electorate, not only in terms of the way the people talk about you but in the votes you manage to get for yourself and for the Liberal Party at election times. If we could figure out on this side of the house what it is that you do locally, we would bottle it and try to give it to our candidates as well.

Having spent some time on Eyre Peninsula recently with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I have seen firsthand just how popular you are. No-one has a bad word to say about you at all that I was able to uncover, I can tell you. In fact, everyone sings your praises constantly. I think perhaps it might be your dedication to the local community, your knowledge of people, the amount of time you have spent in all the towns and in your electorate.

In fact, I was struck also by your knowledge of local businesses. I know that while we were on Eyre Peninsula and spending time with the oyster industry, while we were out on a boat in Smoky Bay, I thought to myself I do not think I know a regional member who is so in touch with industry in their local community. It is to your credit. But the reason I raise that is, again, I do not think the issues regarding the fairness criteria that the member for MacKillop raised in his contribution are particularly apt when we are talking about this bill.

Talking about this bill, we are advised that this particular bill comes from a report received by the Electoral Commissioner. You may ask: was this a report that the government received and the government has had no time to respond and has had to rush in this legislation? No. We know that this report from the Electoral Commissioner has been with the government for over two years. In fact, it is something in the order of 850 days that this report has been with the government.

Why has it taken the government so long to respond to this report? Who knows? Perhaps the Attorney will be happy to enlighten us later on in the debate on this particular bill. But what we do know is that this bill is the response that the government has had to the report. So you might ask: what are the issues that are talked about in the report? I will start off with a very important one that has been flagged regarding enrolment.

The report talks about how the enrolment levels of young people in particular are falling. The report suggests ways in which that might be addressed. You might think the government has taken

these recommendations on board but I will let you know what the report had to say about the issue of enrolment. It stated:

At the close of rolls on Friday 23 February 2018, 1,201,775 electors were registered on the state electoral roll and eligible to vote at the State Election, a significant increase of 5.2% from the 2014 Election and the largest ever roll for a South Australian election. This increase reflects population growth, the effects of the federal direct enrolment program and a surge of enrolments in 2017 for the Australian Marriage Law Postal Survey. The average number of electors per House of Assembly electoral district was 25,570, with the highest number of electors enrolled in Elizabeth (28,399) and the lowest in Flinders [your electorate, Mr Deputy Speaker] (22,756).

South Australians responded positively to ECSA's enrolment campaign in the lead-up to the close of rolls. During the six-day period from the issuing of writs to the close of the rolls there were close to 25,000 enrolments and updates to the electoral roll, representing an increase of 68.2% from the same period in 2014.

However—and this is the important part:

Despite this success, a breakdown of the electoral roll by age groups shows that a significantly high proportion of young South Australians were not on the roll for the Election.

The report has a heading labelled, 'A call for legislative change', so the report itself calls for a change in the legislation. It is headlined, 'Enrolment on the day', and states:

The declining rate of enrolment of younger electors and the increasing numbers of non-voters are a matter of concern not isolated to South Australia. Indeed, there has been longstanding unease about both trends among electoral commissions and commentators in Australia, New Zealand and further afield.

One of the solutions to address falling participation rates successfully implemented by ECSA's counterparts in New South Wales (NSW), New Zealand (NZ), Queensland and Victoria (as well as most Canadian jurisdictions) has been to allow people to enrol after the close of rolls. Although the commissions of these jurisdictions continue to have and to advertise a close of rolls, they allow enrolment on the day as a 'savings provision' to enfranchise people who inadvertently miss the close the rolls. This helps avoid the situation at each election where thousands of people turn up to polling booths and are told they are not on the roll and cannot vote.

ECSA did not record the number of people who attended a polling place at the 2018 State Election and walked away when told they were not on the roll, but we are aware from polling official feedback that there were many potential electors in this circumstance. Records were kept of those who insisted on casting a vote, claiming there must have been an error with the roll. Of the 7,318 people who did so in 2018—

that is 7,318 people who did not just walk away when they were told they were not eligible to vote; they insisted on casting a vote—

just 153 (2%) had their House of Assembly vote counted and 852 (12%) their Legislative Council vote counted, after investigation of their enrolment.

NSW (since 2011) and Victoria (since 2010) permit enrolment up to and including on polling day. NZ (since 2005) and Queensland (since 2017) allow enrolment and voting during the early voting period but not on polling day itself—although Elections NZ is currently investigating extending enrolment to polling day.

The Victorian and NSW electoral commissions consider enrolment on the day a success. In both jurisdictions, the number of voters who have made use of this provision has significantly increased: in NSW from 20,960 in 2011 to 41,978 in 2015; in Victoria from 34,546 in 2010 to 50,653 in 2014. In NZ, where late enrolment has been in place longer, there has been an even more significant rise in enrolments after the close of rolls: from 35,363 in 2005 to 130,757 in 2017 (including 53,000 at pre-poll centres).

This next part is the important part of the call for legislative change in the report:

Given the success of late enrolment options elsewhere in Australasia, ECSA seeks legislative change to bring South Australia into line with other jurisdictions and allow eligible electors to enrol up to and on polling day. Although ECSA would continue to actively promote the close of rolls, enrolment on the day would be a savings provision to help ensure that as many South Australians as possible can participate in state elections.

Recommendation No.1 of the Electoral Commission's report states:

That the Act be amended to enable eligible electors to enrol up to and on polling day. After claiming enrolment, these electors would be allowed to cast declaration votes which would not be admitted to the count until an enrolment investigation had been satisfactorily completed in the week after polling day.

We have here a report from the Electoral Commissioner and a recommendation from the Electoral Commissioner that such provisions be introduced. Where is it in the bill? It cannot be seen. Perhaps the Attorney would like to address that in her summing up of the second reading.

Another thing I would like to talk about is the reduction in enrolment time. We know from the legislation that the government has decided to reduce the period in which people are allowed to enrol, and I do not feel, and the opposition does not feel, that it has been sufficiently explained to us

why the government has made this change. In fact, it has been suggested to us by some people that it might be an opportunity, from the government's point of view, to introduce some sort of voter suppression plan, and I find quite it quite distressing that they would think about such things.

We know that there has been extensive contact between the South Australian Liberal Party and elements in the United States that are involved in planned voter suppression. We know, for example, there has been extensive contact between the then opposition leader's office and the i360 organisation in the United States, which has been involved in voter suppression. We know that that organisation has kept detailed files on electors in the United States. Who knows whether the same thing has happened here in Australia? We just do not know. These questions remain unresolved.

However, we do know that in the United States, for example, there has been planned, calculated and targeted voter suppression of those people that organisations, particularly Republican ones, feel do not support them. We would be most distressed if there was any evidence or intent on behalf of the South Australian Liberal Party to get involved in anything along those lines. I think it would be useful for the parliament to hear an undertaking from the Attorney that such things are not done by the South Australian Liberal Party.

Another thing that is included in the bill is an expansion of pre-poll facilities, for example, allowing people to essentially cast an ordinary vote ahead of the election. I had experience as a first-time candidate at the last election. Obviously, I had been involved in pre-poll before as a party worker and volunteer, but I had never taken part as a candidate before. My particular pre-poll booth where I spent most of my time was at Mawson Lakes, and I was impressed by the way in which ECSA had organised the booth. I think its location was well picked, and I do not just say so because the site they chose is quite close to my home at Mawson Lakes, which was good for me.

I also know that it was probably convenient for my opponents, given that car parking was quite readily available at the site, which was good for my SA-Best opponent who had to drive in every day from the Clare Valley where she lived, and also for my Liberal Party opponent who lived at Hope Valley and had to drive in to the electorate every day to campaign. I know that was quite good for them and it was also very convenient for me, and a good opportunity for me to say hello to local voters when they came to cast a pre-poll vote.

One thing that I did notice was that pre-poll voters seemed slightly less engaged in the political process than those I met on election day. I think it is possibly to our detriment and something that we should do with great caution—not only the expansion of this so-called convenience voting, but I think when we take steps along these lines to interrupt the ordinary business and ordinary flow of the casting of people's votes, we need to be very careful that there are not unintended consequences. So I would caution the government around making changes regarding the way in which pre-poll votes are cast.

I think that there are also some things that are very concerning in the bill regarding the possible counting of pre-poll votes before polling day. I know the government assures us that there are things such as privacy provisions and so forth, but I remember my own experience at the 2010 federal election at an early voting centre in the electorate of Boothby where an AEC official, in order to do what he described as 'facilitate the quick counting of the ballot', decided to open all the pre-poll declaration envelopes in advance and stack the ballot papers in piles of 50.

As I said, it was to make it easier to count on the day, to use his own words. Of course, he did not do so in the presence of scrutineers and so that was regarded as a gross breach of ordinary protocols for the AEC and, unfortunately, it led to many thousands of people not having their votes counted, which I find very distressing.

I really would hate to see something along those lines happen in South Australia, particularly in a state election and particularly in some of the electorates where we know that could make the difference. It could mean that on the day you do not know who has won, which could potentially lead to a by-election, which again I think would be quite concerning for the local population.

One of the other things I would like to address is the provisions of this bill that remove the requirement for the Electoral Commissioner to advertise in newspapers. I think in this state we are well served by our newspapers. Of course, we have our great paper of record, the Adelaide

Advertiser, but there are a number of regional papers in which I think it should be important for the ECSA to advertise so that they not only inform people but also support local regional newspapers.

I think it is concerning that the government has this attitude of trying to undercut the operations of local media. I really do hope that it is not some sort of plan or proposal to reduce the number of voices that are heard in regional areas and to try to have some sort of monolithic corporate attitude so that small, regional, independently owned newspapers are stifled. I think that would be very concerning and something that I certainly would not want to see.

I would like also to take members to something else that gets mentioned in the report, and that is the EasyVote app. This is a part of the report that might well be missed by members, and I think it is something worth reading. The section is headed Modernising Electoral Services, and it states:

The Potential of the EasyVote App

Although engagement with the App was lower than the ECSA had hoped for, with sufficient promotion prior to future elections the App has the potential to enhance ECSA's provision of information and services to voters and generate cost savings.

There is that phrase again, 'cost savings'. I continue:

Savings could be generated through higher use of the App, given that each elector who obtains their EasyVote details via the App does not require an EasyVote Card to be printed and posted.

The EasyVote App offers a range of exciting possibilities for future elections, including:

- serving as one of the means by which electors could apply electronically for a postal vote, as per Recommendation 6 of this Report.
- supporting electors to conveniently manage their enrolment information.

And this is something that I found very concerning, and the third one is:

- integrating Radio-Frequency Identification (RFID) to assist in roll mark-off and prevention of multiple voting.

I think it is important for the government to explain what the commissioner and the government mean by using RFID tracking technology to 'assist people to cast their votes'. The idea that people are tracked or that their individual identification is used to identify them for the purposes of casting their electoral vote, I find very disturbing.

We are given assurances, for example, about QR codes, and we accept the government's assurances on those, but the concerns that lots of people have about the tracking abilities of QR technology, the idea that we will not even use QR codes anymore, that some somehow people's phones or other RFID devices will be used to track them and used on the electoral roll—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: It can happen now.

Mr BROWN: The Attorney says, 'It can happen how.' I ask the Attorney to explain to the chamber what it is the ECSA and the government have in store for using this technology at election time? That will give her an opportunity to explain to us what it is and why we need not be necessarily worried about it.

Mr Picton interjecting:

Mr BROWN: Indeed—some sort of brave new world type thing. I am not sure exactly what they have planned. Briefly, in the time that I have, I would just like to express a couple of things which I am actually glad are not in this bill and which the government has put forward previously, and those are OPV and a ban on corflutes. I think it is pleasing, and I would give credit to the Attorney for acknowledging the fact that there is not support for those two provisions previously put forward by the government and removing them from the bill that is now before us.

I think it is important from time to time in government to acknowledge that you do not have support for these ideas. As much as you might want to passionately to bring them forward, it is worthwhile abandoning them and not wasting the parliament's time in endlessly debating things there is not support for. On that note, I express my views on this bill and look forward to hearing the contribution of others.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:24): I, too, rise to speak on the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2021, a bill that I understand is based on a report that has sat gathering dust for more than two years and which the Marshall Liberal government has now decided to roll out in the home stretch towards the 2022 election.

Of course, this seems like bread-and-butter politics for this conservative side of politics. There are many, many times that we have seen them desperately try to change the rules when they sense that their sense of entitlement, power and privilege is under threat. We saw it, of course, when former Prime Minister John Howard made very late sweeping changes to the Electoral Act in 2006, which included removing the last vestiges of prisoner franchise, the early closure of the electoral rolls and increased identity requirements, amongst other measures, that they desperately hoped would increase the Coalition vote.

There are, of course, other examples of this sort of manoeuvring and tweaking of the electoral laws by conservatives in South Australia and beyond. I do not have time to canvass all of them in the short time that I have available today; however, I am sure that a number of my colleagues will certainly traverse those issues.

So here we are, about nine months from a state election, with the Marshall Liberal government, who are likely reflecting on their term, worrying that it could just be that singular term, and likely reflecting on their waste of three years of government throughout which we have seen absolutely no vision articulated in terms of utilities and infrastructure and, crucially, no vision articulated in terms of the hopes and aspirations for South Australian people and particularly no vision for those people who most need our support, whose voices most need to be heard by us in this place.

No empathy whatsoever has been shown for those who most need governments to hear them, and, in many cases, as we see in the case of Catherine House, who most need this government to fund them. We also see no plan for economic recovery post the pandemic, and a complete and utter lack of cohesiveness within their own party. It is very clear that this bill is all about trying to change the rules at the last moment to shore up votes and it is utterly uninspiring and utterly disgraceful.

The Attorney moved a similar bill, one loaded with similar unpleasantries to this one, late last year. It is astounding that the Attorney and the Marshall Liberal government, after hearing the concerns of members in this place and indeed in the other place in relation to that bill, have decided to bring another bill with many similarities back again. It is a move that reeks of that lack of vision that I spoke about.

Good governments rely on their actions, on their record and on their hopes for the future of the state, which they share with our community, not desperate attempts to change the rules to protect themselves. The previous bill that was introduced was so poorly constructed that the government in the other place had to heavily amend it due to its failure to properly draft it and, incredibly importantly, to properly consider the recommendations of the report which underpinned it.

I must say that this is not dissimilar to another bill currently before the other house, the Children and Young People (Safety) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020, which was also bizarrely heavily amended by the government despite their only having just drafted it, or despite them having drafted it a year after they should have done.

That bill and this bill that we contemplate this afternoon are both examples of their not listening to a report and not responding to what the community wants from them. The government in this bill is shamefully attempting to reduce the amount of time provided to voters to enrol to vote. It is attempting to allow voters to vote over the telephone and also to enable the counting of pre-poll votes before the closure of the polls.

One's intentions can often be seen through their omissions. That is certainly the case with this bill. The 2018 election report this bill is based on completely ignores recommendation 1, which clearly calls for eligible electors to enrol up to and on polling day. This measure, aimed at addressing a particularly worrying declining trend in the enrolment of young voters, has been completely ignored by this government despite it being in that report. I understand that a shocking 38.9 per cent of 18 year olds were not enrolled at the time of the 2018 election and that just 25.4 per cent of voters between 18 and 24 were also not enrolled at the time of the 2018 election.

This government have not only decided to ignore this recommendation of the Electoral Commission but they are also doing the exact opposite by reducing the amount of time to enrol to vote. This is undoubtedly due to their worry that younger people are more inclined to vote progressively. Almost 25,000 South Australians enrolled to vote in the week prior to the last election. Under this appalling bill, if it were successful, that would mean that 25,000 people would simply be denied their basic democratic rights.

More than ever, we should be doing everything we possibly can to encourage and empower young South Australians to exercise their democratic rights. We should be doing everything we possibly can to empower and to grow the voice and the leadership of young people in communities across our state. They, young people, hold the future of communities across our state in their hands. It is they who will bear the brunt of the impact of policies that are made today in relation to our environment, in relation to our economy and in relation to the way we do or do not include and celebrate people and ensure equality of opportunity for every member of our South Australian community.

It is absolutely clear that young people also currently bear many of the troubling issues that we contemplate in terms of our economic recovery through COVID-19. So many of the industries deeply impacted by the pandemic—hospitality, the arts, the event industries, sport, recreation and fitness—employed a plethora of young people, often in work that has traditionally been characterised by job insecurity, low pay and many other factors. This generation of young people, unlike generations that have gone before, are much more likely to be engaged in casual employment and more likely to be unemployed than ever before.

As at April, the figure for unemployed young South Australians was 16.4 per cent, the worst figure in the country. There is a growing body of evidence about the rate of underemployment amongst young people here in South Australia. This is the generation that for decades to come will contemplate the harsh realities of what the pandemic brought to our economy. To traverse a path through this bill that could potentially see so many more young people not engaged in the democratic process is utterly unacceptable at any time, and at this time it is deeply shocking.

Like many people in this place, I love doing whatever I can in our community in the south to empower and to grow the voice of young people. Seeing young people become deeply engaged in the political process, exploring and sharing their views, identifying what is important to them, leading discussions, challenging, exploring ideas, gives me and many others in this place great joy.

I am sure that I am not alone when I say that one of the great gifts of being a member of parliament is the opportunity we have to talk with young people in our communities—visiting their classes, having tours here in our parliament. I am sure I am not alone when I say that one of the first questions that I ask young people when they visit our parliament or when I visit their school to talk about the democratic process and how they can get involved is what is it that is important to them? What do they really care about? What is something about their community that they love? What is something they would love to try to change?

It is truly inspiring that every time I ask those questions there are a multitude of answers, and I am always inspired by the fact that young people care deeply about their community, and they are passionate about the things they would like to change, and a plethora of answers come up every time I ask that question. My next question is often: 'You have identified what you really care deeply about. How is it that you go about making change?' We talk about being active in the community and bringing people together around a particular issue and, rightly, we have that discussion about that process of activism.

We also talk about how important it is for young people to engage in the democratic process in terms of making change for them to vote and to continue to involve themselves in making change in the issues they care deeply about at that school age and as they traverse the journey through their life and come across many other issues they will care passionately about. Anything that takes away from the participation of young people in our democracy is an absolute travesty, and I think that the provisions that are in this bill that completely ignore the recommendation of the report on which this bill is based are an absolute travesty.

As I have said earlier in my remarks this afternoon, the Liberal Party does, however, have form when it comes to voter suppression, particularly here in South Australia, although I do concede the conservatives have given it a pretty good shake in other jurisdictions, including Queensland

during the very strange days of the Bjelke-Petersen government. The so-called Playmander gave South Australians in country areas double the votes of those who live in the city.

Then we had a clause unique to South Australia, which was basically a watered-down version of that Playmander. Today, we have the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2021. Like a poor tribute band rolled out after the cancellation of the original main act, this bill really should have been called the Bjorn Again Bill or something similar. Where this paltry attempt to distort our democratic rights comes from is anybody's guess.

Perhaps the Attorney and the Marshall Liberal government as a whole looked at what has been happening in the US state of Georgia, where voter suppression has been taken to new and deeply alarming levels, and thought, 'Gee, here is something we can try here.' A recent *Washington Post* article highlighted how conservatives in the US are enacting similar measures after the humiliating defeat of Donald Trump. That article states:

The GOP's national push to enact hundreds of new election restrictions could strain every available method of voting for tens of millions of Americans, potentially amounting to the most sweeping contraction of ballot access in the United States since the end of Reconstruction...

In 43 states across the country, Republican lawmakers have proposed at least 250 laws that would limit mail, early in-person and Election Day voting with such constraints as stricter ID requirements, limited hours or narrower eligibility to vote absentee...

Sounds familiar, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I was so incredibly proud that on 18 December 2019 we wholeheartedly celebrated our state's place in changing the face of democracy here in Australia and right across the world. In December 2019, we celebrated 125 years since a group of fierce, activist women fearlessly and successfully fought for their right to vote and their right to stand for parliament, making South Australia the first place in Australia and the second place in the world to achieve this. As that first jurisdiction here in Australia and second in the world to respond to the fight of women to secure their voting franchise, you would expect that all parties would always look to build on that strong foundation and expand participation in our democracy, rather than reduce it for its own cynical, political purposes.

As others have done, I, too, wish to raise grave concerns about the counting of pre-poll votes before the closing of polls. Knowing how so many votes have been cast and to which candidates before election day has the potential to impact on the choices electors make on election day. The government's assurances that protections will be implemented, developed and installed via regulations are completely and utterly unsatisfactory and absolutely reduce this parliament's oversight of these proposed changes.

If the government wanted these changes, it should have set out the protections and the suggestions in the content of this bill so that our parliament could have thoroughly explored what was being proposed. As I mentioned earlier, former Prime Minister John Howard was master of this type of undemocratic and sneaky reform. However, it is worth noting that around the same time John Howard was trashing our federal electoral laws the Bracks Labor government in Victoria was also reforming its electoral laws for that state's upper house.

Unlike John Howard, Steve Bracks democratised the upper house to potentially his own party's detriment. He did it because, unlike those opposite, he valued particular principles. That is in stark contrast to what the Attorney-General is attempting to do here today. I absolutely do not commend this bill to the house.

I urge every member to carefully consider our responsibility as members of this parliament to enable people's participation in the democratic process and particularly to think about our history in that regard and the desire we should all have as members of this place to encourage, to grow, to empower and to engender the voice, participation in the democratic process and leadership of young South Australians.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:43): Deputy Speaker, I would like to commence my remarks on this bill with an apology to you. Although I might be harking back to a previous debate on a previous bill, I feel I was negligent in my comments last night for not thanking you and recognising you for the extraordinary effort you put in through the course of the committee stage of the voluntary

assisted dying debate. While I cannot wax lyrical or as lengthily as the member for Playford about your extraordinary popularity in your electorate based around Eyre Peninsula, what I can say is that it is also reflected in this house on all sides of parliament. It is going to be an awful shame, sir, to see you go at the end of this session of parliament at the end of this year.

Nevertheless, we will make the best of the time we have left—and we do not have much time left, with only 20-odd sitting days until parliament rises at the end of the year. Some people in their contributions so far have been critical of the Deputy Premier for bringing in such a substantive reform to electoral laws so late in the piece. I say to them that I think they are being a bit harsh because the Deputy Premier has had a very heavy load of legislative reform so far in this term of the parliament.

Mr Brown: Like what?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, it is funny that the member for Playford should ask. What about the extraordinary commitment to reform in the legal system that we have had with the reintroduction of Queen's Counsel? Nothing could be closer to the top of the agenda for reform of the criminal justice system than that. Not only has that been reintroduced at some great length to the proceedings of this parliament, but people might be surprised to learn that it has had absolutely no impact on case backlogs and waiting lists for those people awaiting justice or those accused awaiting their trial.

Aside from the reintroduction of that extraordinary reform, we have of course had not one but two cracks at reform to the all-important gift card regime in South Australia. Not only was there the extraordinary reform that has revolutionised the South Australian economy by allowing people to use gift cards for a slightly longer period of time, but after introducing those laws we then had to repeal them after the commonwealth government made it quite clear to other jurisdictions around the country that they would be moving so—and had signalled that well in advance. That had to be reformed.

Of course, we then had a very lengthy period of time delaying, discussing and finally deciding the fuel price monitoring regime here in South Australia. The Deputy Premier initially gave short shrift to the RAA and its proposed model before, years later and with hundreds of thousands of South Australian motorists unnecessarily paying higher prices at the bowser, finally introducing that reform.

So I say to people who have been critical of the Deputy Premier, 'Fair go, really,' because there has been extraordinary reform that she has brought to this place. However, perhaps she is just saving the best for last. Perhaps the coup de grace for this term of the parliament from the Deputy Premier will be a wholly unnecessary, wholly unwarranted and outrageous curbing of the franchise here in South Australia.

Rather than expanding the capacity of South Australians to enrol to vote in the lead-up to a state election, it is the Deputy Premier's view that we should instead be restricting it. There have been many politicians of both political persuasions, particularly from this chamber, who have worked extremely hard—to their own detriment and, in fact, to the end of their own political careers in some cases—to try to expand our opportunity for democratic elections in South Australia.

In fact a former Premier, the Hon. Steele Hall, whose portrait we now see hung in the Speaker's corridor—bearing, I must say, without offence to the artist who proposed it, an uncanny resemblance to a picture popularised in the American sitcom *Seinfeld*—fought, after agreement with Don Dunstan, to finally get rid of the Playmander, colloquially describing the gerrymander that had been on foot here in South Australia for decades.

So there is a person, there is a Liberal politician, who paid with their own political career in order to advance the interests of democracy in South Australia. I find it extraordinary that in the shadow of the leadership of someone like Steele Hall—one of the five who broke away from the conservative party in South Australia, who formed the Liberal Movement in South Australia, who gave birth to the moderate faction of the modern-day Liberal Party in South Australia of which the Deputy Premier is now a flag-bearer—an acolyte of Steele Hall such as the Deputy Premier would now be seeking to move in the opposite direction. That is a very regressive step.

While we can quote statistics about the number of young South Australians at the last two elections, as previous speakers have, of people aged 18 or between 18 and 24 who remained unenrolled at the time of the election and how that number sufficed to contribute an entire additional

electorate in South Australia of 25,000 potential voters, I also draw the house's attention to the fact that the democratic institutions and the processes that underpin them—our elections and our electoral processes—are constantly under threat. They need vigilance and a commitment to progression, not regression, in order to maintain the integrity of our democratic process.

You have had the member for Reynell, the member for Kaurana and the member for Playford make reference to what is happening in other parts of the world. We are a parliament conceived in the Westminster tradition; there are not too many of them around the world. A version of the Westminster parliament, perhaps a little different in many ways from our own, is the American political system with its different representative institutions at both state and federal level. They have been battling this for well over a century.

Ever since the legal abolition of slavery and the commencement of the Reconstruction Era, there has been a constant battle, particularly amongst the southern states of the United States, to push back against those conservative governments that sought to restrict the franchise, particularly of Black American potential voters. They made sure that places where people could enrol to vote were only open at times when people would find it extremely difficult to be able to get to them. They made sure that they had unreasonable hurdles to jump in order to provide a sufficient level of identity.

These have been ongoing battles for decades in other places around the world that seek to maintain the burning fire of democracy. For a parliament like we have in South Australia—which has such a proud history of extending the franchise to people and has a world-leading position in doing so—to be presented with a bill like this that seeks to do the opposite, quite frankly, is not only offensive to us and the community but it is historically offensive as well.

Of course, we should know the lesson that the member for Florey enjoys teaching us so well about the struggle of suffragettes like Muriel Matters, and even her colleague the person after whom my electorate is named, Mary Lee, in order to ensure that finally legislation was passed to give women the right to vote. Even at the death knell of that parliamentary debate, in some tricky manoeuvre the conservatives of that day and age thought that inserting into the electoral reform bill that they were faced with the right for women to stand for parliament would be so egregious and offensive to members that it would cause the entire reform to be voted down. In fact, as we know, it had the opposite effect.

We have a really proud tradition of reforming our electoral laws for the benefit of democracy, and this is not what this does. I am also concerned that, other than the restrictions on enrolment and the impacts that will have on the franchise in South Australia, once again, we have an attack by this Liberal government on the print media in South Australia. This is now the third piece of legislation that this government has brought into this place in the last three years that removes the requirement of government agencies to advertise in print media across South Australia.

You would know better than most, Deputy Speaker, representing a rural or regional electorate, how important local newspapers are. Removing the requirement to place in this instance electoral advertisements or removing the requirement, as we have seen in previous bills, for fire alert or fire danger warning public notices, or other public notices under the Development Act or other public notices for other reasons, not only serves to diminish the capacity of those forms of media to stay viable and stay open—of course, I am not couching my argument just that we should be funding the media in order to keep their doors open—but, as it suggests, it makes it harder for South Australians to gain access to important information.

If we had been witness over the past three years to an ongoing campaign from the Electoral Commission of South Australia to encourage people to enrol to vote, to encourage people to understand their right to vote and how they can go about voting, I would be happy to retract some of my comments. But we have not seen that at all. This is a slightly more regular political Halley's comet effort that we get from the Electoral Commission of South Australia. Once every four years the shutters come back up, the doors open and the lights turn on and suddenly there is an effort to conduct a state election here in South Australia. There is no ongoing effort in order to improve voting here in South Australia.

When there is a lack of public advertising, when there is a restriction on the time frames when people can vote, when there are changes to proposed polling places and the operation of those

polling places and when there are also very significant changes proposed in how votes can be counted even before the end of the time that is allotted for polling, you can understand why many MPs feel discomfort with this bill.

It is extraordinary that on the very day that this bill was introduced here into this parliament we had an electoral analyst from the ABC, nationally famous Antony Green, providing a presentation here in the evening about the benefits of the Deputy Premier's bill. I am the first to admit that sometimes, particularly early on in the coverage, there can be some flat spots on election night coverage.

There can be an awkward delay between the time that polls close, the dot points that the invited panellists have hastily prepared on the cab ride on the way to the TV studio, since those dot points are exhausted at approximately seven minutes past six, and about an hour and a half later when the substantive votes come in. I understand that. However, we are not in the business of organising our polling places and our vote counting for the benefit of electoral coverage. We are interested in doing this for the maximum expansion of the franchise to South Australians and also for the integrity of the vote.

I notice that the bill removes local returning officers from electoral districts. Instead of having a returning officer for each electoral district who is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the election in each electoral district, that is replaced with the Electoral Commissioner. For example, for the elections that are necessary to constitute members of this house, rather than having 47 returning officers we will now have just the Electoral Commissioner. That is a regressive move. That is not in the interests of anyone who is contesting an election in one of the electoral districts to win a seat in this place.

This means that, rather than someone being dedicated to the effort of making sure that elections are conducted appropriately and in accordance with the law, fairly and evenly in each electoral district, that responsibility instead is stumped up to a sole person, and that is the Electoral Commissioner. They are going to be busy enough because they retain all their existing responsibilities in addition to these 47 new responsibilities, as well as the responsibilities the elections for the nearly half-dozen members of the other place will impose on them.

It is not as though the Deputy Premier has been wont over the last three state budgets to furnish the Electoral Commission with additional financial resources—in fact, quite the opposite. Across nearly all areas of the Deputy Premier's responsibilities we have had very significant financial funding cuts that have limited their ability to carry out their work.

It could be, for example, for victim support services or for court services to support victims of domestic violence—they have been cut as well—let alone managed taxi ranks, safe city grants, CCTV grants for the CBD and the list goes on. Right when our state, like the remainder of the country, is having an awakening to the growing crisis of domestic violence and the plight of victims, the Deputy Premier has been removing funding from those support services—not really in tune with the public mood, and here it is again in the superintendence of our elections here in South Australia. So this is not a good reform whatsoever.

The last point I would make is if the Deputy Premier had confidence in her reforms, if she genuinely thought that all these measures that are either set out or intimated in this bill were worthy of the parliament's support, then she would have set them all out and she would not have relied on lazy clauses in the bill that leave out the necessary detail, later to be provided in regulation. That is simply not good enough. We do not have any visibility as to what those regulations might stipulate, we certainly do not have a draft of them, we do not know when they might be presented to the parliament and we certainly do not know when they may come into force. That is simply not good enough.

If the Deputy Premier has had three years of working behind the scenes while the parliament could discharge the other important reforms that she has brought to us, such as the reintroduction of Queen's Counsel titles and gift card reform, then we should certainly have the regulations that have been prepared for a bill of this importance—but of course we do not. From the Deputy Premier it is, 'No, trust me. I've got all that in hand. It will all be okay. You can take my word for it. Those regulations will all be fine.'

We cannot rely on the Deputy Premier because the rest of the bill implies the completely opposite flavour. How you could restrict the opportunity for young South Australians to enrol to vote before a four-yearly election I think is an extraordinary and outrageous move. How you could deliberately remove returning officers from local electorate districts to make it harder for those individual elections to be managed I think is a regressive move.

Not to be able to provide the sufficient detail in the bill and instead rely on future regulations is simply not good enough, and to remove the public advertising requirements and instead say it will be put up on some website, presumably with some sort of clever data harvesting mechanism from the Liberal Party for them, is not good enough. You can gather that we are not in favour of many of these elements of the bill and that we have a lot of questions to ask of the Deputy Premier when it comes to the committee stage.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (17:03): I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LAND TAX (DISCRETIONARY TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed not to insist on its amendments Nos 15 and 16 and agreed to the amendments made by the House of Assembly in lieu thereof with the amendments indicated by the following schedule:

House of Assembly's Amendment—

Clause 129, page 73, after line 41 [clause 129, inserted section 262S]—After subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) If the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of a complaint is an employee of a council, the Panel must, before refusing to deal with, or determining to take no further action on, the complaint, consider any submissions received from a registered industrial association representing the employee.

Legislative Council's Amendment thereto

After 'behaviour' insert 'that is'; and

Leave out 'consider any submissions received from a registered industrial association representing the employee' and insert 'invite and recognise submissions from a registered industrial association that represents the interests of council employees.'

House of Assembly's Amendment—

Clause 129, page 74, after line 14 [clause 129, inserted section 262T]—After subsection (2) insert:

- (3) In addition, the Panel must ensure that, during an inquiry relating to a complaint where the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of the complaint is an employee of a council, any registered industrial association representing the employee in the matter is given a reasonable opportunity to make submissions relating to the inquiry.

Legislative Council's Amendment thereto

After 'behaviour' insert 'that is'; and

Leave out 'a reasonable' and insert 'an'

House of Assembly's Amendment—

Clause 129, page 76, after line 5 [clause 129, inserted section 262W]—After subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) If the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of a complaint referred to the Panel under this Subdivision is an employee of a council, the Panel must, before determining whether or not to take action under this section, ensure that any registered industrial association representing the employee is given a reasonable opportunity to make submissions on the matter.

Legislative Council's Amendment thereto

After 'behaviour' insert 'that is'; and

Leave out 'a reasonable' and insert 'an'

House of Assembly's Amendment—

Clause 129, page 76, after line 40 [clause 129, inserted section 262X]—After subsection (2) insert:

- (2a) If a report under subsection (1) relates to a complaint where the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of the complaint is an employee of a council, the Panel must provide the report to any registered industrial association representing the employee.
- (2b) The Panel may, in providing a report to a registered industrial association under subsection (2a), require the registered industrial association to ensure that the whole or a specified part of the report is not disclosed to any other person or otherwise published.
- (2c) A registered industrial association that contravenes or fails to comply with a requirement under subsection (2b) is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$10,000.

Legislative Council's Amendment thereto

After 'behaviour' insert 'that is'

Consideration in committee.

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

That the amendments of the Legislative Council to the amendments made in the House of Assembly to amendments Nos 15 and 16 of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

I indicate my appreciation to all the parties that have been involved in the development of the bill. In particular, I acknowledge the Local Government Association for their hard work in supporting councils to develop and advocate for very significant reforms in this bill. I am pleased that it is now coming to that conclusion.

I acknowledge that some amendments have been made in the Legislative Council to our consideration. We accept those as well, as they will be minor in the scheme of things. The importance of the reforms takes precedence for the government in concluding our position on this matter. Given the extraordinary amount of work that has gone back and forth to advisers of the opposition and representatives on their side, I want to record people such as Annabel Wilkins in my office, who has been involved in this for a long time, trying to support, along with the direct advice of Alex Hart from the department, a long gestation period. I am very pleased for them that this is now culminating in a conclusion of this reform.

I wish that those in local government, whether they are elected members or employees of councils, are able with these reforms to undertake their work efficiently and diligently for the benefit of the people of South Australia.

Motion carried.

CORPORATIONS (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) (TERMINATION DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr BOYER (Wright) (17:09): I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise this afternoon to speak and make some brief remarks on the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Bill 2021. Could I please offer my acknowledgment of my colleagues who have spoken before me from this side and who have made many very salient points on the changes being attempted in this bill.

It is a very significant undertaking I think whenever members of parliament or the parliament as a whole seek to make changes to how South Australians, or Australians more broadly, vote, the

access they have to pre-poll voting and the access they have to enrolling themselves to vote. We need to be very careful indeed because the ramifications can be very serious.

From the outset, can I reiterate and echo the words of the member for Lee about the very proud history of our state in terms of suffrage and giving different people the right to vote and different people the right to stand for election. I certainly do not think that anyone would like to see us in any way walk back those magnificent achievements we have made by making changes to electoral rules that will in some way make it harder for people to enrol to vote and be a part of our democratic process, thereby disenfranchising them from our system altogether.

We all know what an important role voting obviously plays in terms of the basic function of democracy, but I also think it plays an incredibly important role in terms of just keeping people engaged. Suffrage and the right to vote are important for lots of reasons, but if we expect people to pay any kind of attention whatsoever to the business of a house like this or to the business of parliament, then we need to make sure that they have at least some modicum of control or influence over, if not what happens in here, at the very least the people who sit in here and represent them.

Some of these proposals in this bill we have before us now, in terms of narrowing or limiting the period in which people can enrol to vote, run the risk of disenfranchising people generally if they do not get their registration and enrolment done in time. But, probably more specifically, they will have a more acute impact on people who are vulnerable, may not be in a position where they can go through that process all by themselves and need assistance from other people or organisations to make sure they are enrolled to vote. They are most likely the people who will bear the brunt of any change like this.

I may say that of course everyone's vote should be equal, but surely we pride ourselves in this state and in this nation on making sure that some of our most vulnerable people have a voice as well. I think that is something we have done very well in the past, and I would be hugely disappointed, as I know everyone on this side of the house would be, if we in some way agreed to changes in this bill that made it harder for some of those marginalised and disadvantaged South Australians to become enrolled, have a voice and in some way influence and impact our electoral process. That would be a huge disappointment and something that I and of course the opposition would not support.

Without going across covered territory too greatly here, I would like to focus my remarks on changes proposed in this bill to amend section 113 of the original act regarding misleading advertising.

Currently, part 4 of section 113 allows for an application to the Electoral Commissioner to deal with potentially misleading advertisements. This is an issue at the moment that is very close to my heart, having recently been, I think it is fair to say, the victim of some very misleading advertising in the seat of Wright, which I will happily go into in great detail in the time afforded to me. I have to say that the process I had to go through there, and that the Leader of the Opposition had to go through, in terms of getting some kind of satisfaction about a retraction of those hugely misleading comments was laborious, to say the least.

However, with the proposal in this bill to look at, I guess, in some way outsourcing the role of adjudicating on those kinds of misleading advertisements or misleading electoral material to SACAT runs the very real risk of elongating the time period between potentially misleading material being disseminated into a letterbox or a seat (in whatever form that might take), a complaint being made to whatever the complaint body might be (at the moment it is the Electoral Commissioner, but this government is proposing that it will become the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal) and some kind of satisfaction being provided to the wronged party at the end.

No-one likes to be slandered or have words put in their mouth or have their position on any kind of issue misrepresented, but it is true to say that the stakes are very high when it comes to state elections or any kind of election, and if we do have a robust and responsive system to deal with complaints of a nature that could potentially be a determining factor in the result of an election, or at the very least a major influencing factor in the result of an election, we run the very real risk of encouraging parties—and I will say honestly parties of all colours and persuasions—to disseminate material out into the community that is most likely knowingly misleading.

The information that I refer to, which I will go into in a bit more detail in a second, was certainly knowingly misleading. This would in some way encourage parties to do that because they would know that, if it was dropped at the right time in the lead-up to an election campaign, whatever body was reviewing or making a decision about whether or not it was misleading would not have time enough to deal with it and ask for some kind of retraction in time so that whatever damage was done could be undone before people went to cast their vote.

In the case I am about to detail, it was in about September of last year that the matter was brought to my attention by a resident of, at that time, Wynn Vale, a suburb that is holus-bolus in the seat of Wright, always has been and long may it remain. They had received a flyer in their letterbox which said on the front, emblazoned in big type, with a couple of dubious-looking black and white photos of me and the Leader of the Opposition (you do not need to go too far to find photos like that of me; it would not have taken many Google searches), 'Peter Malinauskas, Blair Boyer and the Labor Party have a plan to demolish dozens of homes in your area.' On the other side it spoke about plans that, apparently unbeknownst to the Labor Party, to extend the O-Bahn, I presume from its current point of termination, which is the Tea Tree Plaza Interchange, to the Golden Grove Interchange or Golden Grove Village.

I was, to say the very least, perplexed at the time to learn of this because not only did we not have any plans to extend the O-Bahn and nor had we said so—and in a moment I will get to the source material that the government actually used for these misleading claims—but I was not aware that there was any plan that existed on a potential extension of the O-Bahn that would necessitate the demolition of homes.

One of the most remarkable things about this whole process was that running parallel with the Leader of the Opposition and me trying to get some kind of satisfaction from the Electoral Commission about this misleading statement, we were simultaneously trying to get access to the much lauded—it used to be lauded but it is not spoken about anymore; it is like it never happened—North East Public Transport Study, which I think kicked off not long after this government came to office. It was going to be the panacea for all our public transport woes. In fact, in 2019, when the first iteration of the study hit the then transport minister's desk, he did a very interesting interview with *The Advertiser* in which he said that the report recommended the extension of the O-Bahn.

Of course, we were very interested to get a copy of this study. At this time, the minister said that it was on his desk and hoped that it would be released soon. That did not happen. We put in an FOI application to get a copy of it. We were denied. We put in an internal review to get a copy of the North East Public Transport Study and we were denied again. We asked for an external review, which, of course, was to the Ombudsman.

I can tell you, having been a part of that process, that those on this side—I am not sure if at that point it was still the former Minister for Transport, the member for Schubert, or whether it was the new Minister for Transport—fought tooth and nail to make sure that that document never saw the light of day. Of course, ultimately they were unsuccessful.

As fate would have it, both the decision from the Electoral Commission about whether or not these documents were misleading and the decision from the Ombudsman to release the North East Public Transport Study to the opposition happened to land on roughly 30 March, which was my birthday, which I thought was fitting and the best birthday present that one could hope to get.

I had a very good read of this enormous document, which outlined a plan to extend the O-Bahn from its current point of termination at Tea Tree Plaza Interchange to the interchange at Golden Grove. It listed the preferred route which was, according to the government's own North East Public Transport Study, to basically follow Dry Creek, which goes up and through a few suburbs, including Wynn Vale and others, to terminate at the Golden Grove Interchange. If this plan was to be pursued it listed that there would be a number of homes that would have to be demolished.

After all that, it became very clear to us that what the Liberal Party of South Australia—to be clear, because that was who authorised the DL-size material that went into letterboxes—accused the opposition, the Labor Party, of, that is, having a plan in terms of extending the O-Bahn and demolishing homes in the area, was not actually our plan at all. We had no plan to do such a thing. The government did. It is in their North East Public Transport Study, which we had to fight tooth and nail to get.

I provide this as an example of an extremely underhanded way of operating, where the government knowingly put in this material falsehoods designed to damage both the Labor Party generally and the Leader of the Opposition and me particularly and disseminated it into thousands of letterboxes across the north-east. I know for certain this material went into letterboxes in the seat of King. I know for certain that this material went into letterboxes in the seat of Wright. The member for Newland would have to tell us whether or not this material went into letterboxes in his seat. I am sure he would know; I just cannot get his attention at the moment. Candy Crush is at a very important stage.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Cowdrey): Let's continue to address your remarks through the Chair.

Mr BOYER: This material was knowingly put into all those letterboxes, not only in areas which, hypothetically, might be affected by the government's plan to extend the O-Bahn and knock down homes but also in areas that were absolutely nowhere near the route at all that the extension of the O-Bahn would potentially take.

This was really scaremongering at its absolute best. It is one thing to suggest to people whose property might back onto Dry Creek that there is a plan to extend the O-Bahn—which there is; it is the government's plan—and that if it proceeds homes would need to be knocked down and it could be their home by virtue of the fact that they are living beside Dry Creek. It is another thing altogether, I think, to put an inflammatory, incendiary piece of material like that into people's letterboxes to scare them in areas where they are nowhere near a proposed route of the O-Bahn.

Thankfully, finally, we did receive a determination from the Electoral Commissioner. It was, of course, in my opinion the right one, and you would expect me to say that, but I do not think it was a huge surprise. Mind you, the Liberal Party of South Australia fought it for months and months and used as their source material for their claim that 'Peter Malinauskas and Blair Boyer and Labor had a plan to demolish homes in your area to extend the O-Bahn' an interview I did on Pilko's program on FIVEaa months before the material arrived.

I had talked about what would happen in an ideal world, where I am sure people would like to see the O-Bahn extended. I said explicitly in the interview that we were not proposing to do that, and we did not know what the cost would be because we were trying to get hold of the North East Public Transport Study.

The commissioner made a determination and asked the Liberal Party of South Australia to put a retraction into people's letterboxes. They are coming out now in dribs and drabs. Thankfully, I have some very alert people in my electorate, some who were just incensed, to be honest, that they were basically tricked into fearing that their home might be knocked down, only to find that there was no such plan.

We now have the retraction, of course, which is nothing at all like the DL-size material that went into letterboxes in the first place, with the black-and-white graphics of the Leader of the Opposition and me and the huge type exclaiming that we were going to knock down people's homes. This was an A4 piece of paper in about size 10 font with a lot of words on it, where right down the bottom, if you got out the magnifying glass, you might see it was issued by Sascha Meldrum.

The Liberal Party of South Australia might think that this is a clever way to try to get them out of a sticky situation, but I can tell you that the people who have paid attention to this have only become angrier at the fact that not only were they lied to with misleading information but then the retraction came in a way that was clearly designed not to be seen or noticed or read by anyone.

I have a real concern that if the changes that are proposed in this bill come to fruition and complaints like the one that the Leader of the Opposition and I made to the Electoral Commissioner were instead directed to SACAT and potentially languished for an even longer period of time as the parties fought it out, and if this was closer to a state election, the wronged party, whoever that may be, would stand absolutely no realistic chance of receiving any kind of satisfaction from SACAT or the Electoral Commissioner or whoever it might be in time for voters to understand that the piece of material that was released was in fact inaccurate.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Mr BOYER: The Attorney has awoken from her slumber and has engaged in the debate now.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Cowdrey): Member for Wright, you will not respond to interjections; the Attorney will not interject.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do take objection to that and offence, and I would like an apology.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Cowdrey): Pursuant to standing orders, the Attorney has taken offence at comments made by the member for Wright. Member for Wright, are you happy to withdraw and apologise?

Mr BOYER: I apologise and withdraw, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Cowdrey): Thank you. We have 30 seconds left.

Mr BOYER: There are a number of problems with this, but I would say to the voters of South Australia: be very careful about allowing a Marshall Liberal government, which has overseen dirty tactics like the one we have just seen in the north-eastern suburbs, change your electoral rules. It will not result in anything good.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COVID-19 PERMANENT MEASURES) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. New Part, page 4, after line 23—Insert:

Part 3A—Amendment of Criminal Law Consolidation Act L935

5A—Amendment of section 20AA—Causing harm to, or assaulting, certain emergency workers etc

(1) Section 20AA(9)—after the definition of human biological material insert:

pharmacy has the same meaning as in Part 4 of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010',

pharmacy services has the same meaning as in Part 4 of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010',

(2) Section 20AA(9), definition of prescribed emergency worker, (e)—delete 'medical practitioner, nurse, security officer or otherwise) performing duties in a hospital' and substitute:

health practitioner, nurse, nurse practitioner, midwife, security officer or otherwise) performing duties in a hospital, or at any other place where medical treatment is provided or medical testing undertaken (however described, but including, without limiting this paragraph, a general practice, medical centre or other place at which people are vaccinated or screened for diseases)

(3) Section 20AA(9), definition of prescribed emergency worker—after paragraph (g) insert:

(ga) a person (whether a pharmacist, pharmacy assistant or otherwise) performing duties in a pharmacy; or

(gb) a person providing pharmacy services at a place other than a pharmacy, or a person assisting in the provision of such services; or

No. 2. Schedule 1, page 11, after line 12 [Schedule 1, Part 1, clause 2]—Insert:

(1a) Schedule 2, Part A2—delete Part A2

No. 3. Long title, page 1—After 'Acts Interpretation Act 1915,' insert:

the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935,

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I indicate that the government accepts amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3 of the amendments as scheduled made by the Legislative Council to the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021. I thank the Legislative Council for their consideration of the matter and with these amendments I accept it. I am very pleased that the passage of the bill can proceed. Accordingly, I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

APPROPRIATION BILL 2021

The Legislative Council granted leave to the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas) to attend in the House of Assembly on Tuesday 22 June 2021 for the purpose of giving a speech in relation to the Appropriation Bill, if he thinks fit.

At 17:33 the house adjourned until Tuesday 22 June 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES**

454 Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (5 May 2021). For each individual country health stimulus project as part of the COVID-19 stimulus package:

- (a) What is the current status of each project as of 4 May 2021?
- (b) What is the amount spent on each project as of 4 May 2021?
- (c) What is the expected completion date of each project as of 4 May 2021?
- (d) How much remains to be spent on each project as of 4 May 2021?
- (e) How many employees have been hired for each project as of 4 May 2021?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The status of the initiatives comprising the regional stimulus package are detailed in the following table.

Of the initiatives in delivery, it is estimated that this stimulus measure would sustain 40 to 50 full-time equivalent jobs, for a year.

Site	Scope of Works	Budget	Current Status	Proposed Finish
Clare	Mechanical ventilation (air-conditioning) upgrade	\$550,000	Complete	Complete
Penola	Hydraulic services upgrade (warm water system)	\$50,000	Complete	Complete
Cleve	Hydraulic services upgrade (warm water system)	\$70,000	Complete	Complete
Tanunda	Back-up power capability upgrade (new back-up generator)	\$280,000	Complete	Complete
Bordertown	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$200,000	Complete	Complete
Barmera	Communications (new site phone system) upgrade	\$110,000	Complete	Complete
Kimba	Structural remediation works	\$100,000	Complete	Complete
Bordertown	Site-wide nurse call system replacement	\$380,000	Complete	Complete
Peterborough	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$355,000	Complete	Complete
Eudunda	Fire services compliance upgrade (fire sprinkler pipework)	\$480,000	Complete	Complete
Gawler	Back-up power capability upgrade (generator and switchboards)	\$850,000	Complete	Complete
Renmark	Fire water supply (new tanks) upgrade	\$260,000	Complete	Complete
Murray Bridge	Car park repair and resurfacing works	\$59,000	Complete	Complete
Coober Pedy	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$598,000	Construction	June 2021
Clare	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$550,000	Construction	June 2021
Strathalbyn	Back-up power capability upgrade (new back-up generator)	\$500,000	Construction	June 2021
Naracoorte	Central Sterile Services Department (CSSD) compliance upgrade	\$3,120,000	Construction	June 2021
Naracoorte	Hospital central hydraulic services upgrade (hot-water system)	\$400,000	Construction	June 2021
Kapunda	Fire services compliance upgrade (fire hydrant plant and sprinkler control)	\$300,000	Construction	June 2021
Kingston	Back-up power capability upgrade (new back-up generator)	\$250,000	Mobilisation	June 2021
Loxton	Fire services compliance upgrade (fire tanks, pumps and sprinklers)	\$1,800,000	Construction	July 2021
Riverton	Bathroom (resident ensuites) structural rectification works	\$150,000	Construction	July 2021
Kapunda	Central Sterile Services Department (CSSD) compliance upgrade	\$635,000	Construction	July 2021
Waikerie	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$440,000	Mobilisation	August 2021

Site	Scope of Works	Budget	Current Status	Proposed Finish
Kangaroo Isl.	Lift replacement (vertical transportation)	\$330,000	Manufacture	August 2021
Angaston	Central Sterile Services Department (CSSD) compliance upgrade	\$1,300,000	Tender Extended*	October 2021
-	Program Contingency & Staging Allowance	\$883,000	-	-
	Total Allocated	\$15,000,000		

E-CIGARETTES

455 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). Since 31 March 2019, how many e-cigarette or vaping licence holders, premises or retailers have been inspected by authorised officers under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, SA Health authorised officers conducted 1,262 inspections of all licence holders and premises since 31 March 2019.

E-CIGARETTES

456 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). Since 31 March 2019, how many e-cigarette or vaping licence holders, premises or retailers have been issued expiations under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, SA Health authorised officers issued 18 warnings to dedicated e-cigarette/vape businesses since 31 March 2019.

South Australia Police (SAPOL) are authorised under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997, and any expiation data for fines issued by SAPOL is not included in this response.

E-CIGARETTES

457 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). For expiations issued to e-cigarette or vaping licence holders, premises or retailers under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 since 31 March 2019, what is the breakdown of expiations by each individual offence under the act?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, SA Health authorised officers issued 18 warnings to dedicated e-cigarette/vape businesses since 31 March 2019.

E-CIGARETTES

458 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). Since 31 March 2019, how many e-cigarette or vaping licence holders, premises or retailers have been issued warnings under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, SA Health authorised officers issued 18 warnings to dedicated e-cigarette/vape businesses since 31 March 2019.

E-CIGARETTES

459 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). For warnings issued to e-cigarette or vaping licence holders, premises or retailers under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 since 31 March 2019, what is the breakdown of warnings by each individual offence under the act?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, the breakdown of the 18 warnings issued by SA Health authorised officers under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Act 1997 to dedicated e-cigarette/vape stores during the period in question is as follows:

- 12 x section 40(1)—A person must not advertise tobacco products or e-cigarette products in the course of a business or for any direct or indirect pecuniary benefit.
- 3 x section 6(ab)—A person must not carry on the business of selling e-cigarette products by retail unless the person holds a licence under this part.

- 1 x section 30(2)—A person must not sell an e-cigarette product if the order for the e-cigarette product has been placed by mail, telephone, fax, email, internet or other electronic means.
- 2 x section 46(3)—If smoking occurs in an enclosed public place in contravention of subsection (1) [Smoking is banned in an enclosed public place, workplace or shared area], the occupier of the place is guilty of an offence.

E-CIGARETTES

460 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). Since 31 March 2019, how many e-cigarette or vaping licence holders, premises or retailers have been prosecuted under the Tobacco and E-cigarette Products Act 1997?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, there have been no prosecutions undertaken against retailers of e-cigarette/vaping products since 31 March 2019.

E-CIGARETTES

461 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). For prosecutions launched against e-cigarette or vaping licence holders, premises or retailers under the Tobacco and E-cigarette Products Act 1997 since 31 March 2019, what is the breakdown of prosecutions by each individual offence under the Act?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, there have been no prosecutions undertaken against retailers of e-cigarette/vaping products since 31 March 2019.

COUNTRY HEALTH, PALLIATIVE CARE

462 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). What is the current waiting times for palliative care in the Victor Harbor and South Coast region?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, palliative care referrals received by the South Coast Palliative Care Service are triaged within 24-48 hours of receipt using the Palliative Care Community Triage tool.

COUNTRY HEALTH, PALLIATIVE CARE

463 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). What is the total funding for palliative care in the Victor Harbor and South Coast region?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As of 7 May 2021, annual funding for salaries for palliative care in the South Coast region is \$223,639.

COUNTRY HEALTH, PALLIATIVE CARE

464 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). What plans are in place to expand in-home palliative care services and funding in the Victor Harbor and South Coast region?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Service expansion is the subject of planning by Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network.

COUNTRY HEALTH, PALLIATIVE CARE

465 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). What plans do the government have in place to consider a hospice for palliative care in the Victor Harbor and South Coast region?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Currently there are no plans for a hospice with the Southern Fleurieu Health Service Palliative Care Team.

COVID-19 HOTEL QUARANTINE

472 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). Have there been any transfers of COVID-positive medi-hotel guests into Tom's Court Hotel that took more than 24 hours between diagnosis and completed transfer to Tom's Court? If so, on what dates were those transfers and what was the total time it took between diagnosis and completed transfer for each case?

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

The Department for Health and Wellbeing is not aware of any instances where a COVID positive medi-hotel guest transfer took more than 24 hours between receipt of notification and transfer to Tom's Court.

COVID-19 HOTEL QUARANTINE

473 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (5 May 2021). Have there been any non-ambulance transfers of COVID-positive people (either to a hotel, to Tom's Court, to a hospital or any other place). If so, what were the dates, methods of transport and reason for non-ambulance transfer in each instance?

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

As at 5 May 2021 there has been a total of seven non-ambulance transfers of COVID-19 positive people to Tom's Court. These occurred on the following dates: two transfers on 15 November 2020; four transfers on 16 November 2020; and one on 18 November 2020.

Non-ambulance transfers are undertaken using a suitable alternative vehicle dedicated to COVID-19 operations which adheres to strict SA Health infection control protocols including practical personal protective equipment training and deep cleaning of the vehicle after each transfer.

Non-ambulance transfers assist in the timeliness of multiple transfers and of large family groups who are all non-symptomatic and require no clinical care en route.

COVID-19 positive persons requiring clinical care are transported by SA Ambulance Service.

GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION

475 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (5 May 2021). What specific tender process was undertaken for contracts to supply replacement buses for the duration of the now delayed Gawler rail electrification project?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): A response to this question taken on notice during question time on 18 March 2021 was tabled on 4 May 2021.

HAMPSTEAD REHABILITATION CENTRE

476 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (5 May 2021). What are the reasons for the ongoing closure to the public of the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre's pool considering the government's previous closure of the Strathmont Centre pool and the relevant code restrictions prohibiting the use of public swimming pools ended in November 2020?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and following expert advice from CALHN's Infectious Diseases Unit, the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre hydrotherapy pool is currently only available to patients who require hydrotherapy for their rehabilitation.

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

485 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12 May 2021). Has any agency reporting to the Treasurer or reporting to another minister provided any advice to the Treasurer regarding the replacement of aluminium composite panels on privately owned residential buildings in South Australia?

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

In response to concerns about the use of aluminium composite panels (ACPs), the Attorney-General's Department has been coordinating a statewide cladding audit.

The audit was formerly coordinated by the former Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

The first two phases of the audit sought to:

- identify buildings where ACP was present and the occupants would be unfamiliar with their surroundings or require assistance to evacuate, such as apartments, hotels, schools, hospitals, public assembly buildings and aged-care facilities; and
- investigate the degree to which the presence of ACP may compromise the safety of those occupants.

Operationally, the audit is being conducted by council building fire safety committees, which have powers to require owners to address fire safety risks, including requiring the replacement of some or all of the ACP should they feel this is necessary.

The Attorney-General's Department is actively monitoring the progress of negotiations between the council building fire safety committees and private owners, and provides regular reports to the Minister for Planning and Local Government, given the department's role in this matter.

No formal advice has been provided to the Treasurer; however, status reports are provided to cabinet.

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

486 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12 May 2021). What options were examined for providing support to residential building owners found to have aluminium composite panels requiring replacement?

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

The Attorney-General's Department (the department) has taken an active role in facilitating the aluminium composite panel (ACP) audit.

The department has provided ongoing and comprehensive advice to all stakeholders, including building and unit owners, building managers, community corporations, consultants and council members of building fire safety committees.

Financial options to assist building owners with replacement costs have not been considered, given that all ongoing costs associated with buildings such as maintenance and repair, are the responsibility of building owners. Furthermore, some building owners have already remediated their buildings at their own cost.

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

487 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12 May 2021). Has a cost estimate been provided to the Treasurer for the replacement of aluminium composite panels on privately owned residential buildings requiring replacement?

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

No costs estimates have been provided to the Treasurer. The Attorney-General's Department is aware of a number of preliminary cost estimates relating to some of the remediation projects, but no final costs have been (or are required to be) formally provided.

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

488 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12 May 2021). Has the government provided any support to private residential building owners to meet the costs of the removal of aluminium composite panels and if so, please detail that support?

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

No financial support has been provided to building owners to meet removal costs. The government's role has been limited to assisting stakeholders navigate the legislative system and providing advice where appropriate.'

HOUSING SA

489 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12 May 2021). How has the budget been spent on Housing SA maintenance each year for the past three years and how many Housing SA properties did this lead to being fixed up to be inhabited again?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority uses its maintenance budgets to respond to urgent health and safety matters, vacancy repairs, planned and other recurrent maintenance activities, and property upgrade programs (capital programs).

Approximately 200,000 work orders are raised each year.

HOUSING SA

490 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12 May 2021). How has the budget been spent on Housing SA new builds each year for the past three years?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority initiatives encompass new build programs designed to improve the quality of public housing, support investment in the South Australian economy and create South Australian jobs.

HOUSING SA

491 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12 May 2021). What is the budget for maintenance and new builds over the forward Estimates?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority's budgets over the forward estimates to 2023-24 are:

Maintenance	
Year	Budget
2021-22	\$133.7m

Maintenance	
2022-23	\$133.0m
2023-24	\$132.9m

The Marshall Liberal government's maintenance budgets over the forward estimates represent a significant increase from the former Labor government's 2017-18 maintenance budget of \$125.4 million.

New Builds	
Year	Budget
2021-22	\$145.9m
2022-23	\$168.4m
2023-24	\$104.2m

The significant investment by the Marshall Liberal government in the development of affordable housing and the renewal of public housing represents an increase in new build spending compared to the former Labor government, who budgeted \$103.1 million in 2017-18.

HOUSING SA

492 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12 May 2021). In the past three years, how many houses were sold each year and how much sales revenue was generated?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Historic Financial Viability sales are publicly available in the SA Housing Authority Strategic Plan 2020-2025.

Financial viability sales will reduce by 76 per cent over the next three years from peak sales in 2013-14 of \$126.7 million. Viability sales for 2020-21 were reduced to \$4.7 million, to enable the retention of dwellings to support COVID-19 homelessness responses.

HOUSING SA

493 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12 May 2021). What are the budgeted sales over the forward estimates?

- How many houses/dwellings are to be sold?
- What will be the remaining stock level?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Financial viability sales projections are publicly available in the SA Housing Authority Strategic Plan 2020-2025.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

498 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 May 2021). As at 30 September 2020 how many people were on waiting lists for an outpatient appointment at Modbury Hospital (in total, across all specialties)?

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

There were 32,103 outpatient appointments at Modbury Hospital in the 2020 calendar year. 8,122 patients were on the waiting list for an outpatient appointment as at 30 September 2020.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

499 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 May 2021). How many presentations were recorded at SA metro emergency departments for each month of the years 2019, 2020 and 2021 (YTD)?

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

During the period 1 January 2019 to 30 April 2021, the following number of presentations were recorded at SA metropolitan public hospital emergency departments:

SA Metropolitan Public Hospital ED Presentations			
Month	2019	2020	2021
January	35,915	35,994	37,374
February	33,466	34,568	34,519
March	37,677	32,833	37,398
April	36,512	26,450	35,402
May	37,104	31,254	
June	35,877	32,377	
July	35,554	34,372	
August	35,675	35,882	

SA Metropolitan Public Hospital ED Presentations			
September	35,093	34,924	
October	36,273	37,163	
November	35,171	35,443	
December	36,574	36,161	
Grand Total	430,891	407,421	144,693

BUS SAFETY

500 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14 May 2021). What safeguards are in place for passengers sitting in the disabled seat who experience a road accident when riding the bus?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

A response to this question taken on notice during question time on 11 May 2021 was tabled on 8 June 2021.

ROAD SAFETY

501 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14 May 2021). What current controls and safety standards are in place to minimise the distractions to drivers caused by large electronic scrolling advertising, especially on highways with speed zones of 80 km/h and greater?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

A response to this question taken on notice during question time on 11 May 2021 was tabled on 8 June 2021.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

502 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14 May 2021). How many staff, and under what job titles or categories, are employed in the emergency department of Modbury Hospital, and are there any vacant or unfilled positions at the Modbury Hospital emergency department at the moment?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

In relation to nursing, I can advise that as at 14 May 2021, 92.6 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff are currently employed in Modbury Hospital, emergency department to the following positions:

- Nurse Unit Manager – RN3
- Nurse Practitioner – RN4
- Associate Nurse Unit Managers – RN2
- Clinical Nurse – RN2
- Registered Nurse – RN1
- Enrolled Nurse – END

In relation to medical, I can advise that as at 14 May 2021, 38 FTE staff were employed in Modbury Hospital, emergency department.

There are currently 8 FTE vacancies across the nursing and medicine which are actively being recruited to.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

503 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14 May 2021). Was the Modbury Hospital emergency department fully staffed on the evenings of Wednesday 31 March 2021 and Thursday 1 April 2021 and, if not, how many positions were vacant during each shift on those days?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Yes, the Modbury Hospital emergency department was staffed to the appropriate patient numbers on both 31 March and 1 April 2021, with no positions vacant on any shifts.

VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

508 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 May 2021). What support is available for someone applying for compensation payouts, where they have been rendered unconscious by a coward punch but has to prove it was the punch that caused the injury rather than hitting the pavement? Where does this person go to get this sort of proof?

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

Compensation will be paid to a victim of crime if the offence has been admitted or proved beyond a reasonable doubt (s22(2)(a) of the Victims of Crime Act 2001 (the Act)). If the offender is unknown there must be material corroboration that an offence has occurred. The evidence of the claimant alone is not enough (s22(3) of the Act). If a person alleges that they have been punched, the incident must be reported to the police (s20(7) of the Act). South Australia Police will investigate the matter, looking for witnesses or relevant CCTV footage. It may be that the victim's injuries are consistent with the alleged offence and will amount to material corroboration in the absence of a witness or CCTV footage. When an assault victim is intoxicated and cannot recall what has happened, the injuries may also be consistent with a fall or a fight. In such circumstances, in the absence of other evidence the injury is not sufficiently corroborated, and compensation is not available (R v Henderson (1983) 37 SASR 288 and Kovacevic v SOSA [2000] SADC 55). The claimant is unlikely to be able to obtain proof if South Australia Police were not able to do so. The only remaining avenue is to apply for the exercise of my discretion for an ex gratia payment (s27(4) of the Act). The statutory scheme provides for all claimants to have legal representation (Schedule 2 of the Regulations to the Act).

PORT MACDONNELL HARBOUR

In reply to **Mr BELL (Mount Gambier)** (11 May 2021).

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I have been advised:

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) undertakes regular hydrographic surveys of the Port MacDonnell boat haven to monitor sand and wrack material (drifting dead seagrass and marine algae) movement.

These surveys have identified that a significant amount of wrack material has accumulated in the boat haven in the vicinity of the boat ramp, wharf and within the marked channel. Sand has also accumulated in the area near the end of the breakwater. DIT intends to dredge these areas.

DIT is working with the Environment Protection Authority to identify suitable dredging methodologies to enable the dredging program to commence. A timeline for the dredging program cannot be developed for the program until this has occurred.

To facilitate safe access to the landing area and boat ramp at Port MacDonnell, a safe navigable channel is marked by lit lateral beacons in line with international guidelines. The channel and its depth are also documented on official navigational charts issued by the Australian Hydrographic Office. Like all harbours and waters around the state, the safe operational depth is governed by the rise and fall of the tide and safe under keel clearance is the responsibility of the vessel operator.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT BUDGET

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection has delivered its efficiency measures as part of the 2018-19 budget.

CHILDREN IN CARE, PORT LINCOLN

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) monitors missing persons reports (MPRs) for children and young people in care at a state level. It is important to note that DCP is required to report a young person as missing if they do not return home at the expected time or if they leave their home without permission. Reports are made even if the whereabouts of the young person is known.

Data issues impact the reliability of the data, particularly at a regional or local level, including variability in approaches to data entry. DCP is undertaking system improvements to enhance reporting capacity in this area.

The following table provides South Australian MPR data for children and young people in care:

Activity Data	2020-21 YTD 30/4/21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Total MPRs Recorded	8,382	10,166	8,968	7,702	6,192	4,914	5,408
Number of Unique Children	406	387	373	333	332	316	289

Number of children in care	4,529	4,370	3,988	3,695	3,484	3,243	2,838
Children with MPRs as proportion of children in care	9.0 per cent	8.9%	9.4%	9.0%	9.5%	9.7%	10.2%

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT, PORT LINCOLN AND CEDUNA

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

From time to time, state government employees leave their positions to take up other short or long term opportunities.

This occurred with the manager positions at the department's Port Lincoln and Ceduna offices, and accordingly they were the subject of selection processes.

Acting arrangements were in place to ensure these roles were staffed by experienced managers.

The selection process for the Port Lincoln position has entered its final stages, and the Ceduna position is filled.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT, PORT LINCOLN AND CEDUNA

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

This answer was provided above.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT, PORT LINCOLN AND CEDUNA

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

Department for Child Protection staff in Port Lincoln do not work rostered shifts.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) assesses all child protection reports in accordance with established policies and processes, and takes action necessary to protect children and young people who are experiencing or at risk of harm in South Australia.

One in three children born in South Australia are the subject of a notification during their childhood, and a significant proportion of the state's population may be referred to in CARL reports at one time or another. This includes people across all professions including doctors, lawyers, police and, occasionally, child protection workers.

All staff are required to have a working with children check, which is continuously monitored by the Department of Human Services.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (12 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I am advised:

Access to the Department for Child Protection's Connected Client and Case Management System (C3MS) is strictly controlled and monitored, and there are stringent rules and training requirements regarding its use.

If any security concerns or unauthorised access is detected, access to C3MS is suspended or removed.

Any allegation made against a staff member is investigated and dealt with in accordance with the Public Sector Act 2009 and Code of Ethics for the South Australian Public Sector.

As previously advised, all staff are required to have a working with children check, which is continuously monitored by the Department of Human Services.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT, PORT LINCOLN

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (13 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

There has been one instance whereby a notification assessed as requiring a 24-hour response was downgraded to a 10-day response.

The decision to downgrade the response was appropriate and was made in line with current DCP practice guidance.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT, PORT LINCOLN

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (13 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

All investigations for notifications requiring a 24-hour response from April 2020 to May 2021 through the Port Lincoln office were commenced within the required 24-hour period.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (13 May 2021).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) monitors missing persons reports for children and young people in care at a state level.

It is important to note that DCP is required to report a young person as missing if they do not return home at the expected time or if they leave their home without permission. Reports are made even if the whereabouts of the young person is known.

Data issues impact the reliability of the data, particularly at a regional or local level, including variability in approaches to data entry between DCP and NGOs and an overstatement of MPRs given system limitations that preclude reclassification of MPRs once submitted (e.g. a child's location might become known). DCP is undertaking system improvements to enhance reporting capacity in this area.