

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 26 August 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 this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE SUPER-DROME UPGRADE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:02): I move:

That the 121st report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Adelaide Super-Drome Upgrade Project, be noted.

Mr Speaker, as you know, the Adelaide Super-Drome is the central feature of State Sports Park at Gepps Cross and was opened in 1993. It has not been upgraded since. The Adelaide Super-Drome is the premier competition venue for track cycling and hosting state, national and international events. The Adelaide Super-Drome is also the home to the Australian Cycling Team and hosts training and events for the South Australian Sports Institute, AusCycling SA, and cycling clubs and accommodation activities in its corporate and track and field areas.

Off track, the Adelaide Super-Drome includes change rooms, workshops, offices, storage areas, spectator entry, catering and seating areas. The Super-Drome is being upgraded in a partnership between the state government and the Australian Institute of Sport (AIS). The scope of works comprises the construction of the new National Centre for Sports Aerodynamics (NCSA), new track heating and lighting, a new digital timing and video system, security upgrade, infield fence, roof repairs and PV solar energy system. Once completed, these upgrades will enable the venue to retain its UCI accreditation for international events.

The total project budget is \$11.9 million, consisting of \$9.8 million in funding from the state government and \$2.1 million in funding from the AIS. Once completed, the upgrade of the Adelaide Super-Drome, including the addition of the NCSA, will improve facilities and opportunities for cycling and other sports activities, provide important economic benefits for Adelaide and the region and provide important social and wellbeing benefits. Project works will be undertaken progressively in conjunction with Cycling Australia's Olympic training program, with final completion expected in December 2021.

The committee examined written evidence from the Department for Education in relation to this project, advising that the project proposal has been subject to the appropriate consultation. 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 as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the proposed public works that I have described to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ENFIELD MEMORIAL PARK

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:05): I move:

That the 90th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Enfield Memorial Park Multi-Function Community Precinct, be noted.

Enfield Memorial Park, located on Browning Street, Clearview, has served the South Australian community for more than 70 years. Management of the Enfield Memorial Park was taken over by the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority in 2002. Enfield Memorial Park is the administrative centre for all four

of the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority's cemeteries. The existing facility is over 50 years old and is reaching the end of its useful life. The cremators are nearly 30 years old and approaching the end of their life.

It is proposed that a new multipurpose community facility be constructed at Enfield Memorial Park that can meet both funeral and non-funeral community needs for the next five decades or more. When complete, the new facility will include improved chapels and lounge areas to accommodate larger services, provide an onsite cafe and floristry service, and include new green space for community use. The crematorium facilities will also be upgraded as part of the proposed redevelopment.

The provision of community function spaces that can be adapted for funeral services and functions ranging from 20 to 450 people is among the key objectives for the proposed project. As part of the 2019-20 budget, cabinet approved the allocation of funding of \$25 million to be provided over four years from 2019-20 for the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority's multifunction community precinct at the Enfield Memorial Park.

Construction of the Enfield Memorial Park multifunction community precinct is expected to be complete by September 2022. The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation 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 as described in the act.

Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee does report to parliament that it recommends the scope of the works that I have described this morning to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: OVINGHAM LEVEL CROSSING GRADE SEPARATION

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:08): I move:

That the 109th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Ovingham Level Crossing Grade Separation Project, be noted.

The existing Ovingham level crossing poses safety risks and traffic delays. The proposed works involve the grade separation of the road and rail networks approximately 100 metres south-west of the junction of Torrens and Churchill roads, Ovingham. By removing the level crossing, the project aims to alleviate the pressure on the road network, improve safety, reduce travel times, improve freight efficiency and improve connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians.

The Australian and South Australian governments jointly committed, fifty-fifty, \$231 million towards the Ovingham level crossing grade separation project. In 2019, DPTI, now DIT, engaged the Public Transport Projects Alliance to undertake a planning study report for the removal of the level crossing on Torrens Road.

This study demonstrated that the most viable option was a road overpass for Torrens Road only that matched an upgraded signalised junction at Torrens and Churchill roads. This option was found to have lower capital costs compared to a rail over road, rail under road and road under rail solution, whilst delivering on project objectives.

The department advised that the revised proposed project budget was \$185 million. The road overpass on Torrens Road will be constructed over the Adelaide Metro passenger rail network Gawler rail line and the Australian Rail Track Corporation interstate freight rail line. The road overpass will match into the upgraded signalised junction of Torrens and Churchill roads, as earlier outlined. Existing pedestrian and cyclist facilities along and across the rail corridor will be improved, and the works are expected to enhance the public urban realm.

The proposed project scope for the Ovingham level crossing grade separation project includes grade separation of rail and road with the construction of the road overpass on Torrens Road over the rail corridor; railway signalling and overhead wiring modifications as required to support the new track alignment; upgrading the signalised junction of Torrens and Churchill roads; an additional city-bound through lane at the junction of Torrens and Churchill roads; a proposed

service road off Torrens Road between Gilbert Street, Guthrie Street and the eastern side of the rail corridor; and a proposed service road between Drayton street, Hayman Street and west of the rail corridor.

To maintain access to the properties on the south-western side of Torrens Road, there will be a dedicated right-turn lane provided on Torrens Road into Chief Street and Napier Street, local connectivity amenity and opportunity for activation of the new open space under the elevated road for the benefit of the local residents and community and continuation of the Gawler Greenway and new pedestrian pathways, including modifications to the pedestrian crossing of the railway lines and utility service relocations.

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

Based on evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the public works that I have described this morning to the house.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (11:12): The electorate of Adelaide welcomes this investment in the upgrade of the overpass and the removal of the crossing. The Marshall Liberal government is building what matters, creating thousands of local jobs and better lives for South Australians through our record \$16.7 billion investment in roads, hospitals, schools, housing and regional infrastructure.

The existing Ovingham level crossing poses safety risks and traffic delays, with an average of 21,300 vehicles in 2018 passing through the level crossing each day. At Torrens Road, Ovingham, the boom gates are down for an average of 22 per cent during the combined peak morning and afternoon periods.

In 2019, the Australian and South Australian governments announced a joint, fifty-fifty, \$231 million funding commitment towards the removal of the Ovingham level crossing on Torrens Road, Ovingham. This was revised to \$196 million fifty-fifty funding, as announced on 18 January 2021.

It is not just motorists who will benefit from the Ovingham level crossing removal project; residents from Prospect, Ovingham, Fitzroy and surrounds will have access to new community spaces, which include multipurpose sports courts, nature play, artwork and a public plaza. Efforts are also being made to improve access in and out of residential areas with new linking roads that will help connect shops, schools and services on both sides of Torrens Road. Major works are now officially underway on the Ovingham level crossing removal project.

The Australian and South Australian governments have committed to \$196 million to this removal. The crossing is one of Adelaide's most frustrating bottlenecks, and we are fixing it. The project is expected to support around 265 full-time jobs per year during the construction. Bridge piling works have been completed in early August, and vegetation removals are also complete.

The project is being delivered under an alliance with a consortium of McConnell Dowell constructions and Mott MacDonald Australia Pty Ltd and Arup Pty Ltd selected as the alliance contractor, with the project alliance agreement executed on 28 January 2021.

Service relocations are continuing and piling preparation works for the eastern approach ramp are expected to be completed in late September, weather permitting. Construction of the bridge retaining walls will be carried out between September and November, again, weather permitting. As I mentioned, the project is expected to support approximately 265 full-time equivalent jobs per year averaged over the construction period. The project is expected to be completed in the first quarter of 2023, again, weather permitting. This is another example of the Marshall Liberal government building what matters.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is able to do that in the context of the orders that have been made, as I understand the present state of the standing orders.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:17): I emphasise the remarks that I have earlier made in relation to this project. It is important and necessary, but it is also right for me to acknowledge the minister's consistent, determined and effective advocacy as a local member. She has been absolutely outstanding as the member for Adelaide in this respect, closely engaged with her community, ensuring that DIT has been out doorknocking and that appropriate community forums have been held.

She is also very well informed about the detail of the options and appropriate options, and it is right for me to emphasise to the house, and particularly to emphasise in the context of different proposals that were considered, that the ultimate proposal involved the minimum or a lower property acquisition than alternatives. We all know the significant impact that property acquisition has not just on those people whose properties are acquired but on the character of a particular community. It is profoundly disruptive and of course very distressing for those directly affected, but it also changes streetscapes and the amenity of communities and the environment.

I recommend the report to the house and I congratulate the member for Adelaide on ensuring that this project could be seen through to completion.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MOUNT BARKER PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:19): I move:

That the 110th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Mount Barker Primary School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Mr Speaker, this is a project, as you would anticipate, that is very close to my heart. Mount Barker Primary School is located on Dumas Street, Mount Barker, within the District Council of Mount Barker. The Department for Education has advised that the school is the regional centre for students with complex needs and works with the National Disability Insurance Scheme providers to ensure that a holistic approach to education is achieved for all students.

In 2016, Mount Barker Primary School was allocated \$1 million as part of the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) program and thereafter Mount Barker Primary School was allocated \$7.5 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program then announced.

The Department for Education has advised that to achieve cost efficiencies and maximise opportunities both of these budgets were combined to provide a project budget of \$8.5 million, less fees then expended. A further \$1.5 million was approved in October 2019, resulting in a total project budget of approximately \$10 million. As the local member, I was delighted that that project total in budget was made available.

The proposed redevelopment of Mount Barker Primary School will include demolition and new works to accommodate up to 440 students on the school site. The project will include the construction of a new two-storey building which will, in turn, comprise new administration facilities, including reception offices; staff facilities and amenities; general learning areas; service learning areas and flexible areas for large and small group learning; a new disability unit, including general and service learning areas; flexible spaces for learning; an external learning space and specialist amenities; staff and student amenities, including lift access; and the demolition of aged buildings. Construction for the project is expected to commence in October 2020, with completion anticipated for January 2022.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation 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 described in the Parliamentary Committees Act.

Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee does report to parliament that it recommends the scope of the works that I have outlined to the house.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:22): I am pleased to be able to rise to assist in the debate and the noting of the Mount Barker Primary School's capital works project and the corresponding report prepared for and supported by the Public Works Committee.

I thank the Public Works Committee, chaired by the member for Kavel, for that important work and as we deliver \$1.4 billion worth of new infrastructure in our public school system in South Australia, that scrutiny process ensures that the people of South Australia get best possible bang for their buck and that the students and the school communities that are supported by these building projects get the best possible projects.

I am certain that as the Public Works Committee has been going through that extraordinary body of work, dozens and dozens of projects have already passed through and been supported by the Public Works Committee, with more than 100 in total including those to come. There would have been few projects that would have attracted the laser-like focus and vision of the member for Kavel and the Chair of that committee, as did the Mount Barker Primary School project. It now has a budget, given the extra expenditure committed by this government to ensure that the scope of works that are necessary at that school are able to be completed, in excess of \$10 million.

Currently, there are 382 students at Mount Barker Primary School and they benefit from a world-class education with great teachers, but it is fair to say that the facilities for some time have not been what those students all need and they did not support the delivery of the curriculum in the way that we deliver it now.

There is also, of course, a significant population growth in Mount Barker, a significant population growth across the whole township, including the areas serviced by the Mount Barker Primary School itself. We are endeavouring to have the student capacity at that school next year, when this project is complete, lifted to the order of 440 students. Even with the move of year 7 into high school—and of course there are corresponding capital works at the Mount Barker High School that will support the lift in student population—we anticipate this being a school, along with the other schools in Mount Barker, that will continue to grow. I commend principal Joanne Simpson for her leadership of the school, including on this project.

There was one other project that is benefiting the teaching of students at Mount Barker Primary School through the provision of new infrastructure, and that was in 2019 when Mount Barker Primary School, along with all the other public schools in the state in November 2019, joined in having world-class internet connections—a fibre-optic cable connection directly to the school as part of the Marshall Liberal government's \$80 million infrastructure project to lift internet speeds. This has assisted the teaching and learning at the school.

The building project, designed by Wiltshire Swain Architects and builder FDC Construction and Fitout, is indeed now underway. We are looking forward to that project being completed. As the member for Kavel said, it is due to be completed by early next year. I am pleased to report to the house that, according to the latest information I have, it is on track to be completed early, in December this year. Of course, there has been some publicity about a couple of projects where, unfortunately, there have been slippages, whether through latent conditions, challenges with structural steels or an unfortunate situation when they closed, leaving a couple of our schools in a difficult situation.

We are also pleased that many of the school projects are indeed running substantially ahead of schedule. Mount Barker Primary School at the moment has a December completion date, but of course we do have challenges when there are lockdowns. Hopefully, there will not be any more lockdowns in South Australia, but it is always a possibility. However, the confidence I have is that we are on track at the moment for this project to be complete well and truly in advance and ready for the school year in 2022.

It is a substantial project, a new building comprising general learning areas and service learning areas focused on STEM, a new disability unit with a range of learning areas, administration facilities, building amenities, a new landscaped courtyard for open-plan circulation and the demolition of some of the ageing facilities that are no longer fit for practice, suitable for purpose or appropriate for use in a school.

I am really excited about this project, and I know the member for Kavel is too. I commend him for his engagement with his local schools. I can assure the school community at Mount Barker Primary School, and all the other schools in Mount Barker, that the member for Kavel is the sort of member who, every time he visits a school or a preschool community and engages in that community, the next day he is on the phone to the minister to share what he has learnt and to share whatever their views are. Certainly, the enthusiasm of the community for education is really welcomed and the enthusiasm of their local member of parliament for this project is very much valued.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:27): This is a very important and significant project for my community, one that is deeply valued by my community and by me. I am very grateful to the minister for his close involvement in not just this project but other projects across the Adelaide Hills. It is right to say, as the minister has emphasised, that the Adelaide Hills, not just Mount Barker, has many growing communities.

In fact, it is important to emphasise in this place that communities outside of Mount Barker are growing at similar rates in some places. It is an attractive place to live and it is an attractive place to raise a family. It is an important place for education and will continue to be so, and the school will continue to be absolutely essential to the wider Adelaide Hills community.

It is important for me to put on record here how grateful I am to Jo Simpson, her staff, the school governing council and all the school community, including parents and students. They have been working through a construction site, and it has not necessarily been easy in those circumstances. There has been the need to remove building materials from the school and introduce new materials.

What is proposed at Mount Barker Primary School is the construction of a second storey. It is a very beautiful site within the township and a site that I note many residents at Mount Barker are very fond of. Of course, many have a close connection to the school, not just through their families but, in many cases, because they were educated there as well.

I will be delighted to see this project complete. I understand that it is reasonably on track. I am very grateful to the architects, Wiltshire Swain, and the builders for accommodating what is a reasonably confined site in particular places. On one side of the site is the school oval, and so on, but on the other side of the site within the existing township is a reasonably constrained site. They have done an excellent job seeing through a design for this location so that the site remains accessible and incredibly useful and well loved into the future.

It is also right to say, as I have earlier said in this place, that the minister has seen through a most remarkable capital works program in this state. He has presided over an enormous body of work, and I know that every single member is particularly grateful on behalf of their community, but also I know, in the quietness of the hearts of every member, is a deep love and affection for local schools and an appreciation of the importance of education. I know firsthand that the minister has had an extraordinary workload. That has not been apparent, of course, but it is clear from the number of reports coming to my committee that there has been an extraordinary workload. He has seen through that workload with good humour and excellence, and I am appreciative of that too.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: URRBRAE AGRICULTURAL HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:31): I move:

That the 111th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Urrbrae Agricultural High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Urrbrae High School is located on Fullarton Road, Netherby, within the City of Mitcham, and the high school is a special interest agricultural secondary school, as members will well know. The school's curriculum focuses on modern contemporary farming, agribusiness, veterinary studies, agriculture, technology and the environment. The high school is allocated funding of \$10 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program, initially announced in October 2017.

The Urrbrae Agricultural High School redevelopment project will be delivering a total school enrolment capacity of 1,300 places by 2022. This is expected to support the transition of year 7 students to high school.

The proposed scope of works for the high school redevelopment project includes construction of a new health and wellbeing building, with specialist areas of food technology, textiles, design and physical education; construction of a new year 7 building providing general learning areas, specialist music rooms and practice areas; extension and refurbishment of the existing gym, including the installation of ventilation and tiered box seating; construction of a covered outdoor learning area (known as the COLA) adjacent the new health and wellbeing building; and, demolition of buildings and landscaping. The proposed works will be staged, with construction expected to be complete in November 2021.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation 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, which members will know is described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of that act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the works that I earlier described to the house.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:33): It is good to see you back in the chair, Mr Speaker. As the member for Kavel alluded to in his remarks, Urrbrae Agricultural High School is the only special interest agricultural secondary school in the state and is recognised as a centre for excellence for studies in agriculture, science, technology and the environment. Urrbrae is undergoing a lot of change at the moment, which is fantastic to see, and this \$10 million project is creating 25 jobs.

Construction of a health and wellbeing building is to include home economics, a physical education teaching space and an agricultural learning square. The construction of a new building to provide additional learning areas for year 7s includes a music space as well, and there is an extension and renovation to the gym to remove the mezzanine level and provide additional seating to enable whole-of-school assemblies.

Like many schools in my community, a lot of the infrastructure was built in the 1960s, and it is great to see the demolition of this ageing infrastructure and a fresh, modern rebuild. Located within metropolitan Adelaide, Urrbrae is no ordinary secondary school, having an outstanding 40-hectare farm in addition to a dedicated wetland for integration with related educational programs, including TAFE programs.

Urrbrae, as it sits, is part of the great legacy that Peter Waite left to the people of South Australia. On the western side of Fullarton Road is the Urrbrae high school campus. That was as part of his bequest, leaving the land to the education department. On the eastern side is the Waite Institute, which is under the custodianship of the University of Adelaide. Sitting in between is the Waite Gatehouse which we, the community, saved from the wrecking ball earlier this year and which will be relocated further in the Waite campus in due course.

Urrbrae high school has a commitment to a sustainable world, which is fantastic. That is a huge, core part of what is taught at the school, focusing on developing our understanding of both the vital role of agriculture and the use of material and information technologies for a globally sustainable world. The motto of the school is 'Science with practice', and no doubt the school embodies this ethos.

Urrbrae enjoys outstanding support from the agricultural industry, parents, teachers and students to make it a city school with a country feel, with a range of co-curricular activities to cater for students' interests in sports, outdoor education, and music and drama, as well as student

passions for agriculture, animal husbandry, crop production, science, technology, mathematics, English, humanities and more.

Just the other day I was talking to a year 11 student from Urrbrae who, once again, expressed his disappointment that the Royal Adelaide Show is not going on this year, obviously because of COVID—that is now two years in a row. Students of Urrbrae play a huge role in the agricultural and horticultural aspects of the show, and that has been going on now for generations. Hopefully, in 2022 the Royal Adelaide Show can be back and the students of Urrbrae high school can play their key role in animal husbandry down at Wayville.

A big thanks to Jos Fox who is the principal at Urrbrae—she does a fantastic job and is incredibly well respected within the community—the leaders of the SRC, David Hart as chair of the governing council, and all who have made this project possible.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:37): Urrbrae Agricultural High School is an outstanding facility. It is indeed a school in the city, but it is a school for all South Australia and its alumni stretch into every corner of this state, whether they are in agriculture or professional occupations or any other number of fields.

Because of the nature of its specialist programs it is a very appealing location for people in all sorts of settings to send their kids. There are many, many families in the Hills for example—including in part of the Morialta electorate I currently serve but that I am losing at the next election to Heysen, Kavel and Schubert—who send their kids to Urrbrae because of the extraordinary agricultural program there, which is fantastic. Of course, there are other good agricultural programs in a number of other Hills schools as well.

The programs at Urrbrae are special, and the farming infrastructure on the school is excellent. As has been pointed out, the engagement with the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society, the Royal Adelaide Show, is pretty important too. The education department has had an education program at the Royal Adelaide Show for a number of years, and I trust all members have had the opportunity to check it out. If they have not, they should go next year.

One of the real highlights of the show is the way that young children, primary school children and adults interact with animals and agricultural life in many ways. For many years the majority of the student volunteers have come from Urrbrae, and we now have a memorandum of understanding where Urrbrae Agricultural High School will, in fact, be the lead, rather than the education department's central office. Urrbrae high school will take the lead in running that stand—more than a stand; it is a building—in the future, and I am looking forward to that taking place. They will do a fantastic job, as they have done as volunteers in the past.

The project the Public Works Committee has reported on is a really important one. I visited the school a couple of times; I visited with the member for Waite in 2019 and prior to that when we were in opposition (I think he was member for Davenport at the time). The school has a lot going for it, but certainly some of the built infrastructure there has long been in need of remediation, improvement, replacement and, in some cases, expansion.

The project that is being delivered has a \$10 million budget and includes the construction of a health and wellbeing building to include home economics, physical education, teaching spaces and a new agricultural learning space. It includes the construction of a new building to provide additional learning areas for the year 7s, including space for music. It includes extension and renovation of the gymnasium, to remove the mezzanine level and provide additional seating to enable whole-of-school assemblies; and, of course, the demolition of some of the ageing infrastructure that we talked about.

We are aiming for the school's capacity next year to be at 1,300. To put that into some perspective, the current student population is 981. In respect of the movement of the Urrbrae TAFE facility, there was an administration group there that is now located elsewhere, so the courses delivered traditionally on the co-located TAFE site can still be delivered. A couple of years ago, when we were restructuring the physical capacity of those TAFE sites, the school was able to also make use of some of that space, which I think has proven to be a very good outcome for all involved.

The member for Waite has spoken on this motion. I know that the member for Unley, into whose electorate the Urrbrae high school is moving as a result of the boundary changes at the next

election, is also very excited about the prospect of having the school physically located in his electorate. But I make the point again that this is truly a school in which many members of the house would have students enrolled, as its catchment is very broad. People from right across metropolitan Adelaide, the Hills and near regions are able to access the school quite simply, as are those from further afield whose kids come to Adelaide, if indeed they are able to attend the school.

Principal Fox is well known. She is an absolute true local to the Urrbrae Agricultural High School. Very few school principals can be said to be as local as she is. I commend her for her work. Matthews and Partners are the architects and the builder is Cook Building and Development. This project is well and truly underway. Anyone driving past is able to see the work underway, and we are on track for completion within the next couple of months. We are currently scheduled for late October—these things are subject to change, moving back and forward a bit—and very much in the wheelhouse of being complete by the end of this year, and I cannot wait to see the final project.

The school has also benefited, of course, from the investment the Marshall Liberal government has made in communications technology and internet infrastructure, with the connection to the SWiFT internet rollout, the fibre-optic cable to the school, in July 2019. For the last two years, the school has benefited—as have all our public schools around South Australia—from that extraordinary uplift provided by having 21st century internet connection.

It is the utility sort of connection whereby the reliability of the internet needed by entire classes or entire cohorts of students all at once is as reliable as turning on a light switch in your house. That has not been the case previously, and for a school like Urrbrae, with its connections across the vast landscape of South Australia, they have been able to use that internet connection and those improvements to great effect.

I am looking forward to seeing the project completed. I commend the Public Works Committee for its work in this area. The Chair of the Public Works Committee, the member for Kavel, has a particularly high number of his constituents who drive down the freeway and are able to access Urrbrae Agricultural High School. I remember meeting in the member for Kavel's office not so long ago with a former chair of the Urrbrae high school governing council, who at the time was also a resident of Mount Barker.

Clearly, there is a strong connection there and I am sure that as the Chair of the Public Works Committee he gave it his laser-like focus to ensure that the people of South Australia got excellent value for money and that indeed the students and school community at Urrbrae Agricultural High School got an outstanding facility with the appropriate parliamentary oversight of the project. I commend the project to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:44): I rise to support this Public Works Committee report into the latest redevelopment to Urrbrae Agricultural High School, noting not only the significant investment by the Marshall Liberal government but that I am a former scholar of Urrbrae—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Hear, hear!

Mr PEDERICK: Yes.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Hopefully, I am not using that word too loosely. I attended there in 1978, and the mission was to stay for another year, but I did get allergic to the city and ended up going home to help my father run the farm. It was an interesting year back then. We had only recently gone co-ed at Urrbrae, and I think there were about 800 students there at the time, and about 10 per cent of those were young ladies.

As has already been indicated in the motion regarding the Public Works Committee report, country kids from all over the state come there to learn not only science, technology and environment but, in my mind very importantly, agriculture. It has had great facilities over the years, which have been kept up to speed by governments across that time. I know that Malcolm Buckby, a former member of this place, a former member for Light, instigated some upgrades many years ago as well.

It certainly gave an insight, not just for the country students but for city students who wanted to have a connection to agriculture, and I think it is something we cannot afford to lose as we move

forward. You certainly note in COVID times the importance of essential services like agriculture. You get some of the—I will be frank—the anti-COVID, the anti-vaxxers, whatever brigade you want to call them who, when you talk to them, say, 'We don't have enough food to feed everyone.' I say, 'Really? We grow enough food in this country to feed 75 million people, and last time I looked that's about three times our population.'

The research work and the education work that happen out of Urrbrae campus are absolutely fantastic. I remember some of my teachers: Mr Burford, Mr Bell and Mr Cook. It was a long time ago, but I have a lot of good memories from Urrbrae.

I note that in this project 25 jobs will be created per year. It is a \$10 million investment. Key features of the upgrade include the construction of a health and wellbeing building to include home economics, physical education, teaching space and an agricultural learning square, and construction of a new building to provide additional learning areas for year 7s—obviously with the year 7s going into secondary school—including a music space. As part of it, there is the extension and renovation of the gymnasium to remove the mezzanine level and provide additional seating to enable whole-of-school assemblies. Also, part of this is the demolition of ageing infrastructure.

It is great to see this level of investment in this school. It is a great school, and it has educated many students from across Hammond and from across the rest of the state to set them on their path in those fields of agriculture, science and environment. It is vital that we keep investment in this sector to promote all of these features around agriculture, science and the environment, and long may it be.

To all those Urrbrae students I wish them well in their end of year studies, especially those in the later years of schooling. Whether they are doing the general course in year 11 and 12 or the agricultural course, which is more focused on the agricultural side of things and farm management and that kind of thing, I wish them all the best in their studies. May Urrbrae have a long and exciting future. I commend the report from the Public Works Committee.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:49): I am absolutely delighted that we have been able to bring this project forward. It is an essential and important project, not just for the many students who are presently attending the school and will see out their education at Urrbrae but also for many students who are looking forward to going to Urrbrae from our community and other communities in surrounding districts and, in some cases, right across the state.

It is an iconic high school, one that has contributed in very material and vital and important ways to the progress, welfare and improvement of our state and to our agricultural prosperity and success as a state. It is right to say that South Australia has depended on our agricultural success and progress, and there are many symbols in this place that emphasise that point.

Can I thank the member for Waite for his determined and effective advocacy in relation to this project and the member for Hammond for sharing information and background as to his scholarly pursuits and commitments before he joined us here. I think it is telling on occasion when members are prepared to share this information, and I always look very much forward to anecdotes in detail and explanations, I should say, from the member for Hammond as to some of his background. We were very much appreciative of his contribution, as we always are. It was of great interest to me and I know of great interest to members here present.

Can I thank, too, the minister. It is right for me to emphasise again the enormous project that he has been seeing through to completion right across his portfolio. This is but one important example of the fruits of that work which will, as I earlier mentioned, benefit many students and the state in the ways I have outlined.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ROXBY DOWNS AREA SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:51): I think this might be my last contribution as part of the Cregan hour and, with the diminishing number of days remaining in this parliament, my fondness for this particular part of our programming only grows. I move:

That the 112th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Roxby Downs Area School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Roxby Downs Area School is located on Richardson Place, Roxby Downs, within the municipal council of Roxby Downs. The Downs Area School is located at the centre of the Roxby township. It shares a number of community facilities, including a leisure centre, ovals and sports courts. The curriculum focuses on science, technology, engineering and mathematics, Yakarti Aboriginal studies, art and drama.

Roxby Downs Area School had 599 enrolments, and the proposed works will deliver a total school enrolment capacity of 820 places by 2022. Roxby Downs Area School was allocated funding of \$7 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program announced in October 2017. The proposed redevelopment will consist of demolition and refurbishment of existing facilities to accommodate 820 students on the Roxby Downs Area School site.

The Roxby Downs school redevelopment project will include the following important scope of works: refurbishment of existing buildings to create new general learning and technology spaces and associated breakout areas; refurbishment of an existing building, including food, technology, general learning areas and soundproofing of a music room and drama studio; creation of a new common landscaped area to include an amphitheatre and an open-air performance space; demolition of aged transportable buildings. There will also be, of course as necessary, ancillary works.

The proposed redevelopment works will be staged, with construction expected to commence in September 2020 and be completed in November 2021. 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 that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and does meet the criteria for the examination of projects as described in 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 does recommend the proposed scope of the work I have outlined to the house.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:54): I wish to speak briefly on the project as outlined by the member for Kavel. The Roxby Downs Area School is a school with 564 students, with indeed an expectation of some growth as a result of the year 7 to high school project. Substantially, this project will upgrade the facilities, including the demolition of ageing infrastructure; refurbishment of general learning areas, teaching spaces, breakout areas; the refurbishment of the food technology building which, of course, includes general learning areas; and soundproofing of the music rooms and the drama studio. Part of the project that I know the school is very excited about is the amphitheatre and open air performance space.

I have not been to Roxby Downs Area School. I very much want to go. I had a video call with Annette Williams, the principal, not so long ago in May and discussed this project, which is on track for completion in November. I am looking forward to seeing the final project and, hopefully, at some stage being able to visit the school itself.

I congratulate Annette as principal on leading the project. She is an outstanding South Australian with a very strong track record of not only supporting schools but also the broader community and young people. I am looking forward to seeing the work of Phillips/Pilkington Architects and builder Pascale Construction finalised. I congratulate all involved with this tremendous project, with a budget of \$7 million, which will support the education and learning in the world-class facilities being delivered at Roxby Downs.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:55): I also welcome this project. As the member said, Annette Williams is an exceptional principal at Roxby Downs. It is good to see bipartisan support for Roxby Downs, especially for the development of facilities, whether at school or whether it is early childhood, in Roxby Downs under the previous and current governments. I do welcome that. Roxby Downs is sometimes seen—and I think mistakenly—as a relatively privileged community. Just about everybody has a job. A reasonable number of people are on high incomes in Roxby Downs, but they do have their own very particular challenges.

I was in Roxby Downs again just recently and visited the school. One of the challenges that especially more remote communities have, when it comes to our schools, is the turnover of staff. Next year, the Roxby Downs school will lose 30 staff. That is a huge turnover and clearly has a real impact. I would be a very strong supporter of looking at country incentives, anything we can do to enhance the continuity of the educational experiences that students have in places like Roxby Downs and Coober Pedy.

People are probably aware that the age profile in Roxby Downs does not reflect the average age profile of the state—it is a much younger community—and people are probably also aware that between a couple of census periods there is a very significant turnover in the population of Roxby Downs. That all adds to some of the challenges in that community. However, it is great to see the physical resources in the community being improved by both the previous Labor government and by the current government.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:57): I thank the member for his contribution and dedication to his community and recommend the project.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE AND CRASH REPAIR INDUSTRY

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:58): I move:

That the eighth report of the committee, on the motor vehicle insurance and crash repair industry in South Australia, be noted.

In July 2019, the Economic and Finance Committee resolved to investigate this industry, which contributes \$2.85 billion annually to the state's economy. Through this inquiry, the committee received 53 submissions, heard evidence from 35 witnesses and held nine hearings at Parliament House in Adelaide between October 2018 and July 2020. The committee also conducted site visits in November 2019 to the Pro Paint 'n Panel crash repair premises at Hindmarsh and the Capital SMART Repairs centre at Mile End. The committee heard evidence at the hearing from crash repairers and major insurance companies. However, South Australian consumers were at the very heart of the inquiry.

The aim was to investigate obligations to consumers, the 2017 Motor Vehicle Insurance and Repair Industry Code of Conduct, consumer choice and protections, and business practices of insurers and repairers. The key theme that emerged through the conduct of the inquiry was transparency, providing customers with greater clarity and more information to make better decisions for themselves and for their families. Given the time, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 August 2021.)

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:01): Mr Speaker, it is good to see you back and I wish you a speedy recovery. You are the second person in a matter of a week who has had a battle with a tree and come out on the losing end—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: He's still standing.

Mr HUGHES: Fortunately—unlike Trevor Wright in William Creek. He had to be flown out from William Creek. I drove all the way from Coober Pedy to see him and he had gone. That was a long trip by dirt road. So I wish you a speedy recovery.

The SPEAKER: I am just keeping my chin up, member for Giles.

Mr HUGHES: I was speaking on the bill last night, and I am sure everyone was there glued to the screen as we led up to the midnight hour.

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

Mr HUGHES: I am sure they are. I want to emphasise that we are incredibly fortunate in this state, the other states and nationally, to have independent electoral commissions. When you look at the way we conduct elections in this state, nationally and in other states, compared with somewhere like the United States, you have to give us a massive tick of approval. The fact that we have electoral commissions that are free of overt and covert political involvement is an incredible positive.

Look at the United States: Trump was mentioned last night and the Republicans were mentioned last night. What you see there in a democracy is almost a dystopian approach to electoral matters and gross political interference, and it has to be said that it is essentially the Republican Party in the areas they control. The way they try to suppress the vote, and suppress the votes of minorities, is a disgrace. That comes on top of an inherent institutional bias in the United States that seriously advantages the Republicans at the expense of Democrats. So we can be proud of our electoral commissions and what we have done in this country to ensure a vote that is supported.

A lot has been said about the nature of the franchise, and we on this side want to see voting made as easy as possible. That is why, when the Electoral Commission of South Australia brought down its report, the number one recommendation was to make it easier for people to vote in this state, to remove that two-day requirement, and make it possible for people to turn up at the polling station and actually vote on the day without being previously enrolled, and that is a real step forward.

Of course, the commission, when advocating that, when making that its number one recommendation, pointed to the evidence in the other states, pointed to the evidence in New Zealand and pointed to the evidence in Canada that taking this particular approach does maximise the vote and does maximise participation. With great surprise, we see that number one recommendation from the commission being rejected in this bill.

Indeed, in this bill, the current status quo is made even worse. That two-day rule is going to be removed and replaced with a six-day rule, which is going to lock out a lot of people from voting, especially younger people who might not be as savvy about our voting systems. It is not just younger people; there are also other people, especially in communities like mine, in the APY lands and in other places.

This particular approach to make it harder for people to vote is something that we on this side cannot support, and the evidence is in. As I have indicated, the commission referred to the evidence in the other states where that capacity to turn up and vote on the day without being enrolled has had a very positive impact. In fact, thousands of additional votes are there to be had in those states that have this particular approach.

In this day and age, when we see around the world a move to a more authoritarian disposition and the undermining of democracies—including in that great democracy the United States, with the raft of their legislation that is now before state houses—we should be doing all we can to build on the proud traditions of this state, and they are proud traditions when it comes to the franchise.

We were one of the very early movers when it came to the female vote and the female right to stand for election. We have a proud history. As I said last night, that history was darkened by the Playmander, but Steele Hall and others on the other side put principle before their own self-interest to bring the voting system into the 20th century and enshrine the important principle of one vote, one value.

We will be opposing what the government is proposing because it appears to be motivated by self-interest. It appears to be motivated by a lack of confidence in their capacity to win the vote amongst those people who currently might not be enrolled and might turn up on the day. We should be doing all that we can to make voting easier in our state and, unfortunately, the government has decided to go in the opposite direction.

Even if we get defeated here in the lower house, I cannot see the upper house going for the proposal to change it from two days to six days. I think the crossbenchers in the upper house will be

of a mind—and I am not pre-empting what it is that they are going to do—to support what we believe is the way forward: that people should be able to turn up on the day and vote.

There are conditions around that. The Electoral Commission of South Australia and the commissioner have set out what those conditions are, and they are sensible conditions. But, clearly, in the mind of the Electoral Commission of South Australia and the commissioner is a desire to maximise the vote to maximise participation, especially amongst young people. In their report, they refer to the decline in the number of people who are voting, so at this juncture we should not be looking to make it harder for people to vote.

It has also been mentioned that this bill has taken an incredibly long period of time to come before the house—13 days or 12 days of this parliament to sit and then we will be going into a virtually de facto election campaign, if it has not already started. So to get a bill before this house and the upper house and then do what is necessary to bed it down, the time restraints are enormous. I would have thought there would be people on the other side as well who would be keen to make as it easy as possible for people to vote.

As I said, Steele Hall reflecting the principles that he clearly held dearly, as did a number of other people on that side, did the right thing and did not look to get an electoral advantage; in fact they did the opposite. It was interesting to reflect on the figures the member for Elizabeth gave last night about the gerrymander and the impact it had over an extended period of time. I call upon some of the members opposite to think about this and think about how we need to make voting easier, not harder.

Time expired.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:11): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I, too, welcome you back and wish you a speedy recovery.

I rise to speak on the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2021. In doing so, I state up-front, that this bill with a number of its clauses and the intentions of those clauses is not worthy or warrants support. Legislation that governs rules around voting, goes to the heart of our democracy and we should tread carefully.

The bill before us, we understand, is based on the election report that has been with the government for nearly 2½ years, a bill that changes the rules currently governing elections, a bill so similar to that already rejected in this house and the other place, with I acknowledge some exceptions, a few changes, but why I am highlighting this is not surprising. There are other times, both at a state and federal level, when there have been desperate attempts by the opposition or those opposite to change the rules.

The member for Reynell reflected on some of these with the former Prime Minister John Howard's changes to the Electoral Act 2006, the increased identity requirements and of course the early closure of the electoral rolls, along with other changes sought to increase the Coalition vote. Last night, and now today, here we are seven months out from the state election and the Marshall Liberal government has put this bill in front of us, a bill that is clearly about changing the rules and shoring up votes in their favour.

The election report on which this bill is based contains recommendations for change. But what do we see? We see the government comb through the recommendations and choose those electoral forms, those recommendations they believe will work in their favour:

Recommendation 1.

Enrolment up to and on polling day

That the Electoral Act (1985)...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 the week after polling day.

The report clearly states:

The declining rate of enrolment of younger electors and the increasing number of non-voters are a matter of concern...

It points out that one of the solutions to address falling participation rates, successfully implemented by the Electoral Commission of South Australia's counterparts in New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria as well as in New Zealand, has been to allow enrolment on the day as a savings provision to enfranchise people who inadvertently missed the close of rolls.

We know that at the 2018 South Australian election, the Electoral Commission of South Australia was made aware from polling official feedback that there were many potential electors who would have benefited from this reform. The report reveals that 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, just 153—2 per cent—had their House of Assembly vote counted, and 852—being 12 per cent—had their Legislative Council vote counted after investigation of their enrolment.

The report goes on to state that, given the success of late enrolment options elsewhere in Australasia, ECSA seeks legislative change to bring South Australia into line with other jurisdictions and to 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 could participate in state elections. I point that out and I reiterate that point: it would ensure that as many South Australians as possible could participate in state elections.

The decision by the government to go against the recommendation of the Electoral Commission of South Australia, in reference to this particular recommendation, is one thing, but going a step further and reducing the time to enrol to vote and making it harder for young people, people with disability, our First Nations people and our new citizens to get enrolled to vote is wrong. We need to remove these barriers that are impacting on the ability to exercise the right to vote.

In reference to other sections that I think would be significant, we need to remove barriers impacting on the ability to exercise the right to vote and, seriously, you need to do a double take. The bill before us proposes to reduce the time period during which people can enrol to vote from six days to two days after the issuing of the writs. We already know that 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 from 18 to 24.

As I have already made reference to, in reducing the time to enrol to vote, we risk disenfranchising not only our young first-time voters but new citizens, people with disability, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, as well as others. We, as a state, as this parliament, should be better than that. We should be looking to expand participation, not to reduce it, as the Electoral Commission pointed out.

In my former role as a senator and in this place, I have always encouraged young people to learn about our representative democracy, the role of government, legislation and how they can not only participate but how they can contribute to change. I encourage my schools to put a visit to our state parliament on their calendar and I welcome the opportunity to host them in this place. I visit classes, speaking to students about our system of government and how, as individuals and collectively, they can effect change when they see a genuine need in their school or in their community.

What this bill does to these young people on turning 18 and becoming eligible to vote is to cut them off. It turns them away. The Commissioner for Children and Young People, Helen Connolly, consulted with a group of young South Australians aged 15 to 22 years about their thoughts on the barriers to enrolment and voting for young people, and about how the proposed amendments might impact young people.

In addition to this, the commissioner has drawn on thousands of conversations with young people since 2017 and she makes the following recommendation: that the proposed amendment to section 48 to reduce the time period in which people can enrol to vote not be supported. The commissioner raises concerns that the reduced time frame would disproportionately impact the enrolment of younger voters who are already under-represented both in terms of enrolment votes and voter participation.

It is without doubt this proposed amendment to reduce the number of days from six to two goes in the complete opposite direction from the first recommendation in the report by the Electoral Commission. You only have to consider the fact that in the 2018 election there were 25,000 electors who enrolled to vote during the six-day period between the issue of writs and the closing of the electoral roll. If we take it that this was spread out over the six days, that is more than 4,000 enrolments a day—4,000 new enrolments, 4,000 new electors to our electoral roll.

If the government has their way with this bill and reduces the time period during which people can enrol to vote by four days, rather than increasing it as recommended by the Electoral Commission, it would be possible that 16,000 South Australians would be denied the opportunity to participate in the vote, to have a say in who will govern them in this state. Many of them would be young, first-time voters. Many of them would be our new citizens. Knowing this, one must ask why the government wants to implement such a reduction in people enrolling to vote.

The second recommendation by the Commissioner for Children and Young People is one that I have already raised. It results from her research and conversations with young people. The recommendation is that the act be amended to enable eligible electors to enrol up to and on polling day. In support of this, the commissioner raises an issue that is close to my heart, one that I am passionate about as a member of parliament, a parent and as a former teacher, and that is the education of our young people. In a letter to the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place, Ms Connolly says:

...this Bill alone can only go so far in terms of improving enrolment and participation rates, particularly for young voters. As highlighted throughout the Electoral Commission SA's 2018 State Election Report...there must be commitment to developing and implementing a comprehensive voter education program with a particular focus on first-time voters and young voters.

Such a program requires adequate funding and will benefit from collaboration with other State authorities, such as my office and the Department for Education. This seems particularly necessary given the reported lack of awareness amongst significant proportion of voters about voting options, including pre-poll voting options, and the Bill's proposed removal of the Electoral Commission's function to encourage the casting of votes on polling day.

Importantly, children and young people themselves consistently highlight the importance of education when asked what would make it easier for them to enrol to vote and to participate in elections.

The commissioner includes some wise words by a 14 year old: 'Better education for teens leading up to the coming of age and being able to vote.' That is what is required. This would help ensure that as many South Australians as possible can participate in state elections. It would raise awareness among others, young people and first-time voters, including new citizens. I hope the government genuinely takes on this recommendation with relation to education; it is so important.

So much of this bill before us is regressive reform rather than reform that benefits our democracy. We all know how important the role voting plays in a democracy is, and every step of the way we should ensure we protect that right, that opportunity. We already know that there is an under-representation of young people on the roll. The election report for the 2018 South Australian state election clearly highlights the declining rate of youth enrolment. We should do all that we can to address this decline.

Education and supporting the extension of time for eligible electors to enrol up to and on polling day would go some way towards achieving a turnaround for our state's young people and seeing more of them add their names to our electoral roll.

This bill also includes an expansion of pre-poll facilities, which allows people to cast an ordinary vote ahead of the election, and we currently have pre-poll with legitimate reasons for some people to vote in pre-poll and postal votes. Here, there are questions unanswered.

Another point of particular concern to me is the removal of the requirement for the Electoral Commissioner to advertise in newspapers. This is found in sections, 18, 41, 48, 49 and 77 of the act. Amendment of section 41(1)—Publication of notice of application, provides:

—delete 'in the *Gazette* and in a newspaper circulating generally in the State' and substitute:

- (a) In the *Gazette*; and
- (b) On a website determined by the Electoral Commissioner;

and

- (c) In any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

Similar wording appears in amendment of section 48—Contents of writ, where it reads:

delete 'in a newspaper circulating throughout the State' and substitute:

on a website determined by the Electoral Commissioner and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations

This should be of concern to all of us here. It should also be of concern to those opposite and anyone in this place who has people in regional communities. This, I believe, will disenfranchise many. There are so many things that are important about this particular piece that need to be considered.

Most days of the week my office will receive contact from a resident who needs assistance with printing forms or accessing information that can only be found online. They come to me particularly frustrated because they do not have the necessary technology to do these things.

It may come as a surprise to some, to those opposite, that (a) many cannot afford to buy a computer, iPad or smartphone; (b) they cannot afford internet connection; (c) they do not have the necessary skills to access the information they need, and this often occurs with the more senior members of our community, not all but some, as I know there are many who do have those skills, and my father in his 80s is quite computer literate, mostly self-taught with a little help from his daughters; or (d) they do not have reliable internet access.

I hear their frustrations when they tell me they feel like they are being left behind, because they do not have a computer, internet access or the latest smart device. I note the tendency to remove print media advertising from committees, and I have raised my concerns that doing so significantly impacts on our regional newspapers and those living in regional South Australia who rely on these newspapers for their information, among others.

It is worth noting that Ms Connolly, too, raises removal of requirement to advertise in print media as an issue when she says:

This office is aware of the significant costs associated with publishing print notices in newspapers, as well as the need for services to be modernised in a changing media landscape. At the same time, however, this office is concerned that a digital first approach may leave some young people behind, particularly those living in regional areas or those without reliable and consistent access to digital devices and data.

The recently released My Digital Life report from the Commissioner for Children and Young People goes into further detail about the impact of digital poverty on children and young people, and I believe this is something we must listen to.

Ms Connolly continues, saying that she understands that the proposed amendment to remove the requirement for public notices in newspapers aligns with recommendation 5 of the ECSA report. However, in the absence of print notices in newspapers other steps need to be taken, whether in the regulations or by other means, to ensure critical information about polling booths and pre-polling to be widely known by all electors.

I think that those opposite should be reconsidering this particular clause. We need to ensure that people who do not have access to the internet, computers or even have those necessary skills are able to rely on the print media, whether that be our daily newspaper here in South Australia, *The Advertiser*, or the *Sunday Mail*, or whether it be all those regional newspapers that I know play a significant role in the lives of those people in the regions. It is where they turn to to get their information. Mr Deputy Speaker, I know that you know that this is the case.

Another issue that I have with this bill is that the Electoral Commissioner would no longer be required to encourage voting on election day. In the time allocated today, I have raised just a few of my concerns with the government's Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2021, a bill based on a report that the government has had in its possession for near on 2½ years and is now attempting to get through this parliament in time for its changes to be implemented for the 2022 election in just seven months' time.

It is a bill that will ultimately exclude particular groups from voting by reducing the time to enrol down to two days and some of the other proposals. I have great concerns with some of the

clauses in this bill and cannot see how it will benefit our society, our community and those groups that I have already highlighted today.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:31): I rise, entirely unsurprisingly, to oppose this bill. There is much to dislike about this bill—its tardiness, its blatant attempt to game the system, its contradiction with the ECSA post-election report recommendations—but maybe the thing that most irks me about it is the intention to reduce the time to enrol, after the writs are issued, from six days to a measly two days.

As I doorknocked and made calls and attended events and visited shopping centres and railway stations ahead of the last election, the days passed one by one and the deadline to enrol arrived and then was passed. Most days after that deadline to enrol expired, I crossed paths with people who had not enrolled or had not enrolled at the correct address, and every one of them who could no longer enrol to vote was aggrieved at the loss of their capacity to exercise that democratic right. Each one of them, when faced with the realisation that they would not be able to vote, was disappointed.

On one hand, you could examine that and say, 'Well, I think it's actually a good thing that people in our community are aware of the power of their vote and that they value it, even if they realise how they feel about that much too late.' The most frequent response I got from people when I encountered them was that they were not aware that there was an election or indeed that it was happening so soon, or that they did not realise enrolment was necessary so far ahead of the election.

In fact, many thought that they could enrol or update their enrolment up to or on election day. Of course, that would make sense. That is not a silly approach to have at all. In so many other aspects of our lives, we can and do register an interest up until a critical date. You would think that in a community that so highly prizes voting—and indeed here in Australia we make it compulsory, we value it so highly—every effort would be put in to ensure that everyone had every opportunity to enrol and to cast their vote.

I also had many constituents who believed that pre-poll voting centres perform the role of enabling enrolment and updating their details, and again that is not a silly assumption. In this age, given modern technology and the capacity to enter very large volumes of information and have it processed at a very fast speed compared to the manual processes that were once employed, it is again not beyond the bounds of one's understanding to conceive that enrolment up until election day, or at least very shortly before, would be achievable. We have obviously just gone through the process of the national census, and although it has had its problems in the past this time technologically it seemed to go quite well.

Obviously, that is a process where many more millions of people are entering large volumes of information, and that is being dealt with in a relatively short period of time. It does seem to me that in a much smaller pool of participants we should be able to get these things right using modern technology and actually be using technology to increase the opportunity for people to be engaged in the process. Of course, the primary way to engage is to enrol to vote and to be able to exercise your franchise.

Who does this move to reduce the enrolment window most affect? Of course, one group—and we have heard quite a few addresses about this—is young people. I reckon all of us could check the electoral rolls and see that very few 18 to 19 year olds are currently on the roll. In fact, I thank the commissioner for providing some information about that, and I might just quote her now. In her letter to parliamentarians she said:

We know that over one third of eligible 18 year olds (38.9%) and one quarter of eligible 18 to 24 year olds (25.4%) were not on the electoral roll at the time of the 2018 state election. Participation was also lowest among this age group, with only 76% of enrolled 18-24 year olds casting a vote, and younger voters reported the lowest levels of confidence about completing their ballot papers.

One would hope as we approach the next election that we will see those figures change and we will see more young people who have recently turned 18 or are even into their 19th or 20th years actually enrol to vote, but it is probably not the first thing most young people do when they turn 18. Maybe having a beer, maybe watching an R-rated movie, or at least not having to hide it from your parents, might outrank the rush to enrol to vote when you turn 18.

Of course, for me and, I imagine, for many people here, I relished the chance to fill out my enrolment declaration the second I was allowed, but I think we would agree that my interest and maybe the interest of those in this place in government systems and democracies may not be the norm certainly for a 17 or 18 year old.

But the vast majority of young people I meet are happy to vote or even enthusiastic about it. Contrary to popular opinion that the younger generation is entirely disengaged or apathetic or ignorant of politics, I find quite the opposite, at least in my electorate. I find that young people are tuned into issues such as climate change and education, gender equality, health, Aboriginal affairs and international affairs to name just a few.

When I give school tours to primary and secondary students and young leaders, I am constantly impressed at their level of knowledge and also their inquisitiveness, because to me a questioning mind is always more important than a rote recollection of facts. The capacity to ask why and how is critical to good government, constant improvement and accountability. I think we often underestimate the political and societal awareness of young people, or maybe we just fail to see it in the forums in which they are expressing these views, which might be different from the way that people like me in our 30s or beyond might communicate and share ideas.

I did read with great interest the Commissioner for Children and Young People's observations. Although they may seem a little different from what I am expressing here about the engagement of young people, I think we are hitting that same point of the urge to be able to engage in democratic processes. She writes:

Children and young people want to understand the systems they live in, know how to engage in the world around them, and acquire the skills they need to transition into adulthood. They recognise that their understanding of civics, and particularly their ability to participate in the state and federal elections, is central to being active citizens in Australia's democracy.

Young people have unique experiences, ideas and passions, and they want to be active members in their communities and in the democratic process that affect their lives. However, significant numbers of young people report making it through their years of schooling without being taught about South Australia's electoral process.

She goes on to describe how young people describe a lack of education or little education as one of many barriers to enrolment and to voting, which I actually think is incredibly sad. As I said, the young people I speak to do have views and do have opinions, but there are, clearly from what the commissioner is saying, barriers to their actually enrolling and then expressing those views and opinions.

It therefore seems bizarre to me that we would be limiting the period in which they could enrol and in which they could have some opportunity to be informed about how to get on the roll and be enabled to express their views and opinions through how they cast their vote at the ballot box. We are obviously depriving them of their democratic right by doing that or at least shortening the opportunity for it and, of course, I think that is a really negative result.

I was also interested to hear some of the direct quotes that the commissioner put in her letter from young people. I might just read one or two of them out. On the issue of the time period or reduction of the time period, one young person said, 'Giving people less time to enrol to vote will be detrimental to the numbers of young people who turn out to vote as I think many of us will miss the cut-off dates.'

Another young person says, 'Young people who are "on the fence" about voting may miss their chance. Young people with disabilities or other commitments could miss out too.' Another says it would mean that young people are more stressed about enrolling to vote. And another says, 'Honestly young people will be taken off guard and have less time to formulate opinions and make decisions.' Those are words directly from young people themselves.

The other group that this seriously affects in my view is new migrants. In Badcoe, there are a number of non-citizens and at each citizenship ceremony I have the great joy of meeting our newest citizens, which I thoroughly enjoy. Many, of course, enrol to vote on that very day that they become citizens. I see them busily filling out their enrolment forms before they head off for lunches and celebrations with their families.

But for others it is maybe not top of mind, and it is something they think they might get around to at some point in the future. So for some people, learning of a election for the very first time in their new home country and understanding that they need to enrol within two days of the issue of writs may be a bit much to comprehend.

I fear that those new voters run the risk of missing out on understanding that there is an election, about how they need to go about getting on the roll, about the fact that they even need to be on a roll. I have certainly had people express to me that they did not even realise that was a process. They thought that as soon as they were citizens they would be automatically added to the roll. The government has all of their information, and this enrolling to vote is a new concept to them. I fear that they may also end up missing out in this change.

So it is staggering to me that this measure is even being contemplated, considering that the ECSA election report of the 2018 election recommended the exact opposite. In fact, it was ECSA's top recommendation: the number one suggestion to us as a parliament was that the enrolment should be allowed up to and including polling day. I will quote from that. Recommendation 1 states:

That the Electoral Act (1985)...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.

That seems like a pretty reasonable suggestion and not particularly controversial at all. Yes, there is probably a bit of work that needs to be done to give practical effect to this recommendation, but instead of doing this work to achieve the recommendation of ECSA this government has decided to do a 180 and walk in the opposite direction. I am baffled as to what the logic is of depriving people of a right or a greater opportunity of accessing a right, rather than empowering them to receive the franchise, especially when it is the exact opposite of what the body that we entrust to make recommendations and to carry out our elections is recommending to us.

There are so many people who have fought so hard in this country over many decades to receive the right to vote, some of them are named in the tapestries around here and have their portraits around this place. Yet with this move, it would be instantly made more difficult for some of those cohorts that we should be most trying to engage, those being young people, who we want, as soon as they become adults, to bring into our democratic processes, ensure they understand them, understand their rights and their powers to influence public debate and the decisions that their government makes; and new migrants, who have come from different systems of government, with different understandings, maybe who have not been able to vote at all in the past, or who have had quite different governmental systems from those that we enjoy here in Australia.

They are the voices we should be most trying to empower, and the least we can do in order to achieve that is to make sure that they are aware that they can enrol and that they need to do that in order to exercise their vote. There are also a number of measures in the bill designed to devalue election day itself and essentially have an election fortnight or month. The bill includes a move to even just remove the function of the Electoral Commissioner to encourage voting at a polling booth on election day, which was a fairly fundamental function until now.

Personally, I like election day; I always have. As a reporter and one who has covered many elections across Australia in my career, as well as elections overseas, I always found it a delight and a commendation of our Australian system to see who were the first people to line up in the queue when it came to voting in an Australian election, those people who were most eager to vote, who got up early and came down and wanted to be first in line. Invariably, they were new migrants and a few young people.

New arrivals to our country were eager to cast a vote for the first time in their lives. Many were from war-torn nations around the world, casting their vote and exercising the right that maybe they did not think they would ever have in their lives. They were excited, eager and even amazed at their new-found right in their new nation. Some I spoke to in those queues had waited many, many years in our country for the chance to write on that little slip of paper and to cast a vote. Honestly, the huge smiles that I saw on people's faces—they had not even voted yet; they were just lining up to be able to go in and vote—have stayed with me over the years.

There are also young people in those queues. Yes, some young people may be a little more eager than others to vote for the first time, but I have always found in those queues that there are a few young people—mostly young women, I have to say—who are keen to take that next step into adulthood and to exercise their democratic right at the ballot box for the first time. That is really exciting to me, and I hope it is to other people in this place as well.

My opposition to this step to devalue election day is, of course, not purely about my own excitement about election days; it is about the impact of devaluing election day. As a person who deeply believes in the power of information and the power of public debate and the contest of ideas, cutting short an election day is abhorrent to me. It is like walking out of a movie halfway through. It is like reading half a book and then writing a review afterwards, even though you have only read half the book.

Clearly, it will be half-baked and ill informed, and maybe if one had read the remaining pages they might have changed their mind—or they might not have—but once that vote is cast a person cannot go back and cast it again later in light of new information. They cannot hear a new policy and change their mind and they cannot discover a fact they did not know before and come back and ask for a do-over.

Once a person votes they are declaring their position and then opting out of the public debate and their right to exercise their ultimate tool in that debate: their vote. That might be fine and they might be immovable in their political views. Of course we know that many people are quite fixed and vote the same way election after election, and that is fine. It is good if people have a firm view and they have come to that position and are quite determined that they are going to vote in that way.

But there are many people—I understand it is somewhere between 10 per cent and 20 per cent of people—who do not know how they are going to vote until the election campaign starts and even right up until the day of the election. So I think it is a dangerous move to devalue election day because it de-incentivises engagement and it means that some people will cast a vote at a time of convenience, rather than at a time when they are fully informed and exposed to all the policies of the respective parties or candidates.

I do worry about this, particularly in the context of our current era of social media. What is happening now is really the much wider disintegration of messaging. Whereas a person may in the past have been able to open a newspaper or watch the TV news in the evening and have a fairly comprehensive idea of what the different policies were about different candidates or what different parties were putting forward, and they could consume that newspaper each day in the election campaign or watch the news each night, we know that that simply does not happen anymore.

We know that the circulations for newspapers are well down on what they used to be. We know that people are not watching the television news as much as they used to. We know that audience is ending up in social media instead and that so many more people are getting their messages through social media. I am certainly not anti social media, but I think you have to recognise what it actually means in terms of informing people.

We all know that there are algorithms that exist in social media and that each of our Facebook feeds gives us news and information that is similar to things that we have previously clicked on and previously liked. It means that, try as we might to get across the many different policies and ideas that are put forward by the many different candidates, those Facebook algorithms are going to reflect back to us the things we have liked in the past. They are not going to give us an unbiased or broad view of what is being put forward in an election campaign.

I think that is a real challenge for the voting public in terms of how they inform themselves of the different ideas that are being put forward and assess for themselves, rather than through the filter of what Facebook might want them to see, the policies that they find most valuable and the things that they want to vote for. Indeed, there is the risk that they will not even know about policies that are quite relevant to them or that they might be quite interested in or might want to compare and contrast against what others are serving up in an election environment. I think that is very dangerous. Needless to say, I, along with my colleagues, will be voting against the bill.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:51): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on this very important bill. It is a very important bill by virtue of the rights it seeks to take away from our citizens. I think that we take our democracy for granted at times. At times, we assume that we do not have to actually be here to protect or strengthen our democracy and that it will just be around for us when we need it.

Well, when you look overseas, that could not be further from the truth. Over the last 10 years, we have seen a decline in democracy across the world—a decline in liberal democracies and a decline in citizen participation in various nations. These are not just nations that we normally associate with what you might call either Third World republics or despotic countries but also the biggest democracy in the world, in a Western sense, namely, the United States.

There are an increasing number of reports coming out of America about individual states that are creating laws about the voting franchise to ensure that it minimises the opportunity for certain people to participate in the elections. In America, unfortunately some political parties have the view that, if you do not like the way people are voting, the best thing to do is not to change your policies or improve what you are doing but to make sure that those people who do not like what you are doing do not get a chance to vote.

It truly has been a campaign in America to minimise the franchise of African Americans, who generally speaking on most occasions would vote for the Democratic Party. In those states where Republicans hold the reins, and because of the unique way in which the American political system operates, and even though they have a federal election, the electoral rules for the federal elections are actually controlled by individual states. So they have electoral boundaries that are drawn in a way that minimises the impact or the effect of particular voter populations.

In fact, the Playmender has its origins in America, where I think it was called 'the salamander'. I cannot remember the member's name, but certainly the electorate was drawn in the shape of a salamander to make sure that a certain voting outcome was achieved in a particular state. I cannot remember which state—it was probably Alabama or Louisiana or one of those more progressive states in the United States that have a good record in democracy.

The point I am trying to make here is that laws drawn to reduce the voting franchise are, by their very nature, anti-democratic. They undermine one of the most fundamental rights in our democracy, in our society, and that is the right to vote. In my view, voting is not just a right but a responsibility. It is important that we all participate in that process to make sure that people make their contribution towards protecting and strengthening our democracy.

If it is a responsibility of ours to make sure we do participate in the democratic process, then it is incumbent on governments of any persuasion to make sure that we make it as easy as possible for people to participate. The reality is that people comply with laws and do the right thing when you make it as easy as possible for them to do so. These proposed changes to the law will make it harder for people to do the right thing, for people to participate and they will make it much more difficult for people to do the right thing, which is to participate in the electoral process. I am not suggesting that the electoral process is the start and end of our political process, but it is certainly an important part in order to engage people in that process.

This proposed provision to close off the electoral roll sooner can only have one effect: to reduce the number of people who will be eligible to vote on election day. That is simply the only impact it can have. It will have the impact of disenfranchising a whole range of people in our community from participating. Some of the effects have been covered by the other speakers very well, but it is important to emphasise that, if passed by this parliament, this bill will have the impact of reducing the capacity of people in my electorate to participate in the electoral process.

Who are some of these people? Certainly young people are generally more mobile, and therefore we need to make sure they are on the electoral roll. People going on to the electoral roll for the first time are very important. We have heard a number of speakers talk about the declining number of younger people enrolling, which is sad to hear because the young people I speak with are fully engaged in community life and civic life and are keen to exercise their political rights. We need to make sure we make it easier.

For a number of years, and I assume it still happens, the Electoral Commission participated in a program of going into schools, speaking to year 11s and 12s, and getting young people to start enrolling. Even though their enrolment does not become active until they are 18, at 17 they can put their names on the roll ready to vote, and it is a very good thing to do that. That is an example of doing the right thing and making sure we maximise the capacity of people to participate in our electoral process.

We have First Nations people, and I have a significant First Nations community in my electorate. This bill would have the effect of discriminating against that group of people by closing off the rolls early. By doing that, we are setting the electoral pendulum back prior to the referendum of 1966-67. We are going back to the days where we said, if you were a First Nations person, you should not be participating in our political process. That is the effect of this bill.

We have mentioned people with disabilities and other vulnerable people in our community—older people and people who, for a whole range of reasons, would need the extra time to make sure they could participate. Another group I would like to mention is new citizens. If we want new citizens to fully integrate into our community, engaging them in the political process is extremely important because, when they exercise their right to vote, they feel a greater sense of belonging to this country, their new country. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Approvals to Remove Track Infrastructure—Annual Report 2020-21

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

Review of the 2017 Management Plan for the South Australian Commercial Gulf St Vincent Fishery—Outcomes

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:01): I bring up the 159th report of the committee, entitled Thomas Foods Facility Supporting Infrastructure Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 160th report of the committee, entitled Kangaroo Island Ports: Cape Jervis and Penneshaw Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 161st report of the committee, entitled Leigh Creek Phase 1 Demolition Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier call a press conference this morning about an \$8 million expansion to the Flinders emergency department and not know the answer to the most obvious question: what is the net increase in beds? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When he was asked by a journalist what the net increase in the number of beds is, the Premier replied, 'I don't have that detail.'

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): I thought the Leader of the Opposition would be very happy because the government is actually fixing up the mess that he himself created when he closed the Repat hospital and broke the hearts of the veterans in South Australia and of course broke the hearts of the people of the southern suburbs. What we have been doing ever since we have been elected is putting money back into the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir: the Premier embarked on debate almost immediately.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members! Standing order 98 is often raised as a point of order. For the benefit of all, I am going to read it. It applies to rules to answers and states:

In answering a question, a Minister or other Member replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter to which the question refers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir, and I look forward to this opportunity. I presume there are going to be quite a number of questions along this line, and I am very, very keen to convey as much information as possible to this question.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition started his question saying, 'Did you call a press conference today?' and then went on to explain what he thought the motivation was. Well, actually, I will tell you why we called a meeting today, because that is the substance of the question.

We called a press conference today to say that we had actually been cleaning up the mess that had been left by the previous government. That is not debate; that was our motivation. The question was very clearly: what was our motivation in calling the press conference? I am telling you honestly what our motivation was. What we know is that the previous government downgraded hospitals and they closed the Repat hospital. Who was the minister at the time? None other than the Leader of the Opposition. That's not debate, sir: that's a fact.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Spot the hysterics, sir. It is debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hysterics from both sides. Member for West Torrens, hysterics from—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We haven't asked any bad questions. Standing order 98, sir: the Premier is now obviously debating the answer rather than trying to give us an answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Premier may have finished his answer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I've got plenty, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just bear in mind standing order 98, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir, because I am answering the substance of the question, which was about the motivation for calling a press conference. That's what the question asked. I fully appreciate that those opposite are not happy with my motivation for calling a press conference, but they actually asked about it. They asked the question about my motivation: did you actually call a press conference? Well, I am explaining to them exactly why I did call a press conference, so that is completely pertinent to the question.

If those opposite in the dream factory can't write questions to narrow it down a little bit, well, that's not my business. I am just working to answer the question as truthfully and as fully as I possibly can. My motivation for calling that press conference was to point out—and I went into some detail at the press conference—the shameful downgrading of hospitals right across South Australia. That was the substance of my press conference. You can see it all. It's all there.

I talked about who was responsible for closing and downgrading those facilities. Who was responsible? Who was the Minister for Health at the time that the Repat was closed?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is another point of order, Premier.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir: the question read this way, 'Did the Premier call a press conference—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —this morning about an \$8 million expansion to the Flinders emergency department and not know the answer to the most obvious question: what is the net number increase in beds?' I don't understand why the minister is not answering it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members would be well aware that, regardless of standing order 98, a minister or the Premier can interpret the question and answer in a way that he sees fit. To my mind at least, the Premier hasn't deviated from the substance of the press conference thus far.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir, and I appreciate that interpretation of the question because that was exactly what the question asked. I am happy for the Leader of the Opposition to ask a range of questions, and I will answer them as fully as I possibly can, but this question is about the motivation for the press conference that was being held.

They hate the fact that we are talking about what they did to the health system in South Australia. But I am going to be telling everybody from Colonel Light Gardens right the way through to Coomandook exactly and precisely what you guys did to the health system in South Australia when you were in government.

The man who stood up as the health minister defending Transforming Health—you don't hear him talking about that at the moment, but that's what he did when he was the minister in South Australia. It was an absolute disgrace for the people of our state.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, take your seat. Standing order 98?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, again, sir. The question did not refer to the opposition in any way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Premier is not responsible for what the opposition may or may not have done when they were in office.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am certainly not responsible for what they did when they were in office, but I am 100 per cent responsible for what we did, and it was a great day for South Australia today when we talked about the improvement not only to the emergency department at the Flinders Medical Centre—the busiest emergency department in South Australia and now the largest

emergency department in South Australia—fixing the mess that we inherited, but we also talked about the southern Adelaide health precinct's upgrade to their facilities down there. It's a massive project—\$86 million.

But today's press conference was all about the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department capacity. When we came to government there were 56 treatment areas within that emergency department. It's now gone up to 86, a 30 bed increase, a 30 treatment space increase on that side. It is more than a 50 per cent increase. We are happy to be doing that to provide the capacity that the people need.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): I welcome the Premier's commitment to answer questions pointedly. My question is to the Premier. What is the net increase in the total number of beds at the Flinders Medical Centre as a result of the \$8 million announcement announced today at the press conference—the net increase in the total number of beds at FMC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition was paying any attention to the press conference at all. The press conference today was about the emergency department. We all know about the original design of the emergency department because we have read about it in technical colour, published for us by the former health minister, the person who was leading much of the design of the revamped Flinders Medical Centre emergency department, and the problems with the original design. That's what we were addressing in our press conference today.

As I said, when we came to government there were 56 treatment areas within that emergency department. We have gone up to 86 treatment areas. I have to say, I am very, very grateful to the clinicians who are working down at the Flinders Medical Centre. They put a huge amount of effort into the redesign of the busiest emergency department in South Australia because they know if we get the Flinders Medical Centre right and fix the problems that we inherited from those opposite it has a flow-on effect right across all metropolitan systems.

Because the previous government took away capacity from the southern system, they closed the Repat hospital and they drove more people to the emergency department at the Flinders Medical Centre, which was designed too small, with a very poor flow, that had a consequential effect of increasing the number of presentations in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network. These consequential problems were caused by the situation that was presided over by those opposite, and that's what today's press conference was about.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There's a point of order. Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate, sir: we asked the Premier how many extra beds were at the Flinders Medical Centre as a result of this \$8 million redevelopment, and the Premier still hasn't answered the question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are quite right: he hasn't. He hasn't answered the direct question, but he's answering the question in the way he sees fit.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the Labor opposition are getting a little bit confused and, well, it wouldn't be the first time. Today's press conference was about the upgrade to the emergency department. I provided plenty of information regarding the very significant increase in the number of treatment areas within that emergency department. That was the money that was talked about today. For some reason, they seem very interested in narrowing down the discussion to the topic which wasn't the subject of the press conference today.

Maybe I will do a press conference tomorrow on the total Flinders Medical Centre, or maybe we will do it on the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network or the Central Adelaide Local Health Network or the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network. It doesn't matter where you look at the

moment, it is this government which is massively investing in the number of beds right across South Australia. There are nine emergency departments across South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this is clearly debate. It was a specific question about a specific number at the Flinders Medical Centre. The Premier might be choosing to answer it how he sees fit, but it's not in accordance with standing orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I don't uphold that. The Premier is entitled to some latitude in his answers in the same way that we give the Leader of the Opposition some latitude.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The question specifically referenced the sum of money which is being spent on the upgrade to the emergency department. It wasn't a question which canvassed the entire Flinders Medical Centre. It was talking about the upgrade, which was the subject of the press conference today. As I said, there are so many press conferences that we could call at the moment because we are upgrading emergency departments right across metropolitan Adelaide and the peri-urban areas. In fact, there are nine emergency department capacity increases that we are presiding over at the moment.

We are spending more than \$1 billion on our hospitals at the moment, fixing the mess that we inherited from those opposite. There's a huge amount of work to do, and I want to thank all the clinicians for the work that they have put into making sure that we can have the right design, especially responding to the new situation that we have with regard to the coronavirus. Ventilation is crucial, the clinicians are being consulted, the facilities are being upgraded.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time has expired. Before I call the leader, the following members are called to order: the members for Playford, Kurna and West Torrens and the deputy leader.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier won't answer the question on the net total number of beds at Flinders, is there any—

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

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There's a point of order, leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you got a problem with questions?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, take your seat. There is a point of order. Minister—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Premier!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is called to order and the member for West Torrens is warned for the first time.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 97 prevents a question starting with, 'Given that someone won't,' etc. It is out of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Standing order 97—and remember, everyone, that this is eating into your question time—states:

Such questions not to involve argument...

In putting any such question, a Member may not offer argument or opinion, nor may a Member...

So I uphold the point of order in the way you began to ask your question, leader; you offered opinion. Leader, you have the call.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that 30 beds in the Flinders Medical Centre Acute Medical Unit have been closed down by this government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): Well, what I can do is commit to providing that detail to the Leader of the Opposition. What I can do is confirm to this house, also, that we are putting a huge amount of additional beds into the overall system in South Australia, just like we are also investing in more doctors, more nurses and a significantly enhanced budget overall. The budget for Health in South Australia now is at a state record—\$7.4 billion—and that doesn't include the capital investment that we are making—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will cease interjecting. The Premier is answering the question and he will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. That would be a decent question for the Leader of the Opposition to ask but he doesn't ask those questions, he just shouts them across the chamber. The question that I have been asked is really about a very specific area of specific beds. I am not the health minister, so I think it's only reasonable that I take that specific question on notice.

But it does give me an opportunity to speak more broadly about the investment that the government is making into more beds, more doctors, more nurses, more South Australian Ambulance Service officers in South Australia to address the situation that we inherited when we came to government. I am very proud to lead a government which has increased the operating expenditure for SA Health to \$7.4 billion per year. This is a massive increase in what we inherited from those opposite.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: More doctors—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order. I've just got a feeling there are going to be lots of points of order today.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It depends whether we get answers, sir. Standing order 98: debate. It was a specific question about whether 30 beds had been closed, not about the level of expenditure broadly within the health system.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure the Premier is getting to resolving that answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was a specific question. I think the member for Lee is quite right—it was a specific question. I am not the health minister, but I am happy to answer the question to the best of my ability, and I have said that I will look into the specific issue raised by the member for Lee.

But I thought it was only helpful to point out to the house the massive increase in expenditure that we are putting into both the operating budget on an annual basis—now at a record of \$7.4 billion per year and increasing—and also the capital budget, which is upgrading the facilities, whether they be the urgent upgrades and maintenance in our country hospitals, the upgrades to the emergency departments in the peri-urban and metropolitan hospitals or just those incredibly important projects that are needed to change the model of care and align with what best practice is.

We have been doing this during and in the midst of a global pandemic. This would be hard enough work in the normal course of business, and this is why I wanted to take this opportunity to thank every single person within SA Health who has contributed to this mighty effort of keeping South Australia safe from the coronavirus and at the same time massively improving the overall amenity in our hospitals.

As I was saying in an answer to a previous question, there is a changed situation. I was talking to one of the clinicians at the Flinders Medical Centre today and he was talking to us about the importance of ventilation in emergency departments—not previously a problem, but now we have to—

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are not interested, sir.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The question was not about the Premier's gratuity. The question was about the number of beds closed during the term of this government, whether it was 30 or not. It was a very specific question. We have given him another two minutes and he hasn't got any closer to the answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Premier has about 40 seconds left.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am very proud of the people who work in SA Health in South Australia. I think they have done an outstanding job and they continue to do an outstanding job with the coronavirus pandemic but also these important upgrades. I am very proud that our government has increased the number of beds in South Australia, the number of doctors, the number of nurses and the number of people who work in our Ambulance Service in South Australia.

Whilst we see a massive increase in presentations, in the complexity and acuity of those presentations and the length of stay, and we see this massive increase in demand around the country, we are well placed in this state because of the work that is underway at the moment in concert, in cooperation, with the fantastic clinicians we have in South Australia.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Premier, is it correct that your media advisers confirmed to journalists after your press conference this morning that there is no net increase in beds at the Flinders Medical Centre?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): I know that the member for Kaurna was, of course, the adviser to the former minister, the minister who belled the cat with regard to the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, but he should appreciate, if he was paying attention during that period of time, that the Flinders Medical Centre sits within the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, which incorporates a range of services, whether they be based at Noarlunga Hospital, downgraded by those opposite; the Repatriation site, closed by the former government; or indeed those services that are provided in the community.

What we are doing in government is making sure that we can have more beds, more doctors, more nurses, more ambulance officers and more services in the community closer to where people live.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the Premier is now debating three answers in a row and he is frustrating the house and becoming obstructionist. He was asked a very simple question: did staff who answer directly to him, who are contracted to him, tell journalists whether or not there has been an increase in bed numbers or not?

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I take your point of order, minister, I will deal with the member for West Torrens, so take your seat, please, minister. There seems to be a continuing theme here of raising standing order 98 in relation to debate from answers that the Premier is giving. I am prepared to give the Premier some latitude. I understand the question was: did the Premier's media advisers give some advice to media? The Premier may or may not get to that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: The standing orders require him to, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is answering as he sees fit.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have no information that I can provide to the house regarding—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir. Point of order: standing order 98 says, 'In answering a question, a Minister or other Member replies to the substance of the question'—not the vibe, the substance of it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The substance of the question; and I don't uphold the point of order. The Premier is doing that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The member for West Torrens is arguing with the Acting Speaker's ruling, when Speaker Atkinson has very clearly laid a precedent. Matters germane to the subject that was the substance of the question are entirely in order in any minister's answer, according to Speaker Atkinson, who repeated that response and would regularly throw out opposition members of parliament for daring to raise further points of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Sit down, please, minister. Thank you for your advice. That in itself was out of order. Minister, if I can refer you back to standing order 98—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! 'A Minister or other Member replies to the substance of the question—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader! The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, I'm not finished yet—'replies to the substance of the question', which I am comfortable the Premier is doing.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The substance of this question is about whether I have any knowledge of a media adviser providing information to the media. I certainly don't have any specific information there, but I will address the substance of the question. I addressed the media myself today, explaining to them in quite a lot of detail the great work—

Mr Malinauskas: You said you didn't know.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I've got no idea why the Leader is so angry today. He's just shouting and shouting and shouting. One can only guess why he is so agitated at the moment. One can only guess why he is so agitated. But maybe, if he was genuinely interested, he might just sit still and listen to the answer in which I am addressing the substance of the question, and the substance of this question—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier now is making personal reflections and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who was that? Where did that yelp come from?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, sit down. I realise only too well that we all had a late night last night and we are here on a Thursday, but this question time has become particularly ratty. Before I call the Premier again, I am going to warn for the first time the deputy leader, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kaurana.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No specific information with regard to the allegation made by those opposite, but I myself provided, I think, quite extensive information to the media today and they listened a lot more attentively than those opposite are in the chamber this afternoon.

There seems to be quite an obsession with one facility, completely ignoring the fact that the Flinders Medical Centre sits as the largest hospital and facility within the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network. Quite frankly, I think most people can appreciate that that Southern Adelaide Local Health Network actually comprises multiple facilities as well as a facility in the community. It includes

Noarlunga Hospital, where we put back in place the 12-bed acute medical unit. That service was downgraded under the previous government. It has been enhanced under this government, and that eases pressure on the Flinders Medical Centre.

We also know—and they hate hearing about this—they closed the Repat. More than 100 beds were taken out of the system. We have reopened the Repat. As a government, we have invested more than \$110 million with the federal government to put services back on that site. They go into the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network. In addition to that, more community-based services, outreach services outside of the hospital—Hospital in the Home, if you like—these are the things that we are doing to bring services as close to the action as possible.

I am very proud of the work that we have done. There is still more work to be done. There is a massive amount of work to be done, but we have a program with a very generous \$7.4 billion annual operating budget and more than \$1 billion going into upgrading hospital emergency departments right across this state.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. When the Premier was touring the Flinders Medical Centre upgrade with television cameras this morning, did he ask any of the staff there what used to be in that space and whether there used to be an acute medical ward with 30 beds that is now closed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): I didn't ask that question. It's a very odd question for somebody to be asking that level of detail.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think we should be sitting until midnight ever again in this place because the behaviour today in question time is absolutely extraordinary. They have to get more sleep. They got up on the wrong side of the bed today—not the wrong side of the hospital bed, just the wrong side of the bed.

I was very pleased to go down and take a look through the paediatric emergency department today. It is an outstanding facility. One of the things I did ask about was the facilities for those people who might be coming in with suspected coronavirus infection because we know that this was absolutely important out at Modbury Hospital recently, when we had somebody come in with a suspected coronavirus infection and the entire emergency department oriented around making sure that person was put into a safe environment, in a negative pressure room, so that the infection couldn't spread right throughout the hospital.

I want to say congratulations to every one of the clinicians and all the other staff working at Modbury Hospital. I did ask questions as I was walking around this morning, and that was the response that I got: yes, there are negative pressure treatment facilities within the new paediatric emergency department at the Flinders Medical Centre revamp. It is also a very attractive environment for young patients who come in because, of course, they would be very anxious when coming into an emergency department.

The clinicians worked with the senior staff at the hospital to design something that not only was a capacity increase over what was there before but also responded to best practice models of care in emergency departments. I was very pleased with that. In addition to being told about the work that has happened at the Flinders Medical Centre, of course I asked the question about the overall Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

I was there with the chair of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Mr Mark Butcher, and also the interim chief executive, Mr David Morris. They were telling me about the great work that is being done right across that system. I think there is in excess of \$85 million in funding at the moment across that system, increasing the capacity, increasing the amenity, focusing on that new model of care and focusing on having services as close as possible to people living in the southern suburbs.

As I said, this will be a big benefit to the people in the southern suburbs. I know that we have many members on this side of the house—the member for Davenport and the member for Elder—

who have been very pleased to get feedback from their constituents about the upgrades there. I expect also that would be the same on the other side of the house.

It is not just a benefit to those members who have electorates adjacent to the Flinders Medical Centre or in the southern area; it is also important for the entire metropolitan area because it takes pressure off Royal Adelaide Hospital in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and that in turn takes pressure off Lyell McEwin Hospital, the other of the three spine hospitals in South Australia, and takes pressure off their emergency departments.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I go to the member for King, I warn for the first time the members for Playford and Karna. I know, member for Karna, you have a number of questions you would like to ask, yet you are warned for the first time

ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY TO 2031

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:33): My question is for the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister please update the house on the development of South Australia's Road Safety Strategy to 2031?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:33): I thank the member for King for her question and her keen advocacy for her local residents and also interest in this particular area. We know that our Road Safety Strategy to 2031 is a key pillar in our fight to reduce lives lost and also serious injuries on our roads. After extensive stakeholder and community consultation, which included webinars, online forums, local government and key stakeholder consultation via the YourSAy website, and community workshops at key regional locations—for example, Tintinara, and Loxton in the member for Chaffey's electorate, and Yorketown in the member for Narungga's electorate—the draft version of the Road Safety Strategy to 2031 has actually been released.

What you see is that we have some bold, ambitious targets: firstly, to reduce lives lost by 50 per cent by 2031 and serious injuries by 30 per cent by 2031. The draft strategy therefore proposes those very ambitious targets but, based on the baseline three-year average from 2018 to 2020 and the median population projection from the ABS, what those targets would see is the number of lives lost on our roads each year drop, from 96 to fewer than 47 per year, and the number of serious injuries drop, from 708 to 515 per year. They are ambitious targets, but they need to be.

The draft strategy identifies some key areas of focus and, if they are addressed, they will go a long way to achieving those targets—for example, supporting and enforcing safer road-user behaviour, which is very important; increasing the use and purchase of safe vehicles in our state; and of course also improving the design, construction and maintenance of road infrastructure right across the network. Reducing the number of lives lost and serious injuries in regional and also remote areas and developing a culture of road safety in South Australian workplace are also very important.

We know that we have to do more to reduce the over-representation of Aboriginal people in road crashes. A greater focus needs to be on older road users, aged 70 and above. We need to continue to improve safety for people who walk and also those who cycle and have a renewed focus on young people who live in regional or remote areas. We need to reduce their over-representation in road crashes.

Importantly, for the strategy to be successful and impactful, what we need is the help of all South Australian road users, so I would encourage everyone to get involved. That's why we are asking those in our state to have their say on the draft strategy, to provide their feedback and also their thoughts about what will make our roads safer. There are a number of things you can do, whether you walk or ride or drive or travel as a passenger. We want the views of South Australians to inform the strategy to make it as effective as possible.

So far, over 800 South Australians have logged onto the YourSAy website to have their say. We have received nearly 300 detailed submissions. We would like to see a few more, of course. I would encourage all members and indeed all South Australians to log onto the YourSAy website by 5pm on 1 September to help make our roads safer and provide that feedback.

We know that the devastation caused by lives lost and also serious injuries on our roads is beyond tragic, not only for the individuals who are involved but, of course, for their families and their

loved ones as well. There is no silver bullet that can eliminate all risk on the road, but our government appreciates that we need to do more and work with the South Australian community. That's why we are delivering a multipronged approach to reduce lives lost and also serious injuries on our roads in the state.

In addition to the development of our Road Safety Strategy to 2031, our approach includes targeted communications campaigns, tough legislative amendments to target dangerous driving and improved infrastructure as well. We will continue to work hard to implement measures to keep South Australians safe on the road.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Premier, why is ambulance ramping in South Australia now at record levels, and why has that rate increased by 400 per cent from what it was, from the same months in 2017?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38): I thank the member for Kaurna for his question. It is a good question because I think the people of South Australia do not want ramping to continue in South Australia. The former Labor government introduced ramping to South Australia. They massively—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is answering.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We inherited from them a budget which was in a perilous situation, where they had already baked into the health budget \$1.3 billion worth of cuts. Of course, what we have had to do since coming to government is to very significantly increase that operational budget, increase that capital budget and make a whole pile of changes to exacerbate the situation, which we inherited from those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader will come to order. Member for Kaurna, I might remind you that you have asked the question of the Premier. You are already on one warning, so interjections while the Premier is answering your own question are out of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Perhaps if the opposition listened a bit harder and more intently to the answers provided they wouldn't make the mess that they made recently when they were told by the Electoral Commission that they had made false and misleading statements with regard to the government's policy regarding health and were forced to issue a humiliating apology and retraction. That's what happens when you don't listen. That's what happens when you just make things up. You get called out when you make things up. The Electoral Commissioner had to say—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —you can't do that. It's not correct.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. Before I take the point of order, the member for Lee and the member for Wright are called to order. Member for Kaurna, you have a point of order.

Mr PICTON: I think the Premier is debating the answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I actually uphold your point of order. Premier, back to the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The question was about ramping and I made it very clear at the top of my answer that ramping is unacceptable. The question was why? Well, I started by pointing out what we inherited. I think that's a very logical place to start. Then I think it is only fair to point out the situation that is occurring right around the country at the moment. This is not peculiar to South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have a chorus of incredulous response from those opposite, but the reality is they can look at any media in any capital city around the country and they will find exactly the same situation—that is, there is a higher level of demand in our emergency departments across the country at the moment. This is something which has been considered by the health ministers. This is something that has been considered by the national cabinet. We see a higher level of presentation at emergency departments with much more complex acuity of cases and, of course, a longer length of stay.

This is not peculiar to South Australia; this is occurring across the nation. But because we recognise that what we inherited from those opposite on coming to government was not fit for purpose, we immediately set about working with the clinicians to upgrade the facilities that we have here in South Australia, and not just to do that but also to look at ways that we could improve the patient flow through our hospitals and whether there are alternative treatments to arriving at an emergency department.

One example of that, which some members would be aware of, is the Urgent Mental Health Care Centre, which was opened in South Australia. This was the first of its type in Australia, something we are very proud of here in South Australia. It was originally opened with quite curtailed opening hours to look at the model and how it worked. We now made a decision in the most recent budget to expand that to 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and then of course to duplicate it and expand that similar type of offering, an alternative to the emergency department pathway, out in the northern suburbs. There is plenty of work to be done. It is unacceptable ramping, and the work that we are putting in place now will ensure that ramping will end once and for all in South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will go to the member for Kurna and then the member for Newland.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:43): My question is to the Premier following that answer. When will ramping end once and for all in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): I appreciate the opportunity to talk about this because it is a very important issue. We don't—

Mr Picton: When? When?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —want ramping in South Australia. The member for Kurna shouts across, 'When, when, when?' The reality is that it's not a simple answer because there are two—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —issues here: one is demand and one is capacity to respond to that demand. To be quite honest, we don't know what will happen with that demand around the country. We know that it is elevated at the moment. We hope that that will subside but, regardless of whether it subsides or not, we are working on the other part of the equation, the part that we can control here in South Australia which is expanding the capacity of our ability to respond.

So, yes, we can't control the demand. Having said that, sir, as you would be aware, on 1 January last year we opened Wellbeing South Australia, which is a new agency focused on whole of person wellbeing and putting preventative strategies in place so that people weren't driven to emergency departments. It's a very good agency, which is headed up by Lyn Dean. She and her team are looking at a range of programs that are there to support people to stay out of hospital. We don't want them in hospital if they can remain healthy and, in a preventative way, stay out of that acute setting.

Nevertheless, people will turn up at a hospital, and we need to make sure we have the capacity to respond. That is why, since coming into government, I'm very proud that the annual health budget, the operating budget, didn't actually conform to what those opposite had planned, which was a \$1.3 billion cut to the budget over the forward estimates. Instead, what we did was increase the

annual budget by \$900 million per year. The annual operating budget is \$7.4 billion, and that is \$900 million greater than what we inherited, when we came into government, from those opposite.

In addition to that, we have had to put a huge amount of focus on capital upgrades to reverse the cuts to Noarlunga, to Modbury, to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and of course the callous closure of the Repat Hospital by those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Premier, just take a seat for a moment. The member for Lee is warned for the first time, and the leader is on one warning already. I have already thrown him out once this week; I didn't like doing it. I am always prepared to give him a bit more latitude than others given his position, but leader you can't continue to interject. It is out of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was mentioning The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a hospital close to my heart. I was born at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned for the second time.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite cut the 24/7 cardiac services. They cut the 24/7 cardiac services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. They have amnesia—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —about the services that were cut when they were in government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, can you take your seat, please. The member for Lee will leave for half an hour.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was an incredible outburst. I would have thought the member for Lee, like many people living in the western suburbs, would be very grateful for the fact that we restored the 24/7 cardiac services in the western hospital and invested a further \$4 million into the clinical cath labs at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Standing order 98: debate. The Premier continues to recite all the substantial upgrades initiated under the former Labor government when, in actual fact—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Premier—

Members interjecting:

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can I finish the point of order, sir?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, take your seat. The Premier is called to order. Minister for Energy and Mining, I will deal with your point of order in a moment. Leader, what is your point of order?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is standing order 98, sir. The question was rather specific. The Premier made an unequivocal commitment that he will end ramping once and for all. The question was: when will the ramping, once and for all, actually end. The question wasn't about the litany of heartbreak announced by the former Labor government that you have the credit for.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, leader; we have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is one of the things that happens in question time. The Leader of the Opposition likes to rewrite history, saying that everything that is occurring now under

our government, the massive increase in expenditure, was somehow created by the former government. That is simply not correct.

The reality was that when we came to government the operating expenditure for SA Health was \$6.5 billion per year. It is now \$7.4 billion per year—and we took out the \$1.3 billion worth of cuts that you had baked into the forward estimates.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Standing order 98, sir. The question wasn't about the cuts baked into the forward estimates.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, thank you for the speech—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It was when will ramping end. He has about 30 seconds left. When will ramping end?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, take your seat. I uphold the point of order. The Premier has 10 seconds.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. There were a lot of interruptions and interjections, but what I was saying was that it is a function of demand and supply. We can control supply, and that is why we are investing. On the demand side, we are working with Wellbeing SA to do everything we can with preventive programs to reduce that demand on our emergency departments in South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Premier has completed his answer. Member for Kurna, I did indicate earlier that I would go to the member for Newland, and I will honour that.

JOB CREATION

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is creating more jobs through investing in the high-tech and health and medical industry sectors in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned for the first time, and the member for West Torrens is warned for the second time.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (14:49): I thank the member for Newland for his question really focusing on the importance of the high-tech sector and the future jobs it can create. Parents and students in his electorate are very interested in future industries. It is very important, for example, for Banksia Park International High School, and here in South Australia we are rapidly transforming the high-tech sector, really moving it forward very fast to make South Australia a technology powerhouse.

Of course, that is attracting global companies to come to South Australia, which means global jobs for students and parents in the member for Newland's electorate. One of those technologies driving high-tech forward is the high speed 5G network. The federal government has recognised this. It has set up a \$20 million fund called the 5G Innovation Initiative, which is looking for a program to scale out 5G because it is an important technology.

From an industrial context, the speed of it allows for the Internet of Things to be connected, whether that is robots, machines, sensors or computers. It allows the future manufacturing industry to become much more automated. That means you get economies of scale and you get opportunities in terms of not only productivity gains but also safety improvements.

That initiative is fantastic, and that is why I am delighted to say that just recently the National 5G Industrial Incubation Lab has been announced to land right here in Adelaide. That has been partnered and led by Nokia, a global company in communications—another global company coming here to South Australia creating jobs for all South Australians.

Not only will it help create jobs but it will also improve safety. Some of the initiatives this lab is going to be looking into include increased rail passenger safety using cameras and AI, airport

situation awareness in terms of safety and also energy management, and 5G connects it all up. It is a fantastic opportunity.

In terms of who will be working with those, we've got the Department for Infrastructure and Transport for passenger safety, the Adelaide Airport, of course, for airport safety, and then also SA Power Networks. They rely on some of the other big institutions that have come to South Australia: MIT bigdata Living Lab; the Australian Institute of Machine Learning; a local company, SAGE Automation; and also Bell Labs Consulting, another major globally recognised lab coming to South Australia out of the US. That is fantastic news.

What that means is not only jobs but also another centre of excellence being positioned right here in Adelaide, this time in the communication and innovation realm. Not only will this be a national centre but also it can be a centre for the Oceania region, which again is great for jobs for South Australians. Not only can you live in Australia's number one most livable city and the world's third most livable city but also you can have a globally based career here.

That is fantastic news for South Australians, and we thank the federal government for recognising the digital transformation that is going on in South Australia. We thank Nokia for investing in South Australia. It is a huge pat on the back in recognition of how this state has transformed in the three years of the Marshall Liberal government. It really supports the hard work that this government has put in to build a thriving ecosystem in South Australia to create sustainable jobs of the future for all South Australians.

FOODWORKS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier take time to visit Foodworks on O'Connell Street and ask that business why they had a 'Vote Labor' sign out the front of their enterprise?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just wait, Premier. Leader, I think the Premier is wanting you to repeat the question, please, and for my benefit as well.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It's very simple. My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier take the time to visit Foodworks on O'Connell Street and ask the employees or the owner of that enterprise why they had a 'Vote Labor' sign flashing out the front of their premises?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54): No.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier taken any time to familiarise himself with why a range of small businesses throughout the state of South Australia are fundamentally opposed to the Premier's stance on total deregulation of trading hours?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I think there's a range of views when it comes to having more flexible hours for shopping. We know that the former trade union leader, the Leader of the Opposition, is opposed to further deregulation of shop trading hours in South Australia. Apparently, now he wants to tinker with an hour here or an hour there, but the reality is that the people of South Australia have made it abundantly clear—abundantly clear. We know that those opposite were against liberalisation like shopping on Boxing Day. Actually, people really enjoyed it in South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas: I introduced Boxing Day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before I ask the Premier to take his seat, before I ask the question—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned for the second time and I'm going to call to order the member for Chaffey and the Minister for Education.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's quite clear there is nothing that the Leader of the Opposition hasn't been responsible for. He is responsible for the sun coming up each day, for the moon, Christmas, Easter—literally everything. There is nothing this man can't control from opposition. There is nothing, absolutely nothing—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, there's a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is mocking the parliament, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I don't uphold that point of order. In fact, I think the Premier, in a way, was invited to provide that response. The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir, and I thank you for the invitation to continue my answer with regard to this important issue of the further deregulation of shop trading hours in South Australia because it's an important one. The simple fact of the matter is that the people of South Australia have spoken. They spoke at the last election. They have spoken in every single plausible poll on this issue over an extended period of time. They don't want the highly restricted arrangements that have been in place for such a long period of time, the restricted practices that we have tried to change but were blocked by the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition here in South Australia.

The reason why we would like to get on the program, like the rest of the country, is that we believe in jobs. We believe in jobs. I get a lot of feedback as the Minister for Tourism in South Australia that it is embarrassing. People come over here, they come from interstate, they go out to do some shopping late on a Saturday afternoon: closed, completely and utterly closed. Would that be the case in Sydney? Would that be the case in Melbourne? Not a chance.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not a chance. We are losing so many valuable dollars and, ultimately, hours for employees by tightening up our trading hours in South Australia. What we are doing here in this parliament because of the bloody-minded position taken by the Leader of the Opposition, the former trade union boss—who still, by the way, I think shares some staff here up in his office with the SDA, what the reason—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, that's my understanding. That is my understanding, that you've got some people doing some graphics who work between the two offices.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, take your seat.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They have almost integrated them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Premier, take your seat.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier just made a statement to the house as fact, that a union official works in the Leader of the Opposition's office, and I ask him to substantiate it or withdraw it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I could not hear the member for West Torrens' point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier made a statement of what he claims to be fact to the house, that a union official works—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining can take his seat. The Minister for Skills and Innovation is called to order—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Skills and Innovation is called to order, the member for Playford is warned for the second time and the leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier made an assertion to the house as fact. He claimed that an SDA official employed by the union works in the Leader of the Opposition's office.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Wait!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Substantiate it or withdraw it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So what is the point of order, member for West Torrens?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He may have misled the parliament, sir. He has made a statement that the Leader of the Opposition employs someone who is employed by the SDA.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Move a motion.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Move a motion? Are you inviting me to?

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Well, you've got it wrong. Who would have thought you would get something wrong.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am still not clear, member for West Torrens, whether you have asked the Premier to withdraw or not.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I have asked him to substantiate his claim to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for West Torrens, that's not a point of order. The Minister for Energy and Mining has a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, just to clarify for you, sir. I was listening very closely. The Premier said nothing about union officials—nothing whatsoever.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, minister, sit down.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Playford can leave for half an hour.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Colton has the call.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN OLYMPIANS

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing—a timely one, I may add. Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters to prepare the next generation of Olympians and Paralympians?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:02): I thank the member for Colton for the question—of course, one of the finest Paralympic athletes this state has ever produced. The 2020 Tokyo Olympics have just wrapped up and the Paralympics are underway. It is quite interesting that they were called the 2020 Tokyo Olympics, and of course they happened in 2021, but we know what we went through

with COVID there. Arguably, it was one of Australia's most successful Olympic campaigns with a contingent—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It's the third time I have had to come to my feet during this question time. It has been an absolute rabble. I would like the leader and the member for West Torrens to pipe down. You are both on two warnings. I am listening to the minister's answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I was talking about was the Paralympic Games that are on at the moment and the Olympic Games, which took place as part of Tokyo 2020, and to congratulate all those involved. As you would know, we have invested \$49 million into our South Australian Sports Institute to make sure we have a high-tech home for sport and home for developing our next quality athletes, much like the member for Colton. I do note the clock—

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and I am being rudely interrupted by the member for Mawson, who perhaps doesn't like sport, I'm not sure. Again this investment was a significant investment, and we will deliver for the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will leave it there. The mumbling is getting to me. I do note we are at the 15-minute mark and others have questions to ask. We have put \$400 million into sports since coming into government right across the board, from grassroots to elite level. We are very proud of that, and to have the great results that we saw—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear a thing.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned. The minister has been asked a question. He is entitled to be heard in silence, otherwise more people will be leaving this chamber.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I know those on that side don't like—

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —to hear about the money we invested in sport, the \$400 million.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I am going to interrupt. The member for Mawson can leave.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mawson can leave without any further comment for half an hour—14 minutes.

The honourable member for Mawson having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I was just concluding my remarks around the \$400 million that we have put into sport, from the grassroots right through to the elite. Our Sports Institute is one of those investments, along with heavy investments into soccer, with Hindmarsh Stadium, the state centre of football. There is Memorial Drive as well and a number of other facilities, such as the basketball stadium at Wayville—\$15 million there—and netball as well.

The list goes on, but we are here to support our athletes of the future and look forward to many more successes into the future. Again, I commend the member for Colton for his question and his great record. I look forward to watching the rest of the Paralympics and supporting our athletes there.

PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Were all 19 projects to be funded by the new Partnerships Program recommended by the Office for

Recreation and Sport and which sporting organisations make up the nine in the secondary stream of funding?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:05): The short answer is, yes, all 19 were recommended by the Office for Rec and Sport. This is our Partnerships Program, and a big part of what we have been doing—and we have engaged with the sporting industry heavily—is we want to get more people more active.

I mentioned the heavy investment we have made into sport right across the board—\$400 million or thereabouts—from grassroots right through to elite. What we also want to do is to get more people more active. We want to reach beyond the sporting sector, beyond the sporting realm, and find others we can bring in because we know, and the studies have been done, that if we can get every person doing 150 minutes of exercise per week we can reduce the health budget by some \$800 million a year. It sounds enormous, I know, but that is the value of exercise.

We talk about mental health and wellbeing, and we note that in this time of COVID sporting clubs, sporting organisations and recreational groups are really important for that wellbeing aspect. These projects and these programs—these 19 projects that we elected to support—are about growing it and getting more people involved in sport and more people involved in recreation and not just working in the same pool. That was the specifics of this.

We know investment in infrastructure—the local sporting clubs in everyone's communities right across the state—plays a really big part in attracting people into those sporting clubs. If we improve the facilities for people who play football, netball, calisthenics or whatever sport it might be, they will come.

But we want to work on bringing people from outside, people who aren't involved in sport. We also want to collaborate between sports and organisations to bring people together. Councils play an important role in that. One of the projects I was really proud of was Surf Life Saving partnering with cricket. You think, 'How does that work? How does that come about?' It's a really great idea.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Beach cricket.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Through beach cricket, you're right, as the member for Stuart, the Minister for Energy and Mining points out. We go to multicultural groups that have cricket at the core of what they love and what they do, but they are not really familiar with the beach, and they don't go to the beach and they are not involved with surf lifesaving.

These two organisations came together and put a program together to invite people from a Muslim background or people from an Indian background to come down to the beach, play cricket and then get immersed and engaged in surf lifesaving. Guess what? These young people are learning to be safe around the water. They are learning to be part of a surf lifesaving club and they are learning what goes on and they are growing into other sports and getting more active in that area.

These are the types of projects and programs we have partnered with, and we want to look at doing more of that. We don't just want to be giving money to organisations just to administer their organisation. We want to be putting money into projects and programs that grow participation and get more people more active. That is the key to what we are trying to do with our Partnerships Program, and we are really excited by that.

It goes hand in glove. The Partnerships Program is a \$2 million to \$3 million program, overlaid with the \$400 million or so we put into sport as far as infrastructure is concerned. We did a big grants review and we had a look at what was key to sporting organisations and they said it was infrastructure. They really stressed that a lot of that community infrastructure had been left to go to rack and ruin over a long period of time. Local sports clubs and community clubs have really dived off.

We started with our grassroots footy, cricket and netball program, and I think I have spoken about that here before. We took \$15 million of taxpayer money—and we thank the Treasurer for that—and turned it into \$59 million worth of projects and programs. That was what the community said they wanted. As a result of that, another \$24 million was in the next round we did, and we have

just closed off the \$20.6 million round and we have more applications to work through. We are building that because that is what the grants review showed us, that infrastructure was vitally important.

But then, on top of that, with our Game On, we want to get more people active. How do we bring them in and get them involved in sporting organisations? Our Partnerships Program is one of those such programs. I think all the money but 0.42 per cent went to a private investor. The rest went into not-for-profit organisations. We brought councils in, we brought our universities in and we brought sporting clubs in. There will be another round and they will be able to apply for more, so it is a great program delivering great outcomes for the people of South Australia.

PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:09): Supplementary, again to the Minister for Recreation and Sport: I did ask you in that question the nine groups that made up the secondary stream of funding that you haven't touched on at all. You mentioned the beach cricket, which is in your press release, but not the nub of the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:09): The nine streams of funding you are talking about? There were 19 programs

Ms Bedford: That's also in your press release.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, there were 19 programs. I take the member's question and she talked about the 19 programs and I think I outlined one of those examples. We can talk about more because they were great programs and great understandings.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you very much, I appreciate that. I can have a look online. Thank you. To answer the member's question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I'm not sure if those on that side don't like sport. It could be what it is. They had plenty to say— **The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. Take a seat.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The minister is imputing improper motives to a member and he is characterising the member for Florey because she dares to ask a question as not liking sport. It's ridiculous. It's debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for West Torrens. The minister said, 'I'm not sure if those opposite don't like sport.'

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In one of the questions that I was answering before there was a lot of noise coming from the other side as I talked about sport, and in the last answer I gave a lot of noise came across from the other side as I talked about sport, so it did lead me to the fact that they weren't that interested.

To go back to the point and to the question and talk about the 19 programs as far as the Partnerships Program, if we are looking at the other streams that the member talks about, to clarify that for her this is the support to sporting organisations, the more traditional sporting organisations. They are the nine. I know athletics had a program in there. I would have to go back and just check all of them. Athletics was definitely one in there. I know calisthenics wasn't. I do apologise to the member for that. I think basketball might have been in there. I will go and find those other nine that are more mainstream sporting organisations.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That's fine. I am giving the member the answer. I will get the detail for her. Again, can I say that this money that goes into sport and the outcomes that we get are so vitally important. I have talked about the great results that we saw at the Olympics and the results

that we are seeing at the Paralympics. We know that if we can get a younger generation more active—there is actually a bigger picture to this too. Speaking to people at local sporting clubs, they have moved back from interstate or overseas and they are going to these sporting clubs where we have invested this money. We have put money into improving the facilities, making them more family friendly, so we are attracting families to sporting clubs and sporting organisations.

That is really important because they are moving back here because they know there are jobs here for the future, and they have seen and heard and are a part of what we are doing as far as Lot Fourteen is concerned, the space industry and the defence industry, these sorts of opportunities that are burning away here in South Australia. They want the full picture. They want to know that we are investing in health, and the Premier has outlined today how heavily we are doing that. We are investing in education. We are investing in our sports facilities as well. It's the full suite that they want when they come to South Australia.

They want things like an arena. They want concerts to be here in Adelaide, in South Australia, as opposed to missing out. When you come to Adelaide, you can come to the Adelaide International and you have the big sporting events here. We will have an arena that will mean that concerts will be here for our next generation. This will stop people leaving South Australia. It is something we have worked really hard to do and the tide is turning. What we are doing is actually delivering for the people of South Australia.

We can't go back to the dark old days—we just cannot. We have so much to offer here in South Australia and we have to be doing it right across the board. That's why we are investing in hospitals, it's why we are investing in schools and it's why we are investing in our roads and in our infrastructure. I need to talk more about the \$17.9 billion we are spending on infrastructure right across South Australia.

We have big visions for South Australia. We don't want to shrink the state like those opposite did for so many years. We want to grow it and we want to have a state that people are proud of, whether it's going to your local sporting club, whether it's having a concert here that people want to go to, or whether it's having international athletes here like Novak Djokovic, Serena Williams and Simona Halep, who were here for the Day at the Drive held earlier in the year.

These are the sorts of things we want to grow here in our state. That is what we are doing. It is what we are focused on. We make no apologies for it. We are investing in what matters to the people of South Australia, and sporting clubs and facilities are a big part of that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Innovation and Skills is warned for the first time. Member for Frome.

COVID-19 BORDER RESTRICTIONS

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:14): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house what arrangements and facilities are in place to monitor the entry of people coming into South Australia from New South Wales and Queensland and in particular Broken Hill? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: We all understand the issue with the ever-increasing number of COVID-19 infections in regional New South Wales. I would just like to get some confirmation from the Premier that we have every aspect in place to ensure that none of that comes into regional South Australia in particular.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:14): As the member may be aware, we have level 6 restrictions in place with New South Wales at the moment. They have had over a thousand cases confirmed today. This is really a very high level of protection for our state. This was upgraded earlier this week, requiring even essential travellers who were working within their 14 days of quarantine to have had at least one vaccination. We take the advice of Health. It is implemented by SAPOL. Nobody is coming into this state at the moment from New South Wales without an exemption and there is a very high level of scrutiny on each and every one of those applications.

COVID-19 BORDER RESTRICTIONS

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:15): Supplementary: what I was asking the Premier was whether we have people or facilities at the borders on those roads coming out of New South Wales?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:15): Yes, that is the work of SAPOL. Obviously, we have a very large border with New South Wales, with Victoria, with the Northern Territory and with Western Australia. It's impossible to essentially monitor every single part of that border, but the police make operational decisions with regard to how we protect that border. I think they have done a good job. We know that some people have come in. We know that they have been identified, we know that they have been apprehended and we know that there are consequences for that.

We know that this is not part of the way we would normally exist here in Australia, putting border arrangements between states, but we do not have a choice at the moment. That's why, under the emergency management declaration that is in place at the moment, we have the State Coordinator, who is the police commissioner, with the ability to put directions into place with regard to border arrangements. Of course, he is responsible for the physical implementation of those border arrangements.

MOUNT GAMBIER ROADS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the residents of Mount Gambier what measures his department is undertaking to maintain and repair state roads in my electorate, which have seriously deteriorated to the point of being dangerous over the last three months?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:17): I thank the member for the question. I was down there a few months ago with the member having a look at a number of the roadworks that were happening. Of course, roadworks through the wintertime are far more difficult. It is more difficult to get the bitumen to set in the wet, colder weather and we appreciate that. I am also told that is a time that there can be some disruption to the roads as well, so as the weather warms up those repairs can be made.

The member would be well aware from when I was down there speaking to him that, when I came into this position, when we came into office, we were left with a three-quarters of a billion dollar road maintenance backlog. That's why we are investing billions and billions of dollars in our regional roads and part of that is repairing the roads.

The specifics as to the areas that he is talking about as far as repair that is needed, I am happy to take that on notice and check with the department as to where that is at. The weather does play a part in that, of course, but we also have a bigger picture problem to fix. That's why we are investing in roads right across South Australia: Horrocks Highway, Riddoch Highway—a big load of work is being done on that as well—Stuart Highway, Eyre Highway and a lot of other roads on the West Coast, including the Barrier Highway as well, just to name a few.

We are investing, as I have said in this house many times, some \$17.9 billion in infrastructure over the next four years and \$8.8 billion of that is going into road and public transport infrastructure. We are very conscious on this side of house that our regions have been left to go to rack and ruin over a long period of time. That's why we are investing very heavily in our regions, billions and billions of dollars to fix the roads, to make them safer. We know people in regional South Australia are over-represented in the deaths on our roads every year and we know that improving the road infrastructure will play a big part in fixing that.

I know the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services was talking about that before when he talked about road safety, that it is a multipronged facet, and actually improving those roads and upgrading those roads and making them wider is a really big part of that. To quote you, sir, you say, 'A wider road is a safer road,' and I think that is 100 per cent right. Putting those road shoulders in place—again, a lot of this work we have done in partnership with the federal

government—putting in audio tactile line marking and also the safety barriers. I know a number of those have been done on the Nelson Road in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate.

So that work is being done. Any specifics around particular areas where there has been any damage over the winter months, I am very happy to take on board and speak to the department about. I have no doubt they will be getting out and fixing those as soon as possible, along with the major works that we are doing, including the South Eastern Freeway where works have just started again today to upgrade those roads as well.

Personal Explanation

STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:20): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: During yesterday's grievance debate, the member for Mawson made the accusation:

...that the Planning Commission is engaging in politics because the Attorney-General in this place is directing her to do it.

Firstly, can I assure the house, with certainty, that this is not the case. The member refers to a number of public statements made by the state planning commissioner in relation to the legislative review of environment and food production areas which is currently occurring.

Prior to the commencement of the public consultation of the review, I was provided with a copy of the statement of intent by the commission and informed that consultation would occur for a period of eight weeks. I was not involved in the drafting of the documents in relation to this consultation. Once consultation was commenced, my office was made aware of correspondence made by the member for Mawson addressed to the Willunga Environment Centre Inc., who had published it on their public website.

My office forwarded this to staff at the Planning and Land Use Services division of the Attorney-General's Department, as they understood the member was introducing new material to the community which required further clarification. The decision to respond to the member by the commission and the manner in which they did so was one they made entirely on their own. I was not involved in any discussions with the chair, Ms Dyer, about the sites the member is concerned with; however, I did welcome the decision of the commission recently, as did the member for Mawson, that there would be no changes to the character preservation area as part of the EFPA review.

Grievance Debate

HEALTH FUNDING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:21): I appreciate the opportunity to be able to make a few remarks following quite an extraordinary question time. You cannot help but reflect on a question time like the one today and think how extraordinarily frustrated you would be if you were a punter sitting at home taking the time to watch this online.

Today, the opposition sought to ask a suite of very important and genuine questions of the Premier regarding important matters of state and policy, and in almost every single instance we had this Premier just being that little bit too clever by half, thinking that he was some sort of tactful politician circumventing the question, deliberately not answering, when people at home want to know what is going on in our health system at the moment.

Right now as we speak, from the most recent statistics that have been made available, ambulance ramping, which is probably the best demonstrator of the health of our hospital system, has quadrupled in comparison to the same months four years ago—an over 400 per cent increase in ambulance ramping presided over by this government.

So when the Premier then takes an opportunity to start to espouse all the substantial capital upgrades that are addressing the ambulance ramping crisis, the irony is not lost on us on this side

of the house that almost all of them—almost all of them—are capital upgrades that were commenced by the former Labor government.

The member for Newland would well know that the Modbury Hospital expansion was entirely initiated, entirely upgraded and initiated by the former Labor government. People in the western suburbs would well know that the \$250 million capital upgrade of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which we are still waiting for, commenced under the former Labor government. We know that the \$40 million-plus upgrade of the Lyell Mac, again formerly commenced under the former Labor government.

Then, of course, we have the temerity of the Premier to refer to what is going on at Flinders Medical Centre. At Flinders Medical Centre, the government are banging on about their \$8 million worth of capital works, but that is in comparison to \$370 million expended by the former Labor government. So you are 2 per cent of the way there when it comes to spending money on Flinders.

Even if you are listening at home, you will understand that dollars being thrown around and figures being thrown around by this government, trying to claim credit for other people's work, does not get you very far when you know that you have presided over a 400 per cent increase in ramping—a 400 per cent increase. And the member for Newland, the member for Unley and the member for Colton are laughing; they are laughing at a 400 per cent increase in ramping.

If you take the time to speak to someone who works in a hospital at the moment, you will understand the extraordinary pain those workers are going through, not just because of the level of toil they are suffering from being worked in an incredibly difficult situation but because of the genuine heartache they experience when they cannot perform their job of looking after their patients. Why? It is because of this government's wholehearted incompetence: redundancies for frontline workers, putting corporate liquidators in charge, overseeing a cut to the Ambulance Service when every other single state is increasing funding. That is their policy, and their legacy is a hospital system in absolute crisis.

The other piece of news that came out today was a recognition that this government is very far detached from its so-called constituency of small to medium businesses. Today, none other than our peak business body, Business SA, actively disendorsed this government's policy of total deregulation and actively endorsed the Labor Party's policy of sensible deregulation. So here we have the proponents of small business being actively abandoned by one industry group after the other, utterly detached from the real-world experience of small business.

We understand that small businesses are the architects of this economy. We know that retail is important, not just those people working in the stores but all the producers who put goods on the shelves. We stand with those small businesses, we stand with hospital workers, and we stand with the—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —patients who are genuinely concerned. I wish I had more time to respond to the member for Unley's reference to land tax, but we will not go to the next election with a vacuous policy, we will go with a real one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time has expired, leader—and, of course, we do not respond to interjections.

COLTON ELECTORATE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:27): I want to take the opportunity today to update my community about the happenings and projects underway in the electorate of Colton. Despite everything, it is a very busy time in the western suburbs. We are getting close to the business end of the winter sports season, and I would like to say good luck to all the local teams competing in finals over the coming weeks.

Both the boys and girls at the Lockleys and Henley Sharks football clubs and Fulham United have had very solid seasons, and I would like to highlight a couple of things. Firstly, the kids and fantastic parents of the under 12s at the Henley Sharks. A couple of weeks ago they held a fundraiser

for Josiah, Zanda and Saxon. The boys sadly lost their mother, Andrea, recently. It is these sorts of events that demonstrate what community is all about, both family and friends wrapping their arms around these boys. I know the family really appreciate that support, and I was glad to have the opportunity to help out in a very small way.

I would also like to quickly say good luck to the Lockleys women's team who are playing in the grand final tomorrow and give a shout out to the Demons Under 13 girls, who secured their elusive first win of the season last weekend. I would also like to recognise the Henley Sharks and Grange Uniting netball teams for their grand final over the weekend.

In other news, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital upgrade smashed another milestone this month, with demolition and significant work underway on site. An upgrade of The QEH was promised by Labor well over a decade ago, but it was shelved on multiple occasions and never saw the light of day on their watch. The only thing those of us in the west saw were downgrades, service cuts and Transforming Health.

I am proud that the Marshall government is delivering this significant project that will, amongst other things, increase the ED capacity, by 15 spaces to nearly 50, because the people of the west deserve to access important healthcare services close to home.

The \$12 million upgrade at Henley High School is now well underway, with phase 1 basically complete, and phases 2 and 3 construction works can be seen from Cudmore Terrace and Henley Beach Road as you drive or walk by. This upgrade is delivering the specialist teaching spaces the school has needed for quite some time and provides a platform for the year 7 to high school transition, which brings us in line with the rest of the country.

The first significant volume of external sand to arrive at West Beach in approximately 20 years has started to be trucked in. This signals the start of the delivery phase of the Securing the Future of our Coastline project. This external replenishment, along with the sand recycling pipeline—which will return sand to West Beach from Semaphore—form the major planks of this project that will secure the future of not just West Beach but Henley South, Henley and Grange.

I appreciate the understanding and patience shown by locals at West Beach as we get this sand in via truck. It is absolutely 100 per cent needed, and ultimately the delivery of this project in full will nearly eliminate the need for large trucks on our beaches into the future, just as the pipeline that successfully operates between Glenelg and Kingston Park has done.

The final plans for Breakout Creek stage 3 have now been finalised and the project has been officially launched. An irrigated area has been retained for the horses, and new pedestrian river crossings will make Apex Park and Henley High that much more accessible for families living either side of the Torrens, as well as for community members in Kidman Park, Lockleys, Fulham Gardens, Fulham and really anywhere in our local area that accesses Linear Park.

It has taken nearly 30 years, but the final stage is happening. Consultation for the proposed stage 2 of the Coast Park is now open for consultation. Plans for the new West Beach Surf Club were released, and I must say they look absolutely spectacular. Our Sea Rescue Squadron has celebrated national medals, and I held a seniors forum on mental health during COVID-19 at the Airport Over 50s Club recently. It has been an incredibly busy time.

I thank the people of Colton for putting their faith in me to represent them each and every day, and I will continue to work as hard as I possibly can to advocate and to deliver for our community.

Time expired.

BADCOE ELECTORATE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:32): I rise on a matter of acute concern to the people I represent in the suburb of Glandore. A person's home is their castle, and for the majority of us it is our biggest asset and debt and something in which we invest not just money but our heart and our soul. Homes are a place for making memories, making families and, accumulated together, they make communities.

In a place like Glandore there are many castles. Within the declared character area there are stunning examples of restored Art Deco and postwar castles, each one their own lovely domain, adored by their owners and these days highly desired by prospective owners too. As a member of the South Australian branch of the Art Deco and Modernism Society, I have a personal regard for the preservation of art deco architecture. I know the close-knit neighbourhood well and the need to preserve its beautiful streets and streetscapes.

Therefore, I found it nothing short of horrific to discover that the government has decided to degrade the character-declared neighbourhood and have it overshadowed by eight-storey developments on Anzac Highway. The only thing more offensive than this decision is that it directly breaks the promise given to the Glandore community by this government to ensure a three-storey limit across this stretch of Anzac Highway at Glandore. To add salt to the wound, this decision was made in secret by misusing, or at least overreaching, the use of a ministerial power and despite an 18-month to two-year public consultation period precisely about zoning in metro areas, including Glandore.

Now for a little local history, which I hope might enlighten those opposite, particularly the Minister for Planning. About seven years ago, the Glandore community campaigned to have the local council declare a character zone, with greater protections for the mainly Art Deco-era housing for which the suburb is renowned. That campaign was successful, and it saw the declaration of a character zone and restrictions on blocks bordering the zone to ensure tall buildings could not overshadow the lower protected homes.

In 2017, I was part of the community campaign to correct a mistake by the drafters that failed to account for a hammerhead block that wraps around behind 192 Anzac Highway, which saw that site unintentionally exempt from the height limits that applied to most of the properties on that stretch of Anzac Highway. A developer wished to construct an eight-storey development at 192 Anzac Highway, which would have been inconsistent with a three-storey limit that applied to other properties bordering the character zone. That development so far has not proceeded.

Amid community uproar, in 2018 the City of West Torrens and I asked former Minister Knoll to correct the error with the development plan amendment via a statement of intent. The former minister acknowledged the error and approved the SOI process on 27 September 2018. He indicated at that time that the new Planning and Design Code would soon eclipse the DPA process and that the correction could be made through the new code, and that promise was communicated to our community.

Given this assurance, our community did not lobby further, as we had already secured a result—or so we thought. When the new code was released in March, this promise was fulfilled, right there in black and white. The residents of Glandore were grateful that the error had been corrected and the area preserved as it was always intended to be. So it was a shock and outrageous to my community that the minister has now secretly used an executive power designed to assist in remedying trifling errors to comprehensively renege on the government's promise to the people of Glandore. This is an abuse of the powers bestowed under section 76 of the act and represents an aggressive overreach.

Rubbing salt into the wound, the decision was not announced publicly but published in the little red *Gazette*. It is profoundly undemocratic, not to mention enormously disrespectful, for the government to use this section to ram through such consequential changes by stealth. And what is worse is that an additional seven blocks have been wrapped into this eight-storey limit rather than just the one that was complained about. How those particular blocks were chosen no-one knows. Given this decision, Glandore residents are very worried that the interests of developers are being put above their own by this government.

I held a community meeting upon discovering this shocking breach of trust by the government, and affected residents packed out a meeting room at the Glandore Community Centre. A petition is now underway, and the minister would know I have also written to her outlining these local concerns. I have also received scores of letters and emails. I welcome the opportunity to speak with the minister because with each day that passes the Glandore community is at risk of a development application being lodged for up to eight storeys, at which time there will be little they can be done to stop that from being approved. This government will be responsible for that.

SMALL BUSINESS

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:37): The last 18 months have been a challenging time for businesses, families and individuals right across our state, including in my community in the north-east. Managing the health response well in South Australia by accepting the science and following the expert advice has placed us in as good a position as anywhere in the world to weather this one-in-100-year storm and come out the other side stronger than before.

Small business is the backbone of the South Australian economy. Thanks to the efforts of small business owners, their staff and the support of local communities, these businesses are leading the economic recovery of our state out of the pandemic. As small businesses grow, they create jobs, and these are opportunities for young people to get a start and for others to pursue their dream career and to help families put food on the table. I would in particular like to acknowledge the efforts of a number of local businesses that have taken risks and had confidence in what they do and in the direction of our state during these challenging times.

There is a local microbrewery I visited with the Premier just on the weekend. I must confess that I have been to it a few times now. SixTwelve Brewing is run by Brad and Alison. This is a great example of innovation and passion. SixTwelve, the name of the business, is in fact named after Brad's height. He is seven foot tall. He is former a basketball player too, so he is quite tall. Brad has been passionate about home brewing for a very long time and had been making it in his back shed for a number of years. In very recent times, in fact 12 months ago, he expanded that into a shopfront offering on Tolley Road in St Agnes, in what used to be a mechanic's shed.

His business has been in operation for about a year and has been going incredibly well. The beer is flowing fantastically through his business there, and people, particularly from the local community, are supporting it very strongly. It is a great atmosphere and a very unique offering, and I must say the beer is fantastic as well. I would very much like to congratulate Brad and Alison on what they have created. These are people who are willing to take risks and do the work to create opportunities that are great for our local community and that also help create jobs.

At the weekend, with the Premier I also recently visited Geoff to check out the recently expanded Rock Solid gym on Tolley Road. The gym is locally owned by Geoff, and it also supports many local sporting clubs, including the Houghton Football Club and the Tea Tree Gully District Football Club. It has been a very challenging time for gyms through the pandemic, but Geoff has had confidence in South Australia and for the community in the north-east to invest and expand the gym, also creating opportunities for jobs as personal trainers or other positions at that business. It is a very impressive training environment in terms of how it is presented, with fantastic equipment, a basketball ring and a half court in the centre of the facility.

Floors 2 Go is another great business on Tolley Road, run by Martin Roantree. They do flooring, such as floating floors, carpet and much more. He has worked very hard through COVID and has a very strong following, but he is also a very strong supporter of the local community, whether it is through local fundraising efforts or supporting local suppliers for his business.

Frankie and the Grocer is another very new business owned and run by Daniel. It is a fruit and veg store at the St Agnes Shopping Centre with not only fresh produce but many other very useful items. In fact, it had only been opened for a couple of weeks prior to the Modbury cluster, which was certainly not ideal, but thankfully he has a great offering and the community is really getting behind and supporting him. It is a fantastic example of someone investing locally in our community and creating local jobs.

I also recently visited the Hope Valley Cafe and Pizzeria, a business owned by Andy. He has been in business there for 12 months. It is on Grand Junction Road, just the other side of the hotel from the Hope Valley Shopping Centre. It has fantastic food, and I had a delicious burger there. I am told there wood oven pizzas are as good as any, and I am certainly looking forward to getting into those more thoroughly down the track.

Jamie is the new owner at the Tea Tree Gully Coffee Shoppe in the last 12 months or so. He is investing and revamping that business, and doing a great job. There are many other local businesses that I could acknowledge, but I am certainly running out of time. Small business is the

backbone of our economy and driving the recovery of our economy out of the pandemic, providing local opportunities for employment in good jobs and contributing significantly to the livability of our local community. So do yourself a favour. These are businesses that support our community, so let's get behind them and support local where we can.

MCKEE, HON. C.D.T.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:43): I take the opportunity today to add my voice in this place to honour the contribution to public life of the late Colin David Thomas McKee who, between the years of 1989 and 1993, represented the seat of Gilles. The seat at that time included the suburbs of Vale Park, Manningham, Windsor Gardens, Hillcrest, Northfield and Gilles Plains, all of which I have had the privilege to represent as the member for Torrens.

Colin's interest in politics started with his family. His father, the Hon. David McKee, was elected to the House of Assembly to represent Port Pirie and surrounding areas and became the Minister for Labour and Industry in the Dunstan government. Colin's political beliefs were firmly formed when the issue of conscription arose around the Vietnam War. He followed a sound Labor path, becoming an organiser for the Musicians' Union and, later, Actors and Announcers Equity, which today forms part of the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance.

In 1979, Colin was elected to the highly sought-after role of state organiser of the Labor Party, where he worked with the then secretary, former Senator Chris Schacht, for close to 10 years, dedicating himself to the success of the labour movement both at a state and a federal level. Post his parliamentary career, Colin bought the Osborne Hotel on the Lefevre Peninsula, and legend has it that, having been taught boxing by his father, on occasion, when the need arose, he put those skills successfully to the test. Following the sale of the Osborne, Colin went into partnership with others to acquire hotels in Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie, becoming highly respected in the hotel industry in South Australia through to his retirement.

I extend my sincere condolences to Colin's wife, Cyndy; his son, Todd; and the rest of his family, friends and former colleagues. I want to let them know that although Colin served only one term in the state parliament, on occasion I still have residents reflect on him in a glowing light.

On another topic, this week on 25 August we celebrated National Meals on Wheels Day, recognising the dedication and commitment of the 45,000 Meals on Wheels volunteers who tirelessly support vulnerable members of our community. In addition, there are 1,500 staff across Australia. I would like to make a special mention of the Northfield Meals on Wheels located in Oakden within my electorate of Torrens, some of whom have been preparing and delivering meals in our community for decades. I have volunteered with these amazing people, many in their 70s and 80s, who volunteer on a regular basis. Not only do these volunteers deliver meals but to many people who live on their own these wonderful people are the only real regular contact they have with another person.

Over the past 18 months, Meals on Wheels has faced a number of challenges: from devastating bushfires to floods and the COVID-19 pandemic. Our volunteers continued to turn up at their local service and make sure no-one went hungry. It has been an important source of social interaction for people who are housebound, have health issues or found themselves in home isolation due to COVID-19.

Meals on Wheels has done remarkable work in maintaining its service in the wake of the significant challenges brought about by COVID-19. Demand was up by around 20 per cent and, for a raft of reasons, there was a decline in volunteer support, but safe, contactless delivery measures were implemented. I encourage anyone who may have a spare couple of hours a week or those who are retired to consider signing up to join Meals on Wheels as a volunteer. I know that the team at Oakden are always looking for reliable volunteers and I can vouch for them as being a very friendly bunch.

We can be proud that South Australia has been at the forefront of this remarkable worldwide service for 68 years and has set the standard for the rest of Australia to follow. I am sure everyone here will join me in remembering the enormous contributions Doris Taylor MBE made to South Australian life when she launched Meals on Wheels in 1953 and in thanking also the selfless volunteers, past and present, involved in making it a truly great charitable institution.

WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP AND ECONOMIC SECURITY STRATEGY

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:47): This month, the Marshall Liberal government released the South Australian Women's Leadership and Economic Security Strategy 2021-24 as part of our commitment to ensuring that South Australia is leading from the front in opportunities for women. As the member for Adelaide, I am excited by the opportunities for women all around the city and in my electorate, and this strategy will guide our work in driving this into the future.

The South Australian economy continues to perform strongly. In July, we had the largest drop in unemployment in the nation, to 4.7 per cent, the lowest unemployment rate in South Australia for over a decade. In July, 10,661 people were employed, with a record 877,200 people now employed, the largest ever in South Australia. Recently, our female unemployment rate dropped to 4.4 per cent, the lowest level in 13 years.

The seat of Adelaide is already an education hub for women, home to the University of Adelaide, University of South Australia and a campus of Flinders University. Over 60 per cent of enrolments in these universities are females, ensuring we have a strong pipeline of female talent. Interestingly, the University of Adelaide was the first university to admit women, with graduates including the Hon. Dame Roma Mitchell, the Hon. Julia Gillard and our very own the Hon. Vickie Chapman, the first female Attorney-General and Deputy Premier in South Australia.

There is a national focus on programs and initiatives that increase the number of women and girls in trades and training. The Marshall Liberal government is working to build partnerships between government, industry and training providers to support women to make career choices in a wider range of skilled professions. Our Skilling South Australia initiative, which to date has already had more than 44,000 commencements, is focused on building these partnerships so that young people can obtain the skills and qualifications needed to build careers and meet the workforce needs of the industry.

The projects are co-designed with business and industry to support skilled career opportunities and outcomes. The results of this investment have been very significant. In the financial year 2020, compared with 2018, South Australia saw an increase of 22.5 per cent in the number of female apprentices and traineeship commencements. We know that science, technology, engineering and mathematics—known as STEM fields—continue to be areas under-represented by women. South Australia is rapidly becoming a national centre of innovation and entrepreneurship, especially in the areas of space, defence and high-tech industries.

Lot Fourteen in my electorate is a leading example of how the Marshall Liberal government is driving rapid development in these areas and building the foundations for our economic growth into the future. Increasing women's participation in STEM growth, including the many high-paying jobs it will create, is vital for our state. Ultimately promoting gender diversity across all industries and occupations benefits individuals, as well as workplaces and the community.

We know that ensuring our children and young people are able to consider all career pathways based on their interests and aptitude begins early in their life. From early childhood to secondary school, our education system is equipping students for the 21st century economy. An example of this is the stunning Adelaide Botanic High School. As a member of governing council, I have seen firsthand their strong focus on STEM subjects for students and the transformative way education is delivered.

We are also ensuring all students, no matter their background, are able to share in this future. The STEM Scholarship Program supports under-represented students to study advanced STEM SACE subjects, and in the 2020-21 SACE round girls made up 78 per cent of the total scholarship holders. These scholarships cover the cost of support to students undertaking these subjects, including tutors, laptops and excursions.

We are providing new opportunities for school students through our VET for School Students policy, which provides improved career, education and vocational pathways to employment for students enrolled in school. Just last week, the Marshall Liberal government announced new funding to support schools to implement VET where government schools will receive top-up funding of

\$300 for each student or \$600 for each eligible student with a School Card enrolled in a VET qualification as part of a Flexible Industry Pathway. The ability to complete VET qualifications while studying at school will put more students on the pathway towards long-term employment.

NAIDOC WEEK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:52): I want to speak today about the National Aborigines and Islanders Day Observance Committee, better known as NAIDOC. NAIDOC Week celebrations and commemorations were held this year from 4 to 11 July 2021 with the theme 'Heal Country'. The week provided an opportunity for not only Indigenous communities to celebrate their history, culture and achievement but also for all Australians to mark the significance of the event.

The Florey Reconciliation Taskforce, now in its 21st year, celebrated NAIDOC Week with a sunset flag ceremony, followed by refreshments, which featured the delicious lemon myrtle cookies baked by our friends at Tauondi College. These biscuits are highly recommended and much sought after.

While these celebrations invite Australians to learn about its First Nations people, it is disappointing to find many students do not yet have a good understanding of how Australia has been shaped by this heritage. South Australian Primary Principals Association President, Angela Falkenberg, in *The Advertiser* article 'Indigenous History Gap' on 28 June this year, highlights David Unaipon as an important figure recognised by his face being on the \$50 note, yet his significance is not always taught in schools.

David was an inventor, writer and political advocate for equality for Aboriginal people and assisted with inquiries and commissions into Aboriginal welfare and treatment. If our First Nations history is not properly recognised or taught in schools, the importance and significance of it cannot be fully appreciated.

Prior to British settlement, more than 500 Indigenous groups, approximately 750,000 people, inhabited Australia. Each group had a close relationship and custody over their land. Indigenous cultures were developed over 60,000 years, making these First Nations the custodians of the world's most ancient living culture. Upon settlement in 1788, the Indigenous population is estimated to have been reduced by 90 per cent in the first 10 years due to new diseases, settler acquisition of Indigenous lands and direct and violent conflicts with colonisers. The decline of the Indigenous population has continued, unfortunately, well into both the 20th and 21st centuries.

The colonisation of Australia also had a negative effect on the land. Cultural burning was an important aspect of Indigenous life for tens of thousands of years. Colonisation suppressed knowledge of cultural burns through the displacement of homelands, the banning of Indigenous languages, culture and practices and forced assimilation with settlers. Colonisers did not always have an understanding of the use of fire and the traditional fire management of the land was lost.

Climate change has a significant impact upon increasing temperatures and the hotter and drier summers we now see. Compacted with colonialism and poor land management, the effect and number of wildfires in Australia has increased. The Northern Territory has supported cultural burns of public lands since the early 1980s and New South Wales began in 2017. It was not until 14 May 2021 that the first cultural burn took place under the auspices of a South Australian local government. The cultural burn took place at the Tuthangga Carriageway Park in Adelaide.

Cultural burning involves an intimate relationship with the land and a localised understanding of environmental needs. Cultural burning is a slow burning of land, where the temperature remains low to ensure seeds and nutrients in the soil are not harmed. It also avoids the burning of trees where wildlife resides. This type of burning strengthens ecosystems and promotes growth after the burning process. The Western style of burning has become popular with the increase of extreme heat and drought seasons and involves the dropping of incendiaries from planes. This form of burning is cost-effective but less controlled, with more evidence revealing this method may not even reduce the damage caused by wild bushfires.

Cultural burning is an example of living with the land without destroying it. In 2017, the Bega Local Aboriginal Land Council in New South Wales implemented cultural burning before and after the 2018 bushfires, which destroyed nearly 100 homes and several thousand hectares of forest.

Six months after the bushfires, regrowth had begun in areas where cultural burning had occurred. This is just one example of how our First Nations people lived on the land without harming the land.

These strategies and traditional cultures hold significant practices, which support and sustain growth and life. An opportunity exists in Adelaide to promote cultural burnings and other Indigenous practices at a Dry Creek site, where walking trails can be accessed from Walkleys Road, leading to the Stockade Botanical Park. Senior Kaurna man, Karl Telfer, has visited the site with local elders Uncle Dookie O'Loughlin and Uncle Frank Wanganeen. Together, we have explored opportunities where we perhaps may have local park rangers employed to talk about the local Indigenous cultures and also to hold performances, such as dancing, storytelling, weaving and other things where interested people can learn from Aboriginal people the things that happen on our own local lands. I look forward to working with them to that end.

PORT PIRIE SPORTING PERSONALITIES

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:57): Today, I would like to speak about another project that Aaron Ward from the John Pirie Secondary School is getting his students to undertake on people who have had connections to Port Pirie and who have had significant exposure to worldwide events. I must admit that the words that I will be reading are those that were used by the students involved. This project was compiled by Jack Soutar, a student of John Pirie Secondary School.

Melbourne Cricket Ground, Saturday, September 1998: against all odds, Adelaide Crows captain Mark Bickley holds the AFL premiership cup aloft for the second successive year. The Crows had finished the minor round fifth that year and were promptly belted by Melbourne in the first qualifying round of the finals. Road trips to Perth, Sydney and then Melbourne awaited them, and history also. History also conspired against them. No side had won the flag from outside the top four in VFL or AFL history since the introduction of the modern format.

The Kangaroos were convincing minor premiers. They had won their previous 11 matches and were led by the seemingly unstoppable Wayne Carey, the code's first million dollar man. Very few gave the Crows a chance that day; however, a 40-point fourth quarter blitz saw them comfortable winners and the state of South Australia and Port Pirie erupted in celebrations. One small pocket of this vast state had more reason to celebrate than most. Mark Bickley was born in Port Pirie, a Solomontown Football Club premiership player. He was the youngest ever recipient of the Madigan Medal, awarded to the best player in the local Spencer Gulf Football League and that association.

He was best known for his hard work, team orientation and a no-nonsense leadership style, as opposed to having sheer natural talent. These were qualities that sat well with Port Pirie's hardworking populace. On that magical day in September, Bickley joined an exclusive club. Since 1897, just 18 men have captained back-to-back AFL or VFL premiership sides and his name now sits among great names such as Coventry, Daniher, Tuck, Voss, Hodge and others.

Remarkably, while Bickley is certainly Port Pirie's most well-known sporting export, he may not be the most successful. To provide him with any real competition, however, one needs to go back to 1893, the year Port Pirie boy Clarence 'Nip' Pellew was born. During the summer of 1920-21, Nip was famous for two things: his distinguished World War I service record and his membership of an Australian cricket team preparing to host England in the first Ashes series following the Great War.

Nip was no batsman and had a deplorable bowling record, yet was regarded as South Australia's greatest cricketer purely for his athleticism in the field. His second great love was Australian Rules football. He would later play for North Adelaide. He delighted crowds by attacking lofted strokes of opposing cricketers, like a fullback leaving his man to effect the spoil downfield. He hunted shots driven along the turf as if his life depended on it.

He caught rockets most spectators could not see. He had an arm like a field gun, the fitness of a midfielder and moved like lightning between wickets. He also adopted the posture of a footballer straight from the trenches. He was mouthy, confident and in your face. It was as if the archetypical modern Australian fielder had been born a century before his time.

The war to end all wars and the polarising conscription debate had recently ended. For the Australian public, particularly the Irish, an anti-British sentiment ran hot leading up to the 1920-21 Ashes series. By the Boxing Day Test at the MCG, the same venue where Bickley would be crowned

79 years later, Australia found itself 1-0 in the series but in big trouble at 7 for 282. Batting at No. 7, however, the Pirie boy flipped the switch and plundered the English attack, piling on 116. His record 180-run ninth wicket stand stood for over half a century and batted the old enemy out of the match.

A fortnight later, Nip again found himself at the crease, this time at the Adelaide Oval, again with hopes of a nation on his shoulders and his back firmly against the wall. Australia had been completely outplayed in the first innings and did well to avoid the follow on. After being run out for 35 just two days before, Nip again answered his country's call. His knock of 104 came from just 135 balls—a strike rate unheard of in those days—and helped Australia to a 3-0 series lead, with Australia—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Keep going, member for Frome. I am enthralled with the story.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —going on to win the series 5-0, a remarkable feat that would not be repeated until the summer of 2006-07. Comparisons between Bickley and Pellew are best attempted with a mathematician and plenty of spare time. Which of these two can claim being the sports-crazed city's most successful export will remain forever a matter of debate. What is fact, however, is that these two Port Pirie men have climbed two of the biggest mountains on the Australian sporting landscape.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(16:03): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 7 September 2021 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEVY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(16:04): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act and to make a related amendment to the Highways Act 1926. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(16:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Bill 2021 amends the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to introduce a road user charge for zero and low emission vehicles.

The 2020-21 budget delivered the largest investment in electric vehicles in the state's history, delivering \$18.3 million to implement South Australia's Electric Vehicle Action Plan.

The 2020-21 state budget also announced the government's intention to introduce a road user charge for zero and low emission vehicles.

Drivers of internal combustion engine vehicles pay fuel excise when they fill up their vehicles with petrol, diesel or LPG. Drivers of zero and low emission vehicles pay little or no fuel excise. Currently, there are very few zero and low emission vehicles in South Australia, but it is expected that the uptake will increase as the availability of models increases and they reach price parity with comparable internal combustion engine vehicles. As the state transitions towards a higher usage of zero and low emission vehicles, a road user charge will ensure that vehicle owners continue to provide funding for the maintenance and improvement of our road network into the future. This includes supporting infrastructure for electric vehicles.

Recognising that the market for electric vehicles is still being established, the road user charge commences from 1 July 2027 or when the sale of battery electric vehicles reaches 30 per cent of new motor vehicles sale in South Australia, whichever is earlier.

To support the uptake of electric vehicles while the market is being established, the government will also introduce an \$18 million electric vehicle subsidy package subject to the passage of this bill through parliament. The package will provide a \$3,000 subsidy for up to 6,000 electric vehicles purchased from the date the bill is approved by parliament.

Combined with the existing \$18.3 million Electric Vehicle Action Plan in South Australia, this package will increase the total level of support for electric vehicles to \$36.3 million and should support the uptake of electric vehicles in South Australia while introducing a more sustainable long-term road funding model.

The final package considers feedback received through the consultation process and allows the market for electric vehicles to develop further before commencing new charging arrangements. The design also has regard to the similar arrangements introduced in Victoria and that proposed in New South Wales.

Details of the charge

The Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Bill 2021 sets out the ability to levy a charge on electric vehicles in South Australia based on the distance travelled. The charge will be an additional levy for the registration of an electric vehicle.

The details of the charge are broadly consistent with similar arrangements in place in Victoria and proposed in New South Wales.

An electric vehicle is defined as a motor vehicle that is powered wholly or partly by electricity from an external source, commonly known as a battery electric vehicle or plug-in hybrid vehicle, or by hydrogen, commonly known as a fuel cell vehicle or fuel cell electric vehicle. The charge will not apply to heavy vehicles or kinds of vehicles outlined in the regulations. The government intends to exclude motor bikes and special purpose vehicles from the charge as part of the regulations.

The charge will be calculated based on the number of kilometres travelled by an electric vehicle on roads and road related areas. This includes travel within or outside of the state. It will not apply where travel is undertaken on an area of private land that is not open to or used by the public.

The prescribed rate applying to the number of kilometres travelled by an electric vehicle is in line with that applying in Victoria and proposed in New South Wales at:

- 2.0 cents per kilometre (indexed) for plug-in hybrid vehicles
- 2.5 cents per kilometre (indexed) for any other electric vehicles

Consistent with the proposed indexation arrangements in New South Wales, the prescribed rate will be indexed annually, from 2022-23. The prescribed rate will be indexed by movements in the Adelaide consumer price index.

The prescribed rate has been set at rates that are below the average amount of fuel excise paid by owners of internal combustion engine vehicles. The lower per kilometre charge recognises the environmental and health benefits associated with electric and zero emission vehicles.

A lower rate applies to plug-in hybrid vehicles, relative to other electric vehicles, recognising that they pay some existing fuel excise.

Based on the number of kilometres travelled by an average passenger vehicle in South Australia of around 12,200 kilometres (2018 ABS data), a 2.5 cents per kilometre rate will result in an annual charge of around \$305 for a battery electric vehicle.

Based on the average fuel consumption and distance travelled by passenger vehicles in South Australia (2018 ABS data), a non-electric vehicle pays around \$565 in fuel excise each year, on average, at the current fuel excise rates. This is around \$260 higher than the charge that will be payable by a battery electric vehicle.

The charge will be calculated and applied as part of the vehicle registration process. When a relevant owner registers their vehicle, they will be required to provide an odometer reading as part of the registration process. This approach is intended to minimise the administration burden associated with the new charging arrangements by leveraging off the existing registration arrangements.

Amendments to the Highways Act 1926

Under the Highways Act 1926 the Treasurer must pay into the Highways Fund money collected or received in respect of registration fees under the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. This will include the additional levy for the registration of an electric vehicle.

The Bill amends the Highways Act 1926 to expand the use of the Highways Fund to include the cost of installing, maintaining, altering, operating or removing charging facilities for the electric vehicles and refuelling facilities for hydrogen powered vehicles.

Electric vehicle subsidy package

Subject to the passage of the Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Bill 2021, the Government intends to introduce an \$18 million subsidy package to support the uptake of electric vehicles in South Australia.

A \$3,000 subsidy will be available for the first 6,000 battery electric vehicles purchased in South Australia, below a price cap of \$68,750 (inclusive of GST). A price cap is considered important to provide an incentive to bring lower priced electric vehicles to the market and avoid subsidising expensive electric vehicles. The subsidy will not be available for plug-in hybrid vehicles, consistent with arrangements in other jurisdictions.

Subsidies will be limited initially to one per individual person residing in South Australia and two per business located in South Australia. The vehicles will be required to be registered in South Australia.

I commend this bill to the house.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

Commencement will be on the day on which the Treasurer publishes a notice in the Gazette specifying that the Treasurer is reasonably satisfied that sales of battery electric vehicles in South Australia will be 30% of new motor vehicle sales in South Australia or 1 July 2027, whichever occurs first.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

4—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of 'electric vehicle' for the purposes of the measure.

5—Amendment of section 20—Application for registration

This clause provides for an odometer reading to be submitted in relation to an application for registration of an electric vehicle and makes a minor consequential change to some wording to ensure the language would include the new levy.

6—Amendment of section 24—Duty to grant registration

This clause makes a minor consequential change to some wording to ensure the language would include the new levy.

7—Amendment of section 24A—Registrar may accept periodic renewal payments

This clause ensures that the periodic payment scheme can address the issue of odometer readings for electric vehicles.

8—Insertion of section 37AA

This clause inserts a new provision requiring payment of an electric vehicles levy of an amount calculated at the prescribed rate per kilometre travelled on roads and road related areas (whether within or outside the State) by an electric vehicle and provides for recovery of the levy and indexing of the prescribed rate.

9—Amendment of section 41—Misuse of vehicles registered at reduced fees or without fees

This clause provides for an odometer reading to be submitted when a person is required to pay the Registrar an amount pursuant to an order under the section relating to an electric vehicle and to ensure that the 'prescribed registration fee' is taken to include any levy payable.

10—Amendment of section 57—Duty of transferee on transfer of vehicle

This clause provides for an odometer reading to be submitted in relation to an application for transfer of registration of an electric vehicle and makes a minor consequential change to some wording to ensure the language would include the new levy.

11—Amendment of section 58—Transfer of registration

This clause makes a minor consequential change to some wording to ensure the language would include the new levy.

Schedule 1—Related amendment of *Highways Act 1926*

1—Amendment of section 32—Application of Highways Fund

This clause ensures that the Highways Fund can be used for defraying the cost of installing, maintaining, altering, operating or removing charging facilities for electric vehicles and refuelling facilities for hydrogen powered vehicles.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (16:06): Honourable members, I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege that was raised by the member for West Torrens in this house yesterday, 25 August. Before addressing that matter, I will outline once again the significance of privilege as it relates to this house and its members. Privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by a vote of the house on a substantive motion.

As I have previously referred, McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand* sets out what I regard to be the best encapsulation of the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the House in the discharge of its duties'.

An essential aspect of privilege is to ensure that each member can speak without fear or favour but at the same time be able to rely on the accuracy of the statement made in the house by any member. It is not a protection from the consequences of misconduct, poor judgement or inaccurate information.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for West Torrens identifying two matters in relation to the Attorney-General and alleging that the Attorney-General deliberately and intentionally misled the house, as the Attorney-General's answers to questions in the house on 25 August were said to be contrary to answers given by the Attorney-General in an estimates committee hearing on 2 August.

The member for West Torrens refers to two lines of inquiry undertaken by the member for Enfield. The Acting Speaker invited the member for Enfield to provide any supporting or further information, and I received from the member for Enfield a letter that raised two further matters that were not the subject of the member for West Torrens' matter of privilege, and I will address those two further matters as well. I have taken the opportunity to give the Attorney-General an opportunity to respond also and I have been assisted in that regard.

In respect of the first line of inquiry of the member for West Torrens, in an estimates hearing on 2 August the member for Enfield questioned the Attorney-General on the planning commission's assessment report into the proposed wharf at Smith Bay on Kangaroo Island. The member for Enfield asked the Attorney-General the following question:

Can you advise what the current status of that application is? Is it with you for decision, or is it with the State Planning Commission at the moment?

The Attorney-General replied by saying:

As the member may be aware, the commission then, after public consultation earlier this year, have responsibility to prepare their assessment report. A few weeks ago, I understand, the commission travelled to Kangaroo Island to inspect the site, and at the end of last week they provided me with an assessment report to note. I am not sure whether they are recommendations yet—it is a little unclear—but I propose to meet with the commission tomorrow to ascertain what they actually mean by this material; it seems to [introduce] a new process. I have dealt with a number of these applications, and this one seems to introduce a new process, so I have asked to speak to the commission to find out what exactly they are suggesting I do here.

Further, the Attorney-General then goes on to say:

In any event, I have just received an assessment report from them. I think it came in on Thursday afternoon. I have had a good read of that, and hopefully I will be able to get some clarification of what I am supposed to do next. It does not ask me to approve anything. It just asks me to note the assessment report and to consider some other matters, so I need to clarify what that is. I thought it was coming to me as a final process, but anyway that is a matter I will deal with tomorrow.

I observe at this point that references by the Attorney to 'it' in respect of, 'It does not ask me to approve anything,' and, 'It just asks me to note the assessment report,' I interpret to be references to the commission as opposed to the report itself, something which is evident in the context of that response. On 25 August, the member for Enfield asked the following question to the Attorney-General:

Did the minister mislead the parliament in her evidence to the estimates committee on 2 August in relation to the planning commission's assessment report into the proposed wharf at Smith Bay on Kangaroo Island?

In explaining the question, the member for Enfield stated the following:

The Minister claimed in estimates there were no recommendations made in that report to approve the port, that it was simply for noting and was introducing a new process. The Minister stated she had a good read of the planning assessment report and I quote, 'It does not ask me to approve anything. It just asks me to note the assessment report.' The minister went on to say, 'I am not sure whether there are any recommendations yet.' I further quote: 'This one seems to introduce a new process.'

The report made 56 recommendations, including at the outset one to approve the application. I quote page 8 of the report:

'Having carefully considered these matters, along with the advice obtained, it is considered that the impacts and potential risks associated with the Smith Bay proposal can be managed through a strict suite of management plans, and licensing when required. On this basis, whilst finely balanced, it is concluded that the proposal should be granted provisional development authorisation, subject to conditions.'

The Attorney-General responded by saying:

Unlike any other major project that had been put to me, which is either recommended development or not, this had a recommendation of provisional development with reserve matters, whatever that means, and as I indicated to the committee, I did get further advice on that matter and made my decision.

Having had the opportunity myself to peruse the 237 page State Planning Commission Assessment Report, I make the following observations: the quote from page 8 of the report referred to by the member for Enfield is not a recommendation as such, nor is it itself part of the 56 recommendations (referred to by the member for Enfield) that are listed in the report, more particularly at page 183. I just observe that, at that point of the report, the recommendations are couched in terms of an opening preamble:

Should the minister decide to grant provisional development authorisation for the development, it is recommended that it is subject to the following conditions...

Those conditions ensue, and page 8 is therefore connected to page 183 in that way. The report thus puts those 56 recommendations in the form of conditional recommendations subject to a response of that nature. To that end, I see nothing in the Attorney-General's responses in both the estimates committee hearing and the house that are inconsistent with the content of the report and its absence of a recommendation requiring the Attorney-General to approve the report.

With regard specifically to references to being asked to note and so forth, there are two points at which the member for Enfield more particularly addresses references to noting. I am advised that the report was provided to the Attorney-General under the cover of a request to note, and I just indicate that I have not otherwise found any such express words in the report itself. However, in my view, nothing turns on that for the reasons I have described in my observations.

In respect of the second line of inquiry, in estimates on 2 August the member for Enfield asked the Attorney-General the following question:

Has the government ever commissioned its own assessment of a best location for that port to export timber from Kangaroo Island?

The Attorney-General responded by saying:

The government is not involved in the process. The major process is where a certain process has to occur and the assessment report is prepared by the commission.

Further, the member for Enfield asked a follow-up question:

But separately from that, has there ever been a process undertaken by government to look at where an ideal port would be to get timber off Kangaroo Island?

To which the Attorney-General responded by saying, 'Not by government.' On 25 August, the member for Enfield asked the following question to the Attorney-General:

The minister, in estimates on 2 August, claimed that no process had been undertaken by the government to determine the best location for a new port on Kangaroo Island, but on page 30 of the assessment report the commission itself confirms that the government, in regard to the Smith Bay proposal, contracted Wavelength Consulting Pty Ltd to and I quote, 'determine whether Smith Bay was an appropriate site for the wharf and port facility and to test the viability of alternative sites'.

The Attorney-General responded by saying:

In direct answer to the question, no. In relation to the report that was referred to at estimates, I did make further inquiry about whether anyone else had done that. My understanding was that the Department of Transport, which at the time was assisting under a previous iteration of this particular project, had commissioned a report. I'm not sure whether that was for the proponent or who paid for it or anything else, but I made that inquiry and, yes, there was a report prepared by a company called Wavelength.

The nature of the allegation made by the member for West Torrens is that the Attorney-General has deliberately and knowingly misled the house. In essence, the member for West Torrens is alleging that, as the Attorney-General's response on 2 August was inconsistent with the response provided on 25 August, the Attorney-General made the response on 2 August knowing the response was misleading and that it was her intention deliberately to mislead the house.

There is nothing to suggest in the actions taken by the Attorney-General, in undertaking further inquiries and advising the house of her findings, that it was the Attorney-General's intention deliberately and intentionally to mislead the house. I note the importance in these matters of taking the earliest opportunity to advise the house in respect of the matter.

I indicated at the outset that, in addition to the two matters that were adverted to by the member for West Torrens, two additional matters are set out in letter that I received subsequently yesterday evening from the member for Enfield. To describe them in terms that the member for Enfield has described them in her letter to me, they are, firstly, in relation to land interests held on Kangaroo Island in the vicinity of timber forests.

The member for Enfield notes that, in relation to the member for Enfield's question on 25 August in question time about whether the minister or any relative or related entity owned land on Kangaroo Island in an area near or impacted by the KIPT forests, the minister stated:

I have given a rather comprehensive, extended response to this to the parliament in a ministerial statement, but in short, no.

The work that the member for Enfield has done and then provided to me then constitutes advice in relation to a number of certificates of title of certain real property on Kangaroo Island. Having identified which, the member for Enfield indicates that the minister's claim that she and her relatives do not own land near the forest ought to be considered by a Privileges Committee in order to determine whether this is evidence that the minister misled the house today.

In that respect, leaving aside the question of whether there was any such intention deliberately to do so, the question in all respects must be one which is a matter of degree with a certain level of reasonable subjectivity. I have asked the Attorney-General to consider the matter in light of the specific certificates of title indicated. The Attorney-General maintains that neither she nor close family have any relevant interest in property near the forests.

The second additional matter raised by the member for Enfield is titled 'Michael Pengilly' and relates to the question of the extent to which freight transport may be increased in the near vicinity of any property at which Mr Pengilly resides. That matter is addressed in rather broad terms, if I may say, by the member for Enfield and again is a matter about which different individuals might have different observations to make.

Having made inquiry, I just indicate to the house that it has been brought to my attention that Michael Pengilly, who is presently the Mayor of Kangaroo Island, in that capacity provided a relevant

observation in remarks to media in August of this year, as I am advised, in which he was directly asked would logging trucks have gone past his house at Smith Bay, to which he indicated no. I just share that with the house for what that is worth. It is otherwise, in my view, a matter of both degree and subjectivity about which reasonable minds might differ and which debate might ensue, but it does not otherwise constitute a matter of privilege.

It is my opinion that the matters raised, for the reasons that I have addressed, are not a matter of privilege. In my view, the matter could not genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties. Accordingly, I do not propose to give the precedence which would enable any member to pursue this matter immediately as a matter of privilege. As members would be aware, this decision does not prevent the member for West Torrens or the member for Enfield, or any other member, from proceeding with a motion on the specific matter by giving notice in the normal way.

Bills

LEGISLATION INTERPRETATION BILL

Second Reading

Second reading.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Legislation Interpretation Bill 2021, which will repeal and replace the Acts Interpretation Act 1915. The Acts Interpretation Act was first enacted over 100 years ago. It sets out the rules for interpreting acts of parliament and legislative instruments, as well as the rules around the operation and effect of legislation and legislative instruments. I know everyone is riveted to learn about the contents of this bill, but I seek leave to have the balance of the second reading and the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Legislation Interpretation Bill 2021, which will repeal and replace the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915*.

The *Acts Interpretation Act* was first enacted over 100 years ago. It sets out the rules for interpreting Acts of Parliament and legislative instruments, as well as the rules around the operation and effect of legislation and legislative instruments.

It contains a dictionary that applies to the entire statute book and rules about service and penalties that also apply across the board.

Over the years, the Act has been amended many times in a piecemeal way.

As part of a review of the *Acts Interpretation Act*, the Office of Parliamentary Counsel identified anomalies, provisions that required updating, and opportunities for harmonisation with interpretation Acts of other jurisdictions.

In general terms, the Bill:

- improves the order and layout of the provisions to make them easier to find and use;
- moves some provisions to other, more appropriate, legislation;
- adds new provisions to reflect developments in statutory law and society; and
- uses consistent language.

Mr Speaker, the explanation of clauses prepared by Parliamentary Counsel for this Bill is much more detailed than usual practice. This will ensure the intention behind any of the changes is very clear. This will assist in the future interpretation of this Bill.

The explanation of clauses identifies those clauses of the Bill that are a direct transfer from the Acts Interpretation Act into the Bill, and those clauses of the Bill where changes of substance are being made. I will not go through each clause of the Bill in this speech. However, I will briefly mention notable changes.

Clause 18 provides that everything forms part of the Act or legislative instrument except editorial notes, legislative history and appendices that are for reference only. This is different from the *Acts Interpretation Act*, which provides that section headings, notes and lists of content do not form part of an Act.

This change is the most significant change proposed by the Bill. To mitigate any risk that may arise as a result of the change, a savings provision has been added.

The provision will allow section headings to be amended once administratively. The amendment would be undertaken by, or under the supervision of, the Commissioner for Legislation Revision and Publication. This is to ensure any errors in headings that had been inserted administratively can be corrected without having to undertake legislative amendments.

Clause 22 includes a new provision to determine whether Acts passed, or instruments made, on or before 20 June 1990 (and amendments to such Acts and instruments) bind the Crown.

The new provision reflects the common law as it stood prior to the High Court's decision in *Bropho v State of Western Australia*, adopting a strict and narrow test that needs to be met before an Act or instrument will bind the Crown.

I note that the Bill was amended in the Other Place and a new clause 15A was inserted.

The new clause codifies the use of extrinsic materials in the interpretation of legislation, and is closely based on the provision contained in the Commonwealth's *Acts Interpretation Act 1901*. The Government supported this amendment in the Other Place and was happy to do so.

Part 9 of the Bill updates the schedule of divisional penalties to reflect the current scale used for penalties that have a monetary value. There are still a number of older Acts that use divisional penalties rather than a monetary amount, and this change reflects the current scale that is used.

Clause 39 is a new provision that will allow certain meetings to be held remotely. I would like to indicate to members that there will a Government amendment moved during the Committee stage in relation to this clause. The amendment is consequential to the passage of the *Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Act 2021*.

In addition to allowing meetings to be held remotely, the Bill also amends the definition of 'Gazette' to allow the Government Gazette to be published electronically. These two amendments reflect changes in society to an increased reliance on digital and electronic means of undertaking work.

Part 7 of the Bill contains the provisions relating to the calculation of time periods. These have been updated and set out in a different format to improve their useability.

It is important to emphasise there is absolutely no intention for the Bill to override the provisions of other Acts or instruments where there is a contrary intention, and there has been no change from the current Act in that regard.

The new Legislation Interpretation Act will sit on the Statutes Book adjacent to the Legislation Revision and Publication Act 2002 and the Legislative Instruments Act 1978, which was formerly known as the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978.

Accordingly, all of the Acts used to guide the interpretation, operation and making of legislation and subordinate legislation will sit together on the Statues Book.

In closing, I would like to acknowledge the significant contribution of the Office of Parliamentary Counsel to the development of this Bill. They are, of course, involved in the development of every Bill. However, the nature of the work they do has meant that they are uniquely placed to contribute to the development of this Bill, and I thank them for their efforts.

Mr Speaker, I commend the Bill to the House and seek to insert the explanation of clauses into Hansard without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

The title of the measure reflects the fact that it applies to all legislative instruments as well as to Acts (so it refers to the general term 'Legislation' rather than the specific term 'Acts'). The measure will standardise the language used across the Acts that relate to the making of legislation or that have interpretative provisions of general application to legislation, so they will all refer to subordinate instruments consistently as 'legislative instruments' and they will all have titles commencing with the word 'Legislation' or 'Legislative'. This means they will all be grouped together for indexing purposes and will appear in sequence on the legislation website. Currently these Acts are the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915* (now to be the *Legislation Interpretation Act 2021*), the *Legislation (Fees) Act 2019*, the *Legislation Revision and Publication Act 2002* and the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* (now to be the *Legislative Instruments Act 1978*).

2—Commencement

This clause is formal.

3—Application of Act

The measure applies to all Acts and legislative instruments whenever made but (like the current Acts Interpretation Act) is liable to be displaced by a contrary intention.

Part 2—Definitions and rules about the meaning of words

4—Standard definitions

This clause sets out standard definitions for Acts and statutory instruments. It includes (and updates where necessary) the existing standard definitions currently in section 4 of the Acts Interpretation Act and adds new definitions of amend, appoint, Australia, business day, calendar month, calendar year, certified mail, confer, contravene, council or local council, Crown, day, District Court, DPP, entity, external territory, foreign country, function, individual, internal territory, Jervis Bay Territory, legislative instrument, Magistrates Court, make, motor vehicle, Northern Territory, office, repeal, SAPOL, SACAT, SAET, year and Youth Court. The inclusive definition of 'record' is now located in clause 8 of the measure along with other provisions relating to digital material.

Some of these definitions are being added because they appear (in one form or another) in multiple Acts across the statute book and having them in the Legislation Interpretation Act will avoid unnecessary repetition. Examples of this would be the definitions of contravene, council or local council, District Court, DPP, function, Magistrates Court, motor vehicle, SAPOL, SACAT, SAET and Youth Court.

Other terms that are used fairly frequently but currently are not usually defined (and therefore have their ordinary meaning or the meaning necessary in the context in which they are used) are now being defined in order to provide readers with greater clarity. Examples of this are appoint, certified mail, confer, Crown, make and office.

Certain other definitions (Australia, external territory, foreign country, internal territory, Jervis Bay Territory and Northern Territory) are included to ensure that we are defining geographical areas consistently with the Commonwealth definitions.

The definitions of amend, repeal and legislative instrument are included with the aim of standardising some of the language we use in relation to legislation. Currently we refer to 'amending' or 'repealing' Acts but for legislative instruments we refer to 'varying' or 'revoking' them. This difference in terminology serves no purpose and so the intent in future is to just refer to 'amending' and 'repealing' both Acts and legislative instruments. It is also intended to use the term 'legislative instrument' to refer to all forms of instruments of a legislative character made under Acts (which currently can be referred to by various terms such as subordinate legislation, delegated legislation, statutory instruments and so on).

The definitions of entity and individual are also being added with the aim of adopting them as standard terms in legislation. 'Individual' will mean a natural person. 'Person' will be defined in the same way as it currently is (and therefore includes both an individual and a corporation) and the umbrella term will be 'entity' which will mean a person (as defined), a partnership or an unincorporated body.

A final group of definitions is included to provide greater clarity in provisions about time, or provisions setting a period within which things need to be done etc. These are the definitions of business day, calendar month, calendar year, day and year.

5—References to professions registered under Health Practitioner Regulation National Law

This clause provides standard definitions of various health professions in keeping with the Health Practitioner National Law and allows for further variation by regulation to match up with any changes to the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) text that are made by regulation under the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010*.

6—Definitions to be read in context

This clause provides that definitions in an Act or a legislative instrument apply to the construction of the Act or instrument except in so far as a contrary intention appears. Currently each Act individually provides this message (eg. interpretation provisions in Acts will generally say: 'In this Act, unless the contrary intention appears—' before setting out the definitions).

7—Parts of speech and grammatical forms

This clause is equivalent to section 4AA of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

8—Inclusion of digital material

The Acts Interpretation Act currently (via the definition of *record* in section 4(1) and section 4(2) of that Act) deals with the interpretation of various specific terms that have traditionally referred to hard copy or analog material and extends the meaning of those terms to digital material. This clause replaces those current definitions with a provision that aims to provide a more complete coverage of the topic by stating the principle that, if any type of information or material is capable of being produced in digital form, a word that describes the information or material in its physical form includes a reference to the information or material in its digital form. The clause then uses the currently defined terms as examples of this general principle. The clause also deals with the interpretation of legislative requirements to produce, or make available for inspection, information or a document in cases where the information or document is kept in digital form.

9—Words relating to gender

This clause includes the interpretative provisions currently located in section 26(a), (d) and (e) of the Acts Interpretation Act but updates it to include a reference to individuals who do not identify as having any particular gender.

10—Use of singular and plural

This clause includes the interpretative provisions currently located in section 26(b), (c) and (d) of the Acts Interpretation Act.

11—Meaning of may, must and shall

This clause includes the interpretative provisions currently located in section 34 of the Acts Interpretation Act but adds further interpretative provisions for the term 'may not' and the word 'must'. These new provisions are merely added for completeness and do not alter the current position.

12—Meaning of expressions used in legislative instruments

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 14 of the Acts Interpretation Act (and does not alter the current position).

13—References to signing or execution of documents

This clause provides for the signing or execution of a document by a body corporate. This is currently dealt with in section 52 of the Acts Interpretation Act but the proposed new provision also specifies that a body corporate may sign or execute a document 'in any other manner permitted by law' to allow for particular schemes that might prescribe or permit different signing and execution regimes.

Part 3—General interpretative provisions

14—Interpretation best achieving purpose or object

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 22 of the Acts Interpretation Act. The current section operates 'where a provision of an Act is reasonably open to more than one construction'. The new provision does not include that threshold test but operates whenever a person is 'interpreting a provision of an Act or a legislative instrument'. In practice, this produces the same result because if the meaning of the provision is clear on its face then the task of 'interpreting' is unnecessary.

15—Interpretation so as not to exceed legislative power

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 22A of the Acts Interpretation Act but also states that Acts and legislative instruments are to be interpreted as operating to the full extent of the legislative power of the State and provides that legislative instruments are to be interpreted as operating to the full extent of, but so as not to exceed, the power to make the instrument.

16—Use of extrinsic material in interpretation

This clause allows for the use of extrinsic material in statutory interpretation. The provision is substantially the same as the Commonwealth and NSW provisions.

17—Act or instrument deemed always speaking

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 21 of the Acts Interpretation Act.

18—Abrogation of presumption that re-enactment etc constitutes Parliamentary approval of prior interpretation

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 18 of the Acts Interpretation Act.

19—Material that is part of Act or instrument

This clause replaces section 19 of the Acts Interpretation Act but, unlike the existing provision, the new clause provides that everything appearing in an Act or a legislative instrument is part of the Act or instrument, with the exception of certain material that gets included for public information purposes in the course of publishing legislation, namely, editorial notes, legislative history notes (which are prepared by the Commissioner for Legislation Revision and Publication under section 7(4) of the *Legislation Revision and Publication Act 2002*) and any divisional penalty appendix (which are included at the back of the Acts that still have divisional penalties, for information purposes only). This means, in particular, that section headings will now form part of an Act. A related amendment in Schedule 1 Part 4 clause 11 will provide a mechanism for alteration of any incorrect or inaccurate headings etc that were included in legislation administratively before the enactment of this new provision.

20—Use of examples

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 19A of the Acts Interpretation Act.

21—Things to be done by Governor to mean by Governor with advice of Executive Council

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 23 of the Acts Interpretation Act.

22—Determining whether Act or instrument binds Crown

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 20 of the Acts Interpretation Act but includes a provision spelling out the position in relation to Acts passed, or instruments made, on or before 20 June 1990 (and amendments to such Acts and instruments). This new provision does not alter the position in relation to these Acts and instruments but merely states the common law position.

23—Date of establishment of State

This clause is equivalent to section 4A of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

24—Declaration of validity of laws made before Australia Acts

This clause is equivalent to section 22B of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

25—Acts taken to be public Acts

This clause is equivalent to section 5 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

26—No requirement for separate enacting words

This clause is equivalent to section 6 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

Part 4—Commencement, amendment, replacement, repeal and expiry

27—Commencement of Acts

This clause provides an equivalent to the current section 7 of the Acts Interpretation Act but would allow a proclamation amending a commencement proclamation to fix an earlier date for commencement (where currently such a proclamation can only fix a later commencement date). The provision also specifies that the default 2 year rule (currently in section 7(5) of the Acts Interpretation Act and now in subclause (6) of this clause) can be disapplied in relation to a particular Act or provision. This is merely an explicit statement of the current position.

28—Time of commencement

This clause is equivalent to section 14D of the current Acts Interpretation Act but instead of saying that an Act or part of an Act that comes into operation on a particular day will be taken to have come into operation as from 12 o'clock midnight of the preceding day, the new provision states that it is taken to come into operation at the start of the day on which it commences (bearing in mind that a 'day' is defined in clause 4 as a period of 24 hours ending at the stroke of midnight so, in effect, this is the same as the current provision but is a more logical formulation).

29—Expiry

This clause makes it clear that a sunset provision may be included in any Act or legislative instrument. Currently section 39(3) of the Acts Interpretation Act makes a similar provision only for regulations, rules and by-laws but there is no reason not to have this provision apply to all legislation (and doing so does not change the current legal position).

30—Time of expiry

This clause provides clarity about the time at which a sunset provision takes effect.

31—Use of headings to indicate amending provisions

Currently every Act or regulation that amends another Act or regulation includes a provision explaining that a provision under a heading referring to the amendment of a specified Act, or a specified regulation (as the case may be) amends the Act or regulation so specified. An example of such a clause can be found in Schedule 1 clause 1 of this measure. The inclusion of this provision in the Legislation Interpretation Act will avoid the need for this repetition.

32—Effect of repeal, amendment or expiry

This clause is equivalent to section 16 of the current Acts Interpretation Act. Some aspects of the wording have been updated and direct amendments made by the Act, instrument or provision that is repealed, amended or has expired are specifically preserved (this is currently just covered by the more general wording of (b)). Subclause (6) is new and is included to provide greater certainty of the continuing operation of transitional and validating provisions.

33—Saving of administrative acts and instruments when provisions replaced

This clause is equivalent to sections 11 and 15 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

34—Amendment or repeal of Act in session in which it was passed

This clause is equivalent to section 7A of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

Part 5—Citation and references

35—Citation and references to other enactments

This clause includes equivalents to section 14B(1), (4) and (5) and section 14BA of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

36—References to amended or replaced Acts, legislative instruments and provisions

This clause is equivalent to section 14B(3) of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

Part 6—Functions and powers

37—Performance of functions

This clause is equivalent to sections 35 and 37 of the current Acts Interpretation Act and adds a new subclause (3) providing that where an Act or a legislative instrument confers a function on a body, the performance of the function is not affected merely because of a vacancy in the membership of the body or a defect in appointment of a member of the body. Currently a provision to this effect is included in each Act that creates a body to carry out statutory functions (see, for example, section 8 of the *Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005*). It is worth noting also that the new definition of 'function' in clause 4 of the measure includes a power or a duty.

38—Performance of functions under provision before commencement

This clause is equivalent to section 14C of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

39—Certain meetings etc may occur remotely

This clause was originally included in the section 17 of the *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020* but now includes a further subclause clarifying that a person remotely attending a meeting is counted as present at the meeting (including for quorum purposes).

40—Power to make instrument includes power to amend or repeal

This clause provides that a power to make an instrument includes a power to amend or repeal the instrument in the same way, and subject to the same conditions. Currently section 39(1) and (2) of the Acts Interpretation Act makes a similar provision for regulations, rules and by-laws but there is no reason not to have this provision apply to all instruments.

41—Powers of appointment

This clause incorporates the matters dealt with by section 36 of the current Acts Interpretation Act but provides a more complete statement of the rules and principles connected with appointments. Whereas the current provision only applies to appointment to a specific 'office or position', the proposed new provision applies also to the appointment of a person to perform a function or do any other thing. This means the provision is focused more on the substance of the role being played by the person rather than whether the person's role is formally designated as an 'office or position'.

42—Gender balance in nomination of persons for appointment to statutory bodies

This clause is equivalent to section 36A of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

43—Powers of delegation

This clause incorporates the matters dealt with by section 37A of the current Acts Interpretation Act but provides a more complete statement of the rules and principles connected with delegations.

Part 7—Time, distance, age and amounts

44—Calculating time

This clause replaces section 27 of the current Acts Interpretation Act but attempts to provide more helpful guidance by setting out the various ways in which periods of time can be expressed in legislation and specifying the rules to be applied in calculating the period in each case.

45—References to time

This provision is new.

46—Part-day public holidays and periods of time

This clause is equivalent to section 4(4) of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

47—References to number of sitting days

This clause is equivalent to section 27A of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

48—Measuring distance

This clause is equivalent to section 28 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

49—Attaining particular age

This clause clarifies when a person is taken to attain a particular age. This does not change the (unstated) current position.

50—Rounding down of monetary amounts

This clause is equivalent to section 45 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

Part 8—Documents provided under an Act

51—Service of documents

This clause replaces section 33 of the current Acts Interpretation Act but also includes a standard form of service provision allowing service by post and so on. Currently individual Acts and legislative instruments each need to have their own service provision to allow other forms of service and this will avoid the need for that repetition across the State's legislation.

52—Compliance with forms

This clause is equivalent to section 25 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

Part 9—Penalties and proceedings for offences

53—Penalties

This clause replaces section 30 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

54—Standard scales for penalties and expiation fees

This clause specifies the amounts that are represented by divisional penalties and divisional expiation fees in some of the older Acts. The amounts have been updated from those that currently appear in the table in section 28A of the Acts Interpretation Act to match the scale currently applied for Acts that do not use divisional penalties but specify monetary amounts instead.

55—Fines etc to be paid into Treasury

This clause is equivalent to section 29 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

56—References to offences

This clause is new but does not change the (unstated) current position. Things like definitions of 'serious offence', for example, can sometimes refer to offences punishable by a term of imprisonment of 5 years or more (or some other number of years) and this provision merely clarifies that life imprisonment or imprisonment for an indefinite term are captured by such provisions.

57—Who may proceed for recovery of penalties

This clause is equivalent to section 42 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

58—Interpretation of references to summary proceedings, complaints etc

This clause is equivalent to section 44 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

59—Offences punishable under more than 1 law

This clause is equivalent to section 50 of the current Acts Interpretation Act.

Part 10—Miscellaneous

60—Regulations

This clause is a regulation making power. It is not anticipated that there would be many regulations made under this measure but there is an ability to prescribe additional classes of 'legislative instrument' by regulation if that becomes appropriate in the future.

Schedule 1—Related amendments, repeals and transitional provisions

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Related amendments to *Evidence Act 1929*

2—Insertion of section 35A

This clause is equivalent to the current section 10 of the Acts Interpretation Act but was thought to be more appropriately located in the Evidence Act.

3—Amendment of section 36—Proof of votes and proceedings of Parliament

4—Amendment of section 37A—Proof of Gazette

5—Amendment of section 37B—Proof of printing or publishing by Government Printer

These clauses give evidentiary value to electronic versions of certain publications produced by the Government Printer.

Part 3—Related amendments to *Legislation (Fees) Act 2019*

6—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes consequential amendments (to refer to this measure instead of the Acts Interpretation Act and also to reflect the new standardised terminology of 'legislative instrument' instead of 'statutory instrument').

7—Amendment of section 5—Fee notices

This is consequential to clause 16 of the Schedule.

Part 4—Related amendments to *Legislation Revision and Publication Act 2002*

8—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This is a related amendment to reflect the new standardised terminology of 'legislative instrument'.

9—Insertion of section 4A

This clause inserts a new provision that would allow publication under the *Legislation Revision and Publication Act 2002* (which is publication on the legislation.sa.gov.au website) as an alternative to a legal requirement for publication in the Gazette.

10—Amendment of section 5—Program for revision and publication of legislation

This clause makes a related amendment that reflects the adoption of new standardised terminology relating to amendment and repeal of legislation (rather than retaining the different terms of 'variation' and 'revocation' for regulations). The amendment would also allow for the making of regulations excluding a class of legislation from the legislation revision and publication program. No regulations are currently planned under this provision but there may be classes of legislation in the future that are not suitable for consolidation and publication as part of the program and this would cater for that.

11—Amendment of section 7—Alterations that may be made in revising legislation

This clause makes related amendments to:

- reflect the adoption of new standardised terminology relating to amendment and repeal of legislation;
- refer to this measure instead of the Acts Interpretation Act;
- give the Commissioner power to omit or vary material (such as section headings) that was formerly included in legislation administratively and did not form part of legislation (but such material may not be so omitted or varied by the Commissioner more than once).

12—Amendment of section 8—Publication of legislation

This clause inserts a new provision that would allow an alternative temporary method of publication to be determined if it was not possible for some reason to publish in the usual ways (eg. if there was some large scale natural disaster that made access to the usual publishing facilities impossible).

13—Insertion of section 8A

This provision requires that, if legislation is published only in electronic form, it must continue to be made available while it is in force.

14—Amendment of section 9—Evidence

This provision gives evidentiary value to the legislative history information published on legislation.sa.gov.au that specifies the day on which legislation was published under the Act.

Part 5—Related amendments to *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978*

15—Amendment of long title

This amendment deletes an unnecessary reference to printing in the long title.

16—Amendment of section 1—Short title

This clause changes the short title of the Act to reflect the new standardised terminology of 'legislative instrument'.

17—Substitution of section 9

This clause substitutes section 9 so that it will reflect the new standardised terminology of 'legislative instrument'. The existing conferral of a power to 'amend, vary or revoke' a proclamation made under the provision is no longer necessary because of clause 40.

18—Amendment of section 11—Publishing of regulations

This amendment allows regulations to be published under the *Legislation Revision and Publication Act 2002* (which is publication on the legislation.sa.gov.au website) as an alternative to a legal requirement for publication forthwith in the Gazette.

19—Amendment of section 16A—Regulations to which this Part applies

This clause makes a related amendment to reflect the new standardised wording of amend/repeal for all legislation (instead of using vary/revoke for regulations) and also makes it clear that regulations operating pursuant to savings provisions or transitional arrangements under a repealed Act are not captured by the expiry program. Sometimes, on repeal of an Act, certain regulations made under the Act are continued by transitional provisions in the repealing Act. It is assumed that such specific provisions in a later Act would apply to the exclusion of this earlier general provision for expiry under the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* but this amendment makes that position clear. If the expiry provisions under the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* were to apply to such regulations, there would be no power to remake the expiring regulations because of the repeal of the Act under which they were made, so application of the expiry program to such regulations would effectively frustrate the savings or transitional provision passed by Parliament in the repealing Act.

20—Amendment of section 16B—Expiry of regulations to which this Part applies

This clause makes a related amendment to reflect the new standardised wording of amend/repeal for all legislation (instead of using vary/revoke for regulations) and also makes an amendment that is consequential to clause 18 of this Schedule.

21—Insertion of Part 3B

This clause inserts a new section that is equivalent to the current section 10A of the Acts Interpretation Act.

22—Insertion of sections 16E to 16G

This clause inserts new sections as follows:

16E—General provisions relating to all legislative instruments

This proposed section contains an evidentiary presumption (in proposed subsection (1)) relating to conditions and preliminary steps required in the making of a legislative instrument, a clarifying provision (in proposed subsection (2)) that makes it clear that a power to regulate a matter by legislative instrument includes a power to impose a prohibition by the legislative instrument and a provision (in proposed subsection (3)) that is equivalent to the current section 40 of the Acts Interpretation Act.

16F—Disallowance of repealing legislative instrument revives repealed instrument

This is equivalent to the current section 12 of the Acts Interpretation Act.

16G—Time of disallowance

This provision is new but clarifies the exact time at which a disallowance will take effect.

Part 6—Repeal of *Acts Interpretation Act 1915*

23—Repeal of Act

This clause repeals the current Acts Interpretation Act.

Part 7—Transitional provisions

24—Bills introduced before commencement of section 19

This clause ensures that headings in amending Bills that are introduced before the commencement of clause 19 will not form part of the Bill. Amending Bills prepared before the commencement of that provision will have been prepared in accordance with the current law and therefore will not include appropriate amending commands in relation to any headings that require consequential amendment as a result of the amending Bill. To avoid confusion and ensure a seamless transition it is intended that where a heading in principal legislation needs altering as a result of amendments in such a Bill, the Commissioner of Statute Law Revision will exercise power under proposed section 7(3) of the *Legislation Revision and Publication Act 2002* to correct the heading.

25—References to time

This clause ensures that new clause 44 will not operate to alter the period of time provided or allowed for the doing of anything under an Act or a statutory instrument where the period commenced before the commencement of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:29): Before lunch, when I started to speak on this matter, I ended up talking about the importance of making the rules very simple to ensure that everybody in our community who was eligible to vote has a capacity to vote on election day. I then talked about the importance of new citizens being able to vote on election day.

As I said—and I am sure there is quite a bit of evidence to support this—if we are trying to assist new citizens in this country, as I was once myself, to participate in the political process, we need to make sure we make it as easy as possible for them to do that as it is for other people. I think that any new law that would have the effect or impact to preclude them from participating in that process would be a retrograde step.

In terms of the young people I alluded to earlier, certainly my experience has been that young people are interested in our democratic process and that they are also interested in a whole range of issues. Some of the issues young people raised with me through my Youth Advisory Panel I am sure they would like to take to an election and to also participate in that election. For example, my young people have a strong interest in sustainability.

In fact, tomorrow I will be going to one of my local schools and undertaking a tour of a whole range of sustainability initiatives undertaken by young people at the school. Another school is visiting to learn from them, so young people are not only talking about things but they are actually doing things in our community. It is an important political issue and one issue that my party has quite different policies from those of the government, particularly at the federal level. I think that the young people in our community should have a right to voice their opinion and also right to voice their vote on these issues.

Young people are particularly concerned, like other members of our community, about mental health, particularly the mental health of young people and the impact of COVID on their lives, but there is also an increasing sense of powerlessness in our young people. They feel they have less capacity to influence the things that happen to their lives. COVID is one example, but there are a whole range of events that happen in our society.

I will come to a couple of other issues that are impacting my particular community, such as increasing pressures on them to achieve at school and the importance of getting a good ATAR, to get a good university education, to get a good job, etc. While there are an increasing number of pathways to get to university, there is certainly pressure on young people to achieve that.

One of the things that has come up in my Youth Advisory Panel when they talk about this issue is the provision of mental health services, and that is certainly a view of young people in my community. It is important to have the capacity and the ability to make judgements on election day about this because it does impact them—that is, there are insufficient services being delivered to young people or available to young people for mental health issues.

Dr Naomi Rutten, a local GP who specialises in mental health—in fact, her practice is now a mental health practice—cannot take new people on her books for about six months, and this is at the primary care level. The waitlist is endless. This is one of the issues that young people would like to ensure they have an opportunity to express their view about. More so than my generation, young people place greater weight on respectful relationships, not only between genders but between people of other cultural backgrounds, sexuality, etc. They have a much greater understanding and a greater acceptance of people from a whole range of different backgrounds, and relationships between people have to be much more respectful.

We have had some recent examples of some rather disrespectful language, which has been made public. Young people actually do value that and they want to see laws change and policies change, and for that to happen they have to be able to vote. I think they should have the right to vote, and any law that takes away that right by the way it impacts on them is wrong.

Climate change is another major issue that young people raise with me. They certainly do not support the current lack of policies at the federal level in relation to climate change and they would like an opportunity at both the state and federal levels to have their say on that. The cost of further education is another issue they raise with me and how this generation is burdened with a debt once they leave university, unlike previous generations. That is certainly having a negative impact on their forming their own households and investing in a new home, etc., because this debt is an enormous burden on them.

In my electorate, they have a particular interest in public transport. At the moment, the lack of trains is causing a huge problem for students in my area, not only for those who are trying to get to study but also for those who study and do some part-time work to support their education and living. The lack of good substitute services is causing quite a few difficulties for young people, amongst others. Recently, when I was at one of the bus stops people waiting told me they were concerned about the length of time the bus takes. If you are able to get one of the express services, that is fine but, if you are not, it can take up to an hour and 40 minutes to get to the city and back. If you go somewhere else for work, it takes even longer.

One of the other issues which has been raised with me by young people and which I am sure they would have a strong view on and would want to vote on on election day—and I think this is probably one of the reasons this government are trying to make sure as few young people as possible are able to vote on election day—is all the various cuts the government have made to TAFE that are impacting directly on our young people and their families.

In my electorate, the government have closed down courses available to local young people and moved them to the southern side of the city. People say, so what? Well, for a lot of people who perhaps do not have a car of their own and need to use public transport, etc., it makes it very difficult to access TAFE, particularly at a time when we are trying to ensure that young people enter vocational training because of a lack of skills, which has been foreshadowed.

Not only has this government closed down programs in my area but it has also moved some of the programs online, which are then run by interstate companies, making it more expensive as well. This government's lack of commitment to public vocational education that is accessible and available to all, is an issue young people hold dear, as do their families, because the increasing costs and the increasing cost of transport, etc., are often borne by the families. That is an issue I believe they should have a right to express their view about on election day.

When you look at these issues and the views of young people, in some ways it makes sense that this government is trying to make sure they do not vote because they are certainly not going to get these young people's votes. They are not going to get the votes of those people who wait hours for an ambulance. They are certainly not going to get any in my town, where we only have one ambulance service and where people do not feel safe because of the lack of health services.

These people want to vote and want to have a say in the election. What the government is doing here is trying to make sure it removes those people from the roll in an indirect way, preventing them from having their say on election day. If that was not enough, for the last year and a half our society has been turned upside down by COVID-19. It has disrupted all our lives. It has hurt some of our lives. I am one of the fortunate ones in terms of impact on me, but there are a lot of other people who have been greatly impacted by COVID-19, particularly a lot of older people in my community who are living in greater isolation.

One would think that with so much change and impact from COVID, the government would be putting its attention towards addressing those issues. Also, if this Premier believes he is doing as well as he thinks he is, then why is he trying to reduce people's capacity to vote? If he is doing a really great job, he should be saying, 'We will make enrolment as easy as possible because I am going to win as big as I can.'

I think this is really an admission that this government wants to actually get off the enrolment books as many people as possible because they are not confident, because they have not done a good job. Certainly, the commissioner and Professor Spurrier have done a good job leading this state—that has been quite clear—but when you look at other things the government has not done that. Very quickly, I would like to discuss the issue of print media. This is just another nail in the coffin of regional papers by this government.

Time expired.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (16:41): I appreciate the opportunity to address the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2021 because, as I think many of my colleagues have said throughout the course of this debate, this is an important bill because it goes to the very heart of how we contemplate our democracy, particularly in the context of the very specific issue of voting, which of course is the essential tenet of how democracy operates.

Throughout the course of the last 10 days, we have had one of those moments which has captivated the attention of the world and which we have not seen for probably a few years in a geopolitical context. What I am talking about is the events in Afghanistan recently. All those images we have seen on TV of desperate people queueing up at the airport, trying to get themselves on a plane out of their country, presumably to go to a free, democratic land anywhere they can get their hands on, I think are a demonstration of that permanent human yearning to be able to chart the course of your own destiny, to be able to have a legitimate say on what the society that you live in and that of the children you raise looks like.

For me, at least, it has just been a startling reminder of just how lucky we are here in Australia that all our citizens, most of whom were born here—myself included, obviously—take for granted that democratic ideal. We take for granted that every three or four years we get to roll up to the ballot box and cast our vote with absolute confidence in the electoral system, having absolute confidence that the will of the people will prevail on election day, win, lose or otherwise, and that we live in a place that allows that to perpetuate almost in a way we take for granted.

That is why I think all of us who are given the privilege to be elected to this place do everything we possibly can to allow those principles to manifest themselves in electoral bills that do not just preserve our democracy but enhance it, that do not just ensure its survival but, more importantly, ensure that it thrives.

The thing about democracy, as everybody knows, is that really it is in its absolute infancy. We come together in a room like this one which we think is ornate and maybe even old but in actual fact in the context of human history, we are an absolute blip on the radar. Human civilisation has been organising itself for tens of thousands of years but, despite that long history, democracy with universal franchise has only existed ever since our state's leadership on the issue for just over 100 years. It is nothing.

Over the course of that bit over 100 years, or for as long as democracy has existed, what we have seen is a constant evolution in terms of how people vote, where people vote, who gets to vote when they vote and what they are voting for. That has all evolved. So it would be utterly naive of us to assume that the model that we have right now is perfect and not worthy of change. It clearly is. In fact, we have an obligation to make sure we make changes, but when we do that it has to be about empowerment, it has to be about enfranchisement, it has to be about strengthening democracy at a time that quite frankly is under threat.

I do not think this bill meets those objectives. There are elements of the bill that are absolutely meritorious but there are elements of the bill that are not because they are contrary to the very principles that we should be standing up and fighting for. There has been growing social research coming out of democracies around the West, particularly in the United States, about how a growing cohort of people are becoming increasingly cynical towards politics and politicians—vis-à-vis increasing numbers are becoming cynical towards democracy itself.

I was stunned a couple of years ago when someone showed me a paper that had come out of the US amongst students from universities that showed the dramatic increase in the number of

people who thought democracy was failing and that potentially a one-party state would be a better way for a society to govern itself. This is in the United States of America. This is in the country where, culturally, liberty and democracy are ingrained into children from the moment they are born—far more so than here. Yet over there, what we have seen is a rather rapid decline in people's perceptions of the effectiveness of democracy and its connectedness to the people's will.

At the very time we see democracy under threat—and, of course, I would point to extraordinary political outcomes, particularly in the pre-COVID era, when we saw shocking, stunning electoral outcomes on both the far left and on the far right, whether it be Trump, whether it be the Corbynistas, whether it be the Five Star Movement in Italy, whether it be the rise of Le Pen, whether it be the stunning election of Macron, even here in Australia having five prime ministers in five years—all these shocking, startling electoral results tend to be a manifestation of people's frustration towards democracy.

At the very time all this is under threat, we now have a bill here that I do not think enhances people's confidence in democracy but, rather, diminishes it. That is why I will not vote for it. That is why my team is opposed to it. Allow me to give you an illustration of the examples which I know have been well traversed during the course of this debate.

Regarding the issue about enrolment to vote, having received an independent report from the Electoral Commission, in whom our party and I have great confidence and faith, they made it crystal clear that there should be a change to the Electoral Act to amend it to 'enable eligible electors to enrol up to and on polling day'. Why would we not do that? Who are we worried about here? What would we possibly be worried about with an eligible voter rolling up and enrolling on election day?

The member for Colton might not like people voting, and the member for Newland might not like people voting, the member for Finniss might not like people voting, but I personally like the idea that if a constituent in my seat of Croydon decides that they had better catch up with their enrolment—because they have moved address or they have just reached 18 years of age or they have just recently become a citizen—they are able to enrol straightaway. Why shouldn't they?

How they vote is up to them. They might choose not to vote for me; they might vote for another candidate. I am nonplussed about that, it is up to them—or I am plussed about it, I would prefer they did vote Labor but it is their democratic right not to do that—but why wouldn't we allow more people to enrol? Why aren't we making it easier for younger people to enrol?

Why are we ignoring the Electoral Commission saying to allow people to enrol up to election day? It might furnish a brand spanking new Australian who has finally, after years of going through a process to become an Australian citizen—they might be a former temporary protection visa holder who has come from a country like Afghanistan—have realised their ambition to become a citizen, to be able to call Australia home. Why should that person not be able to roll up on election day, enrol and then be able to cast their ballot, which I know they are excited to do.

As much as 49 per cent of my electorate or thereabouts are people who have English as a second language. I recall, on state election day in March 2018, spending the day at the Woodville Gardens booth in my electorate, my community, and being truly aghast at the length of the line before the polling booth opened at eight o'clock in the morning. The line was going around the block, and when I looked at that line I saw a representation of a very diverse community.

I remember talking to people who were casting their ballot for the very first time and seeing their genuine enthusiasm for what they were about to do. We should be making that available to every last person who is an Australian citizen who is recently enrolled—except that this bill has very deliberately and thoughtfully left that principle behind, despite the recommendation from the Electoral Commission themselves.

Why? There can be only one reason, and it is that the conservative side of politics—and we know they have an extraordinary track record for this—are not interested in making it easier for people to vote. They are only interested in making it harder for people to vote: people with immigrant backgrounds, young people. They do not want to see enfranchisement; they are interested in disenfranchisement.

This is a practice we have seen growing—only on the conservative side of politics—throughout the world. We are witnessing this debate very much consume American politics at the moment, where we are seeing arguments against thoughtful policy like independent boundary commissions, late enrolments, enrolment drives, all aimed at preserving democracy into the future, being rallied against from the conservative side of politics.

I pose this question to the Acting Speaker and those in the chamber: why did the government ignore this? It was within their means to take a principled stance and encourage more people to be able to vote on election day.

I want to assure this house that as the leader of the alternative government I take very seriously the responsibility I have as an MP, and also as the Leader of the Opposition, to make sure that electoral reform is pursued into the future—not just electoral reform but other reforms as well, that are all about improving the integrity of our democracy, the accessibility of our democracy, the transparency of our democracy, so that we can see a growing degree of confidence within our electoral system.

There is also the question of assisted voting. This is one of the elements of this bill that I think has a great degree of merit—except of course, in a way, I think there is a degree of cynicism from the Attorney-General. There is an extraordinary degree of lack of detail, assuredness and specificity regarding exactly who will be able to get access to this new system.

We think that there are very noble ambitions associated with giving people with a disability, or issues around access, the ability to cast a vote through alternate means, but it strikes me that the bill seems to be focussed on sight-impaired electors rather than going to different other groups. I understand that the bill provides for regulation to be prescribed by the Attorney-General for any class of elector, but then where does that stop? How do we know where this Attorney-General—particularly this Attorney-General—or for that matter a future attorney-general will start drawing a line about who can and cannot get access to this.

I think that one of the most critical elements of having confidence in the electoral system comes down to a genuine sense of independence around the decisions that are being made. I made reference earlier that on this side of the house we do have confidence in the Electoral Commissioner. I have great faith in our electoral commissioners around the country as being genuinely independent, but we cannot have a situation where the Attorney-General of the day can ram through a regulation that arbitrarily fundamentally alters the way people cast their ballots or who casts their ballots in certain formats.

That does not speak to transparency or assuredness or the ability for people to have confidence that we will not have decisions being made by the Attorney-General of the day that are consistent with their own political interests as distinct from the interests of our democracy more broadly.

The cynical approach in which the government has sought to pursue this bill also raises questions about the integrity of the process. Why is it that the Attorney-General has waited until—how many sitting days do we have left—approximately 15 sitting days before the next election to try to ram this bill through?

She has been sitting on these recommendations for more than 800 days. For more than 800 days she has had the opportunity to try to put up a version of the bill that facilitates more people to be able to vote, but persistently what we see from the Attorney-General is a willingness to completely ignore the recommendations of the Electoral Commission on getting people to enrol to vote.

The rate of enrolment amongst young voters, as the Attorney-General should know, is declining. The rate of young people enrolling is declining. In fact, 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. I repeat: 38.9 per cent of 18 year olds eligible to vote did not enrol, and this Attorney-General says, 'Yippee!' This Attorney-General says, 'That is something worth preserving.' That is why she has not accepted the recommendation of the Electoral Commissioner to allow people to roll up and vote on election day.

What is wrong with making it easier for young people to vote? I simply pose that question. I mentioned before the value of having people who have recently become Australian citizens voting, but what is this government's problem with trying to improve the shocking rate of 38.9 per cent of young people not enrolled to vote at the election? This is all because they think it is in their political interests.

As the member for Light I think adeptly pointed out, what government seeks to make it harder for people to vote? Only a government ashamed of their record, only a government that is clinging on to other people making decisions for them, namely, people like the police commissioner, who has essentially been in charge of the state for as long as the Premier has and who has an exemplary record. They are clinging on to a hope that maybe a situation around the pandemic will suit their purposes electorally.

It is not a policy vision for the future of the state. It is not a willingness to stand by their record or policy delivery, which of course is patently appalling, whether it be broken promises around privatisation, infrastructure pipedreams that never came to fruition or broken promises on better services for the people of South Australia. It is an extraordinary record of saying, 'We are decreasing taxes,' on one hand but in actual fact increasing taxes and coming up with whole, brand-new taxes, like an electric vehicle tax on the other.

If this government were sincere about its policy record, if this government actually had a policy vision for the future of the state, they would be actively encouraging every young person they could get their hands on to enrol. The member for Newland would be running around the Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre saying to young people who shop, go to the movies and work there, 'Yes, I believe that you should have to pay for your parking. Yes, I believe that the company that owns this shopping centre should be able to put in boom gates, and I'm proud to stand by that record and let you cast your vote at the ballot box accordingly.'

But, no, the member for Newland does not want the electors in his electorate to know that he thinks paid parking is something that they should be able to pursue. He does not want them to be able to go to the ballot box and enrol to vote on the day and say, 'I'm a young person, I'm a young worker at Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre and I want to let Richard Harvey know that I don't like that paid parking that is going to come my way because of the member for Newland's inaction in policy.'

If we are willing to stand by our record, if we are willing as parliamentarians to allow people to cast their judgement on our performance over the course of the preceding four years, then we would be encouraging them to vote and we would make it easier for them to enrol to vote so they can have a say at the next election. This parliament has a duty and an obligation to uphold South Australia's proud and long history of progressing democracy, making it easier for people to participate, trying to enfranchise people, not disenfranchise them. Unfortunately, this bill ignores that precedent. This bill ignores that principle, which is why it should be opposed and why I will be opposing it.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (17:01): I rise with others on this side of the house to oppose this bill. It is quite astounding in the current circumstances that we do so. We speak quite regularly in this chamber about the rise of undemocratic and antidemocratic movements right across the globe, about regimes that once prided themselves on being pillars of democracy slowly, slowly creeping further and further into what is becoming a new catchphrase, that is, 'liberal democracies'.

It is quite a displeasure that I need to stand here with my colleagues from the Labor opposition to oppose many measures in this bill. Of the particular measures that have been just put by the Leader of the Opposition I will reflect on two in particular: the reduced franchise of voters and the attempts in this bill, through changes, to inhibit the ability of young and first-time voters to enrol and then subsequently exercise their democratic right to vote. If the right to vote is not the most central tenet of our democracy, then I challenge anyone in this place to say what is. I have not heard any contributions from any member on either side that challenge that assertion.

We are a state and nation with an incredibly short history from the time of European occupation. However, within that time, we have seen a dramatic and profound series of changes and roundabouts in our democracy and our ability to truly enfranchise all to vote. We have seen massive changes in the rights of Aboriginal people not only to vote but also to be recognised as citizens of

this country. We have seen changes and, as we have heard so often in this place, led women's franchise and the suffragette movement that was spawned by South Australia. It has changed, but it came from a system where, once upon a time, it was landowners and the aristocracy who ruled the roost in this place. Well, thank God we have come a long way from that despite cynical attempts in this bill.

Looking at this bill, it would be reasonable for some—not me—to mount an argument that they, and some on the other side, would be fawning over a return to those dark old days of massively reduced franchise and massively reduced voting rights for the citizens of South Australia, where they can effectively count on the top hat brigade and Adelaide Club elites to rule the roost of this state.

It would be a very reasonable argument that could be put with some reflection on this bill. It is that type of condescending, patriarchal view that some on the other side would have, should this argument be mounted—that they are born to rule, that they know best, that it is their right and their privilege to rule. Unfortunately, little in this bill goes to dissuading someone seeking to make that argument.

Many of us in this chamber, from both sides of politics, often and regularly attend citizenship ceremonies, where we reflect on the many rights and privileges that Australian citizenship brings. We have heard the member for Colton on a number of occasions reflect on voting being the greatest privilege and the greatest right that new citizenship brings. I do look forward to the change to the member for Colton and others from the other side in their platitudes at these citizenship ceremonies because the greatest right and privilege of citizenship, which is to vote and the right to vote, now come with a massive disclaimer: it is the greatest right and the greatest privilege—on our terms. Not if you are young, not if you are from a CALD background and certainly not if you are from a lower socio-economic background.

But, rest assured, if those on the other side do not change their platitudes at these ceremonies, I know that those of us on this side are more than happy and willing, and will fill in the citizens of this state about what is changing and why it is changing.

There are literally people being evacuated from Kabul as we speak. It was an enormous sign of solidarity for this parliament to be illuminated last night in the colours of the Afghan flag. People are literally putting their lives on the line and are willing to sacrifice their lives because of their commitment to democratic ideals and democracy itself. The ideals of a single unitary value of voting and what that means in their commitment to fight, to revolt, to flee and to ultimately seek safety in this country.

A large portion of these people have settled in the western suburbs, in my electorate of Cheltenham. As I have spoken of before, almost 40 per cent of people who reside in Cheltenham were born overseas—people like the Vietnamese boat people who fled Vietnam after the fall of Saigon, who were welcomed with such compassion, first by Malcolm Fraser and then by successive governments thereafter, and the White Russians, whose journey fleeing oppression in Russia took them through Russia to China and then eventually Queenstown in pursuit of that democracy. As a sidenote, that settling in Queenstown means that Queenstown has the highest portion of Russian speakers of any suburb in this state, and quite a few Russian churches to boot.

The West is home to generations of brave and courageous immigrants who fought for democracy, fought for freedom and fought for simple things like the right to vote—the Greeks and those from former Yugoslavia, from Myanmar, from Hong Kong more recently, from east and west Africa, and even my father from Hungary. This bill, and proposed changes being sought by the government, flies in the face of this ideal, and it is enormous disrespect to the values these people have fought for and found in Australia.

Recently, as part of Refugee Week I spent some time at Woodville High School with their students of a refugee or CALD background. I was lucky enough to witness the creation of a poem. It was under the guidance of the incredible and talented, principled activist and slam poet Manal Younus.

At the heart of this workshop, amongst these young students of Woodville High School, was a strong sense of journey and a strong sense of what it means for the rights and privileges of these

younger people and their families. To me, it was clear that unlike some of us in this place, me included, who at times do not value the finely balanced nuance of democracy, they certainly did not underestimate it and they certainly do not underestimate it.

One of the quite profound reflections in this poem, which I would be very pleased and honoured to read to the house now, encapsulates some of that commitment to and strong sense of their place and purpose in our democracy. The poem reads:

We are students, we are daughters and older brothers.

We are athletes, aspiring doctors, mechanics, artists and teachers.

We are gamers, we are dreamers and much more.

We are the people of Woodville High School.

It is a privilege that I was able to spend some time with those students just a couple of weeks ago in bringing that together.

My reflections to those students would be: what would the proponents of this bill proffer in respect of their argument in favour of change? What will those in the Marshall government say to first-time voters and high school students when they find out that their ability to enrol, once the writs are issued, has been reduced by some 300 per cent, by some two-thirds of the time? What will they say? What will the arguments be in favour, and will they even bother?

If they do not bother to try to mount the argument as to why these young people should have less time and should have fewer rights to enrol to vote and exercise a vote, it shows simply they do not care about the young people who are being affected by this, and it is being done for cynical reasons. It is not only a retrograde step and measure in itself but it is also a massive departure from the recommendation of the Electoral Commissioner himself and his recommendations to allow enrolment right up to and including election day.

We just heard from the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Enfield about some of their own reflections on that report, but it is telling that after such a significant amount of time between the report being tabled and provided to the Attorney and this bill being debated today that there has been a huge departure from the recommendations themselves. The recommendation from the Electoral Commissioner in respect of enrolment up to and on polling day could not be any clearer. In fact, it could not be any more important because it is recommendation 1 of his report. The Commissioner himself says:

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.

He goes on to say:

One of the solutions is to address falling participation rates successfully implemented by ECSA's counterparts in both New South Wales (NSW), New Zealand (NZ), Queensland and Victoria (as well as most Canadian jurisdictions)—

Of course, a commonwealth country of note—

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 missed the close of rolls.

That is the key phrase here: 'to enfranchise'. We should be debating in the year 2021 new and innovative ways that we can ensure that more people have the right to vote, that more people can easily access voting, not fewer. The fact that we on this side of the chamber have, contribution after contribution, talked about the reduction of franchise—the reduced capacity to enrol to vote—should be a significant concern to all. It certainly is to me.

Not only has the Electoral Commissioner made these recommendations but there has been quite a considerable reflection and piece of work undertaken by the Commissioner for Children and Young People, much to her credit. She has taken steps to engage and hear directly from young people who will be affected by this bill and these proposed changes by the Marshall government. It

is certainly not something that is consultation and engagement that you would accuse the government of doing in this respect.

I want to thank the commissioner, Helen Connolly, for her work. I have known and worked professionally with Helen Connolly for many years, back to my time as the secretary of SA Unions, and the commissioner's commitment to engaging and amplifying the voices of young people and also the disenfranchised and the marginalised is something that deserves great respect and my commendation in this house. The Commissioner for Children and Young People notes:

We know that over one third of eligible 18 year olds (38.9%) and one quarter of eligible 18 to 24 year olds (25.4%) were not on the electoral roll at the time of the 2018 state election. Participation was also lowest among this age group, with only 76% of enrolled 18-24 year olds casting a vote, and younger voters reported the lowest levels of confidence about completing their ballot papers.

The consequences of a growing lack of trust when combined with a growing lack of civics proficiency is worrying for the future of our democracy and the ideals and values it represents.

That is a stark reflection, when we look at the two major proposals in this bill. Of course, there is the reduction in time provided to first-time voters, or any person for that matter, to enrol to vote once the writs are issued, and also a significant winding back on the ability for the commissioner to promote voting on the day.

As someone who was elected in a special by-election, I know that the literacy of many voters at the best of times is limited, and certainly in a by-election we see a significant dip in the way people both engage and turn out to vote, so it is not a great secret to say that a significant part of my by-election campaign was speaking to voters about the fact that an election was on. That was the first hurdle.

As the opposition leader said, every single person in my electorate that we can engage and encourage to participate in civics and democracy is a good thing. We are not afraid of voters. In fact, we on the Labor side and in the labour movement embrace the ability to seek to persuade a voter because with that we get to talk about our values. We get to talk about what we stand for. We get to talk about what the future looks like, rather than the fact that we want to stick to where we are and, as I reflected on, turn back the clock to days of old when it comes to voting franchise. That is not who we are and we embrace the ability and the opportunity to engage with young people and first-time voters on any issue.

But I must say that the ability and the tenacity and the commitment that those of us on our side will be telling the tale of the Attorney's treachery on this will be loud and amplified and not limited to our existing areas. I also note, as time starts to conclude, that my opposition colleagues have already reflected on this: the perplexing gap, time and interlude between the government receiving the report of the Electoral Commissioner into the 2018 South Australian election and the introduction of this bill into parliament with, I think, some 15 days of sitting left in this session before we head off to the 2022 state election, which we cannot bring on fast enough, if you ask me.

What has caused this delay? It is a reasonable question to ask. We might get some answers in the committee stage, but what has caused this delay? What on earth has been the contrary legislative agenda from the Attorney and the Premier? We know from the Premier not much. The Attorney does carry a heavy load and certainly does the lion's share of the lifting for her Premier. But what has the cabinet been up to? What has delayed this decision?

In fairness, I thought I would reflect on this because I did not want to be too unfair on the Attorney, who does have a significant load. Some of the things that might explain why this has been delayed, why we have had a couple of years between drinks, could be the scandals that have plagued this government. That could slow things down. Criminal charges, travel rorts and mass resignation of ministers could have contributed to the slowdown. It could be ICAC probes. It could be findings of misconduct against ministers of the Crown. It could be bullying and harassment investigations that have taken the attention of the Premier, or maybe it could be more personal issues for the Attorney, things like Henry Keogh and the payment that she made to Henry Keogh and, of course, dodging the public backlash around that.

It can certainly be said that you can always back the self-interest horse. The self-interest horse of this government is bolting down the back straight and they are being chased, despite the

whipping of the Attorney and the whipping of the Premier, by the scandals, by the ICAC investigations and by the pork barrelling, No matter how hard they whip this horse, no matter how hard they protest, this is cynical and this is cooked up against those people who do not tend to vote Liberal, who do not tend to vote conservative and it will not be forgotten by those people.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:22): In the absence of there being any other speakers, I would firstly like to thank all members for their contributions during the second reading stage and I look forward to the discussion of a number of matters that have been raised during the debate in committee. I note foreshadowed amendments from the opposition, which largely cover the question of the availability of enrolment up to 6pm on polling day, use of the SACAT for resolution of matters in dispute and pre-poll issues or the length of the period of pre-poll as I have categorised those three areas of proposed amendment. I will briefly address those during the course of the response.

The first thing I need to do is inform the house that there has been, I think, a complete red herring raised in this debate. I need to say this because I think every speaker without exception was obviously singing from the same hymn sheet in the instructions they were given and there has been a perpetuation of the error of this through the debates. Some of it, I think, is not actually their fault. Let me start with the first item.

Members would be aware that the vast majority of amendments presented in this bill are actually recommendations from the Electoral Commissioner. Can I say in opening, given the statements made about excluding the young and inaccessibility of voters—and I will come to the red herring aspect of that shortly—I just want to assure the house that given the recommendation of Mr Mick Sherry, our Electoral Commissioner, in the time I have known him and worked with him on the development and passage of legislation, I have not seen him as anything like Donald Trump.

I actually have seen him as quite different from that. Because this is his recommendation, I need to explain it so there is not a misunderstanding, which I think the opposition have taken and sort of raced with as though this is their knock-out submission. As I say, some of it is not necessarily their fault.

I want to come firstly to the question of information that is being relied on from the report, and in particular the repetition in support of one of the arguments raised of the 25,000 enrolments. I will find the exact number here; I think it is 25,000. I will just get the actual report. Members on the opposition have referred to paragraph 14, and he says at point 5:

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 issue of the 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.

It may have escaped—and even had for me, initially—the attention of members, but the commissioner had also published a press release in relation to a number of matters, including the record number of electors in 2018, on 26 February 2018. He outlined, in that press release where the reference to the numbers of voters, in particular the enrolment activity, that, 'Enrolment activity over the last month before roll closed saw almost 25,000 electors enrolled or updated.' I just bring to the members' attention, I have asked the Electoral Commissioner to confirm this in writing to me and he indicates in a letter to me dated today, 26 August, as follows:

Recommendation 7 within the election report for the 2018 state election proposed to bring forward the closing date for receipt of postal vote applications so they could be issued by post in sufficient time for them to be received by electors to enable them to vote before 6pm on polling day.

I will come back to his explanation about that in a moment. In respect of the specific issue of the publication in the report, he says:

I have reviewed the information which appears to have been sourced from the 2018 state election report and confirm that an incorrect textual reference relating to the volume of enrolments has been included in that report. While the figure of almost 25,000 is correct, the reference to the period being a six-day period from the issue of the writ to the close of rolls should have in fact stated as 'during the last month before the close of the rolls'.

I just advise you of that information because all of your speeches enclosed the same issue of there being a situation of, on the face of it, 25,000 people enrolling in six days. Then it is translated to the argument, which I think is the red herring in this position, that therefore a moving of a six-day to a

two-day period robs the opportunity of electors to be able to enrol, and therefore in some way, shuts the gate or closes the gate towards time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, this is what the Electoral Commissioner explains. He refers to recommendation 7 about the postal vote:

While this recommendation sought to resolve a particular problem—

that is, in relation to postal votes being received—

it had the effect of reducing overall number of days following the close of the rolls to process applications and issue those postal votes. Therefore a proposal was forwarded through your department—

and he is sending this to me—

addressing this issue and proposing to reinstate an equivalent period by bringing forward the close of rolls date by four days. This proposal would provide almost the same period in which applications could be processed after the rolls closed with the ballot materials prepared and mailed to each eligible postal voter. The proposal provided in October 2020 is attached for that clarity.

I am happy to have that available for anyone else who wants to have a read of it. He continues:

During the debates of the merits of this proposal—

that is, the advancing of the days for the purposes of allowing postal vote applications to survive and be included in the count—

it would appear that references have been made to the volume of enrolments at the 2018 state election during the period leading up to the date of the close of rolls.

Then, as I have indicated, there is the explanation of the error in relation to the description of the number of people who have been made available.

What is important to appreciate here and to perhaps explain, hopefully as clearly as possible, is why this is therefore a red herring. Why is it that to address the problem that we have in relation to postal votes and giving an opportunity for them to survive and therefore changing the dates in relation to that, there is not then a direct correlation to Rob the new elector and a chance to vote? I will tell you the reason why: it is because the Electoral Commissioner has made it very clear that the election that he has provided a report on had his campaign and it is all set out in his report.

I will find the page reference for those who are following this. Starting at page 35 of his report in chapter 3, this is the education division, he sets out what his office did. Bear in mind he has an obligation under the Electoral Act to actually educate the public and, amongst other things, you can see that in the legislation, but he sets out the campaign that they undertook in that month before the election.

There is another factor we need to consider here, that is, since 2002 we have had fixed date elections. It has to be on the third Saturday of the fourth annual anniversary in March for the election, unless in certain circumstances. They are limited to very few, but one of them, of course, is if a federal election were called during the month of March in which our election is due, then there is a capacity for our election to be delayed for up to several weeks. That does not mean it has to be—even in a circumstance where a federal election is announced—on 19 March 2022, but any time in March, so we have a backup situation there for that.

So we have this fixed election arrangement and the Electoral Commissioner, as he reported to the parliament in chapter 3, undertook a comprehensive nearly \$500,000 campaign to educate South Australia in getting the message out to have a say, enrol and, as he reports here in the report, using the slogan 'Put your vote where your voice is'. That was the 2018 slogan from the Electoral Commissioner.

I think I have made this clear to the parliament, but if people have not understood this I will make it very clear: the Electoral Commissioner, to try to capture and save the postal vote problem that was experienced—and I do not think I need to explain that to a lot of the members here; they understood the problems we had in the 2018 election—has recommended the changes there, but to ensure there is no disadvantage to those who might be alerted in this campaign to enrol and have a

say, he has publicly made it clear that on 22 January, not the 28th but 22 January, he will start that campaign.

So the people of South Australia, who know the election is coming up on the third Saturday of the fourth anniversary in March, will, from the 22nd, be alerted and have all the materials out there in a campaign to remind them of the opportunities they have and the different ways they can express their view, have a voice, have a vote and know how to enrol.

There are a lot of other campaigns after that month that the Electoral Commission undertakes as well, and most members are familiar with these: where the polling booths are, how you vote, what the nature or the type of voting system is that we have in this state. They are all important pieces of information. However, the key issue that has featured in the opposition's contribution to this debate is that somehow or other the people of South Australia, particularly young people, are going to be excluded by this recommendation that has been taken up by the Electoral Commissioner and that we have presented to the parliament.

This is not some kind of attempt by me or anyone else on this side of the house to somehow or other disenfranchise people from the opportunity to enrol and have a say. In fact, it is a recommendation of the Electoral Commissioner, and he has made it very clear that that campaign will again occur, even though he is asking us, the parliament, to accept his recommendation to change the rules in relation to postal votes, which is in this bill, so that we do not have the same disadvantage in relation to that opportunity to vote.

I want to be absolutely clear here that I do not think that is the intention of the Electoral Commissioner. I think his report is very clear as to why he is doing this. He does not want to disadvantage those who—as they did in 2018—elected to use a postal vote system. He wants to be able to remedy that situation, but he does not want to disenfranchise those who will have a month, as they have had in previous elections, to be alerted and have the opportunity to enrol to vote, because it is important.

Members have quite rightly pointed out the significance of democracy. The member for Cheltenham even brought it into contemporary terms to remind us of how important it is to have the right to vote, especially when you have countries that we are now attempting to support—both in the return of our people and the support of civilians from Afghanistan—who are in a desperate circumstance. Those people do not have the freedoms and the right to vote that we have, and he is quite right that it is important we reflect on that from time to time, on what a privilege we have in this state, in this country, to have that vote.

It is a secret ballot. We do not have somebody standing next to us with a machine gun at the polling booth when we line up to have a vote, and we do not have the fear of repercussions if we do not write a certain way—that is, death to your or your family. We have had monitoring in elections for years. Australia has been a great observer in that area of responsibility. So he is quite right, and other members are quite right, to remind us of the significance of that.

However, I want to assure the house that there is no mischief in the Electoral Commissioner's recommendation to us that we try to protect those who utilised a postal vote and missed out. He is trying to remedy that. He is also trying to reassure the house that there is no loss of time from the alerting of this issue to the public, to parents who might say, 'My child is turning 18 in February. I had better make sure they enrolled to vote,' etc.

That is still a very important job of the Electoral Commissioner, and he is committed to continuing to carry that out. That is to continue, and you can expect—from his published position—that the campaign for the next election will start on 22 January 2022 and that there will be all the usual aspects to it: material, electronic information, obviously website information, community meetings with different CALD communities and, very importantly I think, information to young voters.

In fact, I was just handed a poster of a young woman that says on it, 'Got an opinion? Vote with it. Enrol for the state election.' Clearly this is targeted to the area of the youth vote that many members have referred to. I am confident, and I am certainly satisfied, that the Electoral Commissioner has every intention of doing what he sees as important to ensure that we encourage those who have a right to vote to vote, that they exercise that right, that they have a voice and are aware of what the circumstances are. That is the first thing.

The second aspect relates to the timing of the bill. Can I just make a brief contribution on this. It seems to have escaped the attention of a number of members what has actually happened. We had the election in 2018. We had a report in 2019. We had a bill in 2020. In fact, within a very short time after we went into pandemic circumstances we had a bill in this parliament. It has been through and voted on in here. It has been dealt with in the upper house. It has been disposed of and, of course, included the optional preferential voting, which I still love.

The parliament has spoken and said, 'No, we're not having that.' Fine, that is what has happened. Frankly, I always find it curious that I could sit down with Mr Rau, the former member for Enfield and my predecessor as Attorney-General—

Mr Picton: Misleading: he wouldn't sit down with you.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —listen up—and have discussions with him about a new system of voting in the Legislative Council—wait for it—optional preferential voting and a model that we would discuss, which ultimately did come to the parliament and was passed, and we utilised it during the last election. Guess what? The sky did not fall in. Somehow or another, optional preferential voting is a great idea if the Labor Party thinks of it, but it is a hideous idea if we think of it. Anyway, it has happened. I might be around another day to canvass the pros and cons of that, but that has now gone.

We are now back to corflutes in another bill. I will not canvass that because there is another bill in the parliament to deal with those. We are back to the core information and recommendations of the commission. There is one that is missing, and I will come to that in a moment, in relation to No. 1 because it has also been part of the discussion here. In relation to the timing, we had a bill. It was dealt with in the other place. It was introduced the House of Assembly in July 2020, so even with the pandemic we got on with that. It was passed in October.

The Legislative Council dealt with it, disposed of it in March this year, and then of course we have progressed the carve out, I suppose, of what I thought would be relatively uncontentious. Nevertheless, obviously parliament can express a view that is different from that of the Electoral Commissioner. I am happy to hear that, but I am just making a point that most of these recommendations are his recommendations.

Let's talk about the timing of the bill. I keep hearing there are X sitting days left, that we are seven months out from the election. I think it is 204 days, actually until the next election and, yes, bring it on. I am more than happy to have an election. I love elections, actually. Nevertheless, there is the incredible gall of the opposition to say, 'How dare you introduce electoral reform seven months out from an election? How dare you do that?' To even have the Leader of the Opposition come in here who, you might recall, on the last night of the dying days, when he was over in the Legislative Council—they do all sorts of things in the—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —Legislative Council. On the dying night of parliament, they passed legislation to remove the fairness clause in our electoral laws. They do that and of course they thought it was going to be brilliant, that it was going to be their big strategy, that this was going to revolutionise the way the counting would occur in elections and that they would be back in government because they would be able to sustain an argument for equal numbers of people in every electorate, as though one vote, one value meant that every electorate had to be equal in number. As we all know, the boundaries commission took place subsequent to that, and then Mr Reggie Martin, the secretary of the Labor Party, took on and challenged that boundary distribution in the Supreme Court and lost 5-0, of course.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, I just make this point. They lost the argument and the Labor Party came limping out of the Supreme Court and thought, 'We are going to soldier on. We have been robbed.' Even though 5-0 was the decision, they had been robbed. The whole strategy started to fall apart. Anyway, the Leader of the Opposition, who was one of the architects of all that

horrible mess for them, has now come into our house and has the gall to come in here and say, 'How dare you introduce legislation that will change the electoral laws seven months before the election.' Give me a break!

In any event, let's look at the late enrolment aspect. I just want to look at this question because it has been referred to, and members quite rightly say, 'If you are keen to follow the Electoral Commission's reforms as per his recommendations, why haven't you progressed recommendation 1?' That is quite a legitimate question, let me make that very clear. Through all these contributions, I have also heard of the difficulty, the weight, the burden of having to have all this electoral reform just before the next election.

Well, let me say this: there is no question that there are two things that are happening at the moment. One is that we are dealing with a bill with quite significant electoral reform. We are extending the pre-polling, we are doing some changes to postal arrangements, etc. They are all the machinery of operation in relation to elections and what is in this bill. Secondly, we are dealing with a pandemic, which has created a whole lot of other aspects in relation to people congregating in a public place and all the personal safety and health issues surrounding that.

We are dealing with reforms that enable us to progress all these things in a circumstance. For example, I received a submission yesterday from Mr Sherry setting out other reasons why, especially with COVID plans and COVID marshals and various other things that are necessary on top of the multimillion dollar cost of elections—extra money that he will need to be able to deal with an election where they may be—

Mr Brown: Can we see it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: You asked the question during estimates. In relation to the extra money that is sought, all this planning that is going on, it is a bit of a moving feast. Obviously, I will take his request to a Mid-Year Budget Review; there is a normal process that happens with these things. I remind members that we did actually set out some extra provision in the budget for some other aspects that he asked for at the time, but he has now brought to my attention some new things that he needs to have considered, and I indicate that for the importance of having an election those matters will be presented in the usual process.

Let me just explain therefore that, if we were to introduce these reforms and all the provisions that we have in relation to extra personnel, etc., required by the commission to deal with the COVID circumstances, then we are going to have to identify what else is the most important. I am advised that in relation to recommendation 1, yes, there would be a cost obviously because there would be a requirement for the Electoral Commission to be able to process and then ultimately assess, and then open and count later, declarations in relation to late enrolments as we move up to either the day before the election or the day of the election. That clearly is an extra cost, and we had to make some decision about how much we could advance in this tranche of legislation and what was going to have to be the priority.

We have not dismissed recommendation 1. I think there were three recommendations that Attorney-General Rau did not progress from the 2014 election. They say, 'Why aren't you doing all this?' We have not completely eliminated it, but at this stage we are not going to consider that. So we have made a judgement as to what we think is appropriate, and some of you have raised that it is a massive exercise to have an election. More particularly, if we are under any form of restrictions, how can we manage that and also ensure that everyone will have their democratic right to vote, and that it can be counted?

A number of those include the development of telephone voting and the accessibility of that program—two parties who are either overseas or are sight-impaired, etc. As I said, I will come to those in just a minute, but I make the point that we have not done everything in this. Again, I can honestly say—

Mr Picton: You've done the bit that stops the enrolment; you just haven't done the bit that makes enrolment easier—funny that.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I am just telling you that there is nothing different with the advance of this bill from what we have at present in having a campaign for a month before the election

for very clear information and instruction to assist people. Frankly, all of us, as members of parliament, should also be at our citizenship ceremonies supporting ECSA, which I know many of you do, to make sure that new citizens get information and have an opportunity to enrol.

You can enrol electronically to get to vote. If you have children coming up to 18 or grandchildren or neighbour's children or anyone else, again I think we all have a civic responsibility to encourage people to have a say, have a vote and have a voice. The member for Kaurua expressed concern regarding the regulations prescribing additional classes of people who can access telephone-assisted voting. The flexibility that is provided in the bill is important, especially given the risk of ongoing COVID outbreaks. For example, it may be necessary to allow for telephone-assisted voting in nursing homes, remote communities, quarantine facilities and prisons.

Members will be aware that in 2017 we introduced amendments to the Electoral Act that allowed for electronically assisted voting for sight-impaired electors. There were only about 100 people who ultimately took up that model. It was available through one of the support agencies. There were a number that assisted the ECSA. It is all in the report. The Electoral Commission had purchased a package of software—a program from Western Australia—but you needed to physically be at a place to then be assisted to vote. This is a new system. As I understand, this is how it is to work: you phone in, you give your name and address and date of birth and you then are identified as to what electorate you are in and so forth. You are then transferred to somebody else who you do not give your name and address to, but you have got through the first hurdle. They give you an identifier number and the options of who to vote for. I remember I was given this information. I will try to clarify it before we get to committee.

Ms Bedford: Don't try it at home then.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No. I was asked to explain how this worked by someone the other day and I had the information directly in front of me. In short, you get an identifier number and then you go to have your vote, but there is an observer who listens in to make sure, presumably, firstly, that the person does translate what you want in the vote that you are asking for in this process and also as some supervision. The operator then determines the elector's district after you have given your name and address. The operator transfers the elector to a specialist telephone voting assistant and, without disclosing the elector's identity, provides the unique identifying number and the House of Assembly district for which the elector is entitled to vote. That is the second thing I was trying to think of.

To provide assurance that the voting intention of the elector is followed by the telephone voting assistant completing the ballot papers on their behalf, an observer would listen and observe the entire voting transaction. The telephone voting assistant marks the ballot papers in the presence of the observer and then reads back the voter's preference to confirm their intention and, if corrections are made, they are confirmed by the observer. The observer will declare the voter's intention has been followed by writing the unique identifier number on the declaration envelope, signing the declaration, folding the ballot papers and sealing them inside the declaration envelope.

It is a little bit like doing your SACA vote, for those of you who are members. You get an envelope and another envelope and then you put your signed ballot in the envelope. That has no identification on it and then you put it in another envelope. It is a new system. It is one that has been used in a number of other states and New Zealand. It has been operating, essentially, since 2007 I think in one of the jurisdictions, so it is not new. Our own Electoral Commissioner has used the vote assist in the last election, but now we are going to a much more modern and contemporary version, which is able to assist. I think it is also very important to the people we are helping here—in COVID there will be many more for the reasons I have explained—the international electors, those living overseas or stuck overseas or still doing their service overseas. Consultation with the disability sector has occurred and that is something that is occurring. Since federal elections, we have had vision-impaired electors using telephone voting—in Victoria, since 2010; in New South Wales, since 2011; in Queensland, since 2015; and in Western Australia, since 2017. I am sure we would have heard if there were major problems in relation to that.

That is what is happening. Regarding the removal of the requirement of the Electoral Commissioner to encourage voting on polling day, if ever there was a reason to move to an

opportunity to pre-poll, it is the fact that we are in the middle of COVID. We have already had three elections that we know of that are very high profile: New Zealand, Queensland and Western Australia just in recent COVID time. Nearly half the electors—increasing each time—have elected to vote before election day. One of the reasons is that obviously they do not want to take a risk going out, they do not want to have their health compromised, etc., and we understand the reason for that.

We have always taken the view that people ought to have the right to vote when they determine they wish to vote. We now have a pandemic with us. The Electoral Commissioner is asking for from the week before—I think it is currently a week, because there is a public holiday on the Monday in the week before the next election. He is seeking the two weeks before so that there can be a pre-poll opportunity. He has announced that there will be many more pre-polling booths. Obviously, we are in the middle of a pandemic and if ever there was a reason to do it, it is now. It is a surge in popularity for the choice and convenience of people generally. We are in the 21st century. We need to recognise that and ECSA has recognised that. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SENTENCING (HATE CRIMES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Parliamentary Committees

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it has appointed the Hon. H.M. Girolamo to the committee in place of the Hon. D.W. Ridgway (resigned).

Bills

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (ALCOHOL AND DRUG OFFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (TELEPHARMACY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

OATHS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Tuesday 7 September 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***AMBULANCE RAMPING**

528 Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (10 June 2021). What is the median patient transfer time (in minutes) from ambulance into the metro emergency departments for each month of the past 12 months?

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

June 2020	26 minutes
July 2020	27 minutes
August 2020	27 minutes
September 2020	26 minutes
October 2020	27 minutes
November 2020	28 minutes
December 2020	27 minutes
January 2021	28 minutes
February 2021	29 minutes
March 2021	29 minutes
April 2021	29 minutes
May 2021	31 minutes

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

530 Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (11 June 2021). What was the longest wait (in hours and minutes) recorded for a patient in emergency departments to be seen, for each month, over the past 12 months?

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

During the period 1 June 2020 to 31 May 2021, the following were recorded as the maximum wait time to be seen at SA public hospital emergency departments (EDs):

Month/Year	Max. Wait Time (HH:MM)
June 2020	11:28
July 2020	13:17
August 2020	11:56
September 2020	10:26
October 2020	13:33
November 2020	11:26
December 2020	10:39
January 2021	11:56
February 2021	11:50
March 2021	11:12
April 2021	14:47
May 2021	14:46

*Estimates Replies***TORRENS PARADE GROUND**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

The expected income over the forward estimates for the 2021-22 financial year from bookings at the Torrens Parade Ground is \$190,000.