

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12 October 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 Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:02): I move without notice:

That standing orders be so far suspended up to and including Thursday 14 October to enable ministers and members to speak and conduct business from any seat within the chamber and the Speaker's gallery and that members of the Legislative Council be prohibited from admission to the Speaker's gallery.

The SPEAKER: As an absolute majority is not present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Bills

FIREARMS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 September 2021.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:05): I rise to speak on the Firearms (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2021. I will not keep the house in suspense: I indicate from the outset that the opposition will support this bill in the House of Assembly. I thought I might outline a little about Labor's approach, since this is the first time I think we have met and opened up the Firearms Act in this session of parliament.

I thought I would put on the record, first, the Labor Party's position generally on firearms, so that no-one has any doubt. It is our position that of course public safety, the safety of the community, is absolutely paramount. Any law changes or any rejection of law changes comes on the back of that one principle: public safety.

Having said that, we are not religiously averse to the legitimate use of firearms. There are thousands and thousands of people in this state who enjoy the use of firearms for sporting or hunting purposes and for legitimate uses such as police, security officers and so on. None of those things would come under threat by this parliament while this opposition is here, or while we are in government, unless of course it offends that first principle of public safety, which remains paramount.

I am pleased to speak on this bill and I am pleased to support it. It arises out of two events or two sets of circumstances, the first being the coronial inquest into the murder of Lewis McPherson in 2012. The second lot of amendments arise from the National Firearms Agreement, which all the states are either in the process of signing up to or will sign up to at some point, I am sure.

I might just read a little from the inquest, which lays out the reasons for some of the amendments in this bill, which relate generally to public safety, particularly the safety of young people in this state. We are seeing more and more news events of people, particularly young people, engaging in violent acts, particularly with knives but also occasionally with firearms. We are seeing this more and more, and we are also seeing, sadly, young people arming themselves in the event that they themselves get attacked, so there is a kind of arms race we are seeing going on in terms of weapons.

This is one measure I am happy to support, which might go some way to addressing that. I will advise the house of the beginning of the finding of inquest into the death of Lewis McPherson:

Lewis Mike McPherson was 18 years of age when he met his death on the evening of 31 December 2012. As he walked with his two male companions in Sixth Avenue, Warradale he was shot once to the chest with a projectile from a small calibre handgun. People in the street rendered assistance. Ambulance officers arrived at the scene. By then Lewis McPherson was unresponsive, with absent pulse and respirations. Resuscitative measures were administered at the scene by ambulance officers. He was transported to the Flinders Medical Centre Emergency Department where resuscitation efforts continued but which were ultimately unsuccessful. Lewis McPherson's life was certified extinct at 8.50pm that evening.

Autopsy findings supported the clinical view that death had resulted from uncontrolled haemorrhage as the result of gunshot injuries to the lungs.

I will not go into the injuries. I continue:

The person who inflicted the fatal gunshot wound was Liam Patrick Humbles who at that time was 17 years of age. Although Humbles and Lewis McPherson were known to each other at the time, there was no evidence that there was any animosity between them. The same applies in respect of Lewis McPherson's two friends who were with him at the time of the shooting.

That evening, which was New Year's Eve, Humbles had been at [an address] along with a number of other youths. During the course of that day those present at that address, including Humbles, had consumed alcoholic beverages in significant quantities. Cannabis had also been smoked. Humbles in particular was intoxicated during that day and evening having consumed alcohol, cannabis and MDMA...

This is the important point:

The gun and ammunition that he would use to shoot and kill Lewis McPherson had been in his possession for some time. As a person under the age of 18, he was not lawfully permitted to possess the firearm. Prior to the shooting Humbles had irresponsibly caused the weapon to discharge on two occasions of which the Court is aware, one time in a public park and the other inside a house.

Then it goes on at quite extensive length to detail Humbles' addiction and mental health issues, which I will not go into here.

The salient point of the inquest in this regard, and in regard to this bill, is the age of the offender. He clearly had ready access to a firearm at an age of 17 or younger. As always, the law is at a loss really to see what we can do about these things. All we can do is try to tighten up the regulations around these things and perhaps increase penalties where we can in an effort to inform the community and to discourage the community from any of this type of unlawful activity.

Importantly, the bill amends section 22 of the Firearms Act by imposing greater penalties for aggravated offences. It redefines an aggravated offence as circumstances in which it has been proven that the person to whom the firearm was supplied was a person under the age of 18 years.

As always with these aggravated offences, this is a relatively minor change. If you understand anything about the criminal mindset, they are largely undeterred by slightly increased penalties for offences that take place in the course of their businesses, but we do what we can. I think this bill does try, so I am happy to support that provision. We do not want to see any more firearms unlawfully in the community and we certainly do not want to see firearms unlawfully in the hands of young people.

The inquest goes on to make several recommendations and another of them is enacted by this bill. The bill introduces a requirement upon a court to impose cumulative sentences for certain offences relating to the unlawful possession—and I stress unlawful possession—use and acquisition of firearms or ammunition.

Currently, I am told, and as is generally the case in the law, sentences are served concurrently. For instance, and to put it very simply, if someone is discovered with one illegal firearm, they are sentenced to a certain penalty. If another person is caught with 10 or 15 illegal firearms, generally speaking, while you would expect the head sentence to be higher, those offences are not dealt with concurrently.

This bill makes the fairly simple and I think fairly sensible amendment that sentences should be served cumulatively for the possession of each firearm, as I understand it. The minister can correct

me if I am wrong, but it is a sentence for each possession offence. Of course, this does get complicated by definitions of firearms.

We have heard many instances—I will not reopen this debate here and now—of persons arrested for or charged with possession of a deadly firearm and then also charged with possession of a gel blaster, which now is defined as a firearm. So, you may have a situation where you have a cumulative sentence and the sentence for the initial deadly firearm is dwarfed by the cumulative sentences for the gel blasters. Be that as it may, I think this is a good step forward. I think that possession of any illegal firearms in the community should be punished and punished with whatever force we can apply.

The final thing this bill does—again, the minister can correct me if I am wrong; there will be a short committee stage—is reclassify lever action shotguns entirely. Those with a capacity of five rounds or less will be category B firearms, and those with capacity of more than five rounds will be category D firearms. I am told they are all currently classed as category A firearms.

This is important because once you have a category A firearms licence, as I understand it, the test to then purchase and register firearms is reasonably low. It is stringent, obviously, and thank goodness we have tight controls over firearms in this state and in this country. I am advised by the police that the tests to register a category B firearm or a category D firearm—the fit and proper person test and the reason for use test—are far more stringent. I am advised that this basically puts lever action shotguns in the same category as pump action shotguns.

We all understand what a pump action shotgun is, and I am advised by the police again that the essential function of a lever action firearm is similar to a pump action firearm. I will be asking a couple of questions about that in committee just so that we all understand what we are talking about when we talk about these two different types of firearms. If I did not mention it before, this was not a recommendation of the inquest into Lewis McPherson but part of a national firearms agreement.

With those few words, I do support this bill and I indicate the opposition does support this bill in the House of Assembly. I hope it goes some way to making firearms more difficult to get, particularly for young people. I also want to reiterate to those people who were consulted during the course of this bill—and I understand there has been considerable consultation—and to reassure the legitimate and law-abiding firearms community, that the opposition support these measures because they believe that they are in the interests of public safety, and we will always put public safety first.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:16): I rise to support the Firearms (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2021. Coming off the land, like a lot of others, I like to own some firearms for vermin control. They are a practical part of the agriculture and farming community. I have a Harrington and Richardson single shot .410 shotgun—a very handy little piece—and I have had for quite a few years a Remington 870 magnum pump action shotgun, which you can only own under a C-class category. You have to have primary production land to own that. In the last couple of years, I have purchased a Remington .22 bolt action with a 10-shot magazine capability. They are very much part of the tools of trade of running agricultural properties, and most landowners would have a form of firearm.

In regard to what we are discussing here today, this is part of the coronial inquest into the very sad death of Mr Lewis McPherson back in 2012 in very tragic circumstances, as described by the member for Elizabeth. In 2017, Deputy State Coroner, Anthony Schapel, released his findings of that coronial inquest into the death of Mr Lewis McPherson and made 17 recommendations. In recommendation 8, the Deputy State Coroner recommended that a person who supplies a firearm to a person under 18 years of age be subject to greater penalties than provided for under the Firearms Act 2015 in South Australia (the act).

In recommendation 9, the Deputy State Coroner recommended that a person convicted both of unlawfully supplying ammunition and unlawfully supplying a firearm be required to serve the sentences of imprisonment for both offences cumulatively rather than concurrently.

In regard to recommendation 10, the Deputy State Coroner recommended that a person convicted of both unlawfully possessing ammunition and unlawfully possessing a firearm be required to serve the sentences of imprisonment for both offences cumulatively rather than concurrently.

In regard to the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreement on lever action shotguns, between 2015 and 2017 the National Firearms Agreement (NFA) was reviewed, updated and endorsed by COAG, with all states and territories committing to enacting the legislative updates.

As part of the review, COAG agreed to recategorise lever action shotguns based on the availability of magazine capacities exceeding five rounds.

COAG recognised particular concerns with the recently developed—and it has been around a few years—Adler A110 lever action shotgun, which is manufactured with a magazine capacity of either five or seven rounds. I have seen one of these at a field day with a legal capacity of, I think it was, 13 rounds in an extended magazine. The Adler A110 and other lever action shotguns with similar capacity and rapid firing capabilities result in the firearm having a similar operating capacity to category D firearms, such as pump action shotguns.

Currently, section 5 of the act recognises lever action shotguns as category A firearms, regardless of their magazine capacity. Category A firearms are the most prevalent and accessible firearms in South Australia, as licensees are not required to establish a genuine need for their acquisition.

In regard to discussion around this legislation, the Firearms (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2021, this bill does deliver on recommendations 8 to 10 of the coronial inquest into the very tragic death of Mr Lewis McPherson and recategorises lever action shotguns in accordance with the national agreement made by COAG.

In regard to the McPherson coronial inquest, to address recommendation 8 the bill amends section 22(10) of the act by introducing tougher penalties for the offence of trafficking in firearms where it is proved the offence was committed with aggravating factors. The penalties for an aggravated offence will be as follows: if the firearm is a prescribed firearm or a category C, D or H firearm, \$100,000 or imprisonment for 20 years; if the firearm is a category A or B firearm, \$50,000 penalty or imprisonment for 10 years.

The penalties for non-aggravated offences will remain as follows: if the firearm is a prescribed firearm, \$75,000 or imprisonment for 15 years; if the firearm is a category C, D or H firearm, \$50,000 or imprisonment for 10 years; if the firearm is any other category of firearm, \$35,000 or imprisonment for seven years. The bill inserts a new section 22(14) to prescribe that an offence of trafficking in firearms will be an aggravated offence if it is proved the firearm was supplied to a person under the age of 18 years.

In regard to addressing recommendations 9 and 10, the bill inserts new section 66A, which prescribes that a court must make any sentences of imprisonment cumulative if a person is convicted of both unlawfully supplying ammunition and unlawfully supplying a firearm or of both unlawfully possessing ammunition and unlawfully possessing a firearm.

In regard to the Council of Australian Governments agreement in regard to lever action shotguns, to implement the updated National Firearms Agreement as agreed to by all states and territories, the bill amends section 5 of the act to recategorise lever action shotguns as follows: lever action shotguns that have a magazine capacity of five rounds or less will become a category B firearm, and lever action shotguns that have a magazine capacity of more than five rounds will be a category D firearm.

Importantly, schedule 1 of the bill provides for transitional arrangements so that those who currently lawfully possess lever action shotguns are permitted to continue to possess their firearm. I think that is important as part of the transitional arrangements until the appropriate time when those licences can be updated, because obviously the shotguns are owned by people who are legal gun owners at the moment.

In relation to the consultation in regard to the changes contained in the bill, SAPOL engaged with firearms dealers, industry representatives and other stakeholders on these amendments and has received broad support. I note that Mr Mark and Mrs Kim McPherson, the parents of Mr Lewis McPherson, have also been consulted and are supportive of the amendments.

It is timely that we are getting on with this. The Coroner's inquiry, the legislative framework and the consultation all take time, but we are here today to make real change and get these licences updated so that we get the appropriate outcomes for the community. I support the bill.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (11:26): I would like to thank members on both sides of the house for their

support for what is a very important legislative change in the firearms space. I would also like to thank the stakeholders for having their say. This reform has been long overdue and I think it will go a long way towards increased firearm safety in this state. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr ODENWALDER: I open by thanking the minister and his advisers and indeed SAPOL for the depth of information they were willing to provide in terms of this bill. I know the McPherson family is supportive and very keen to see these changes passed, and we certainly do not want to stand in their way.

I have some questions about consultation. Could the minister tell me—and I think I know the answer to the first part of this question—if the Sporting Shooters' Association and the Shooters Union were consulted on the content of this bill, whether they were supportive and, if they provided written submissions, what their submissions were to the bill?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I thank the member for the question. Consultation was quite significant. It was a significant process and it was managed by SAPOL in relation to these various amendments. The stakeholders consulted included the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia, the Combined Firearms Council of South Australia, firearms dealers, the South Australian Gun Club office bearers, the Law Society of South Australia and also owners of lever action shotguns.

I think it goes without saying that, following the coronial inquest, for a long period of time it has been on the cards to push on with change in this area. In terms of when they were consulted, a meeting was held with firearms dealers and other industry representatives, including the Sporting Shooters' Association of Australia South Australia on 11 April 2019, when SAPOL outlined the intended changes. No significant issues were raised at the meeting attended by 46 dealers and representatives. A meeting was also held on 16 April 2019, and firearms club representatives and over 108 people attended and the proposed changes were explained. Again, no significant issues were raised then.

Furthermore, in July 2019, over 2,800 letters were sent to stakeholders outlining the proposed amendments and also the purposes of recategorising, if you like, the lever action firearms. There was information relating to the proposed changes that was made available on the SAPOL website. Of course, Mr and Mrs McPherson, parents of Mr Lewis McPherson, the subject of this tragic death reviewed by the Coroner in 2017, were kept informed of the proposed amendments and progress throughout.

To give the member for Elizabeth a time line, in 2021 the final draft of the bill was completed. A draft bill was provided to key select stakeholders for further consultation. Those were the Combined Firearms Council, the Sporting Shooters' Association SA, the Shooters Union SA—to the member for Elizabeth's point—the Law Society, the Commissioner for Victims' Rights, Gun Control Australia and also Mr Mark McPherson and Mrs Kim McPherson.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given that—and I am sorry if you covered in the earlier part of your answer—did the Sporting Shooters' Association or the Shooters Union provide any written submission or any objection at all to any of the measures in this bill?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: There was an email sent and it was broadly supportive. My advice is that it highlighted some of the history and issues concerning the legislation proposed but was broadly supportive.

Mr ODENWALDER: I know you touched on this, but were there any representations from individual lever action shotgun holders who were opposed to this bill and what were the reasons?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: What will happen in relation to parties that are affected is that the SAPOL firearms branch will make direct contact with the owner of any registered lever action firearm. They will provide confirmation of the change of category for their lever action firearm to category B or D, depending on the magazine capacity. Any licence holder—and this has been explained—who does not have a category B or D licence approval will be provided with a temporary variation for the

ownership life of that specific firearm. All those variations will be fee free. SAPOL is managing the transition relatively well.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, that question seemed to relate to clause 4 more than anything else.

Mr ODENWALDER: It was arising out of the minister's answer.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr ODENWALDER: Notwithstanding the minister's detailed answer about consultation—and I take all that on board—these changes, while important, are relatively minor. They impose greater penalties for aggravated offences, they impose cumulative sentences for certain offences and they reclassify, or whatever term you use, lever action shotguns. Given that the coronial inquest reported in 2017 and the McPherson family are rightly very keen to see these changes enacted, why has this taken so long to come to fruition? I understand that consultation has been quite fulsome, but these are relatively minor changes.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Obviously, this is much-needed reform. I have been the minister for just over a year now, so it certainly was a high priority for me. All I can say is that we have got on with the job of trying to put these changes in as soon as possible. Of course, there have been a number of other balls in the air that SAPOL has also had to juggle, but we want to get these changes right and here we are before the house with very sensible changes. I think that we should not hold up the process and let's get on with it.

Mr ODENWALDER: I agree. Arising from that, the member for Hammond said there were 15 recommendations of the coronial inquest. Can you tell me how many of those relate directly to the Firearms Branch and the Firearms Act and whether there are any that have not been enacted by this?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am advised that all the recommendations in respect of firearms have been enacted.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr ODENWALDER: This is the clause that recategorises lever action shotguns. I do not know very much about firearms. I do not know very much about shotguns. It has been suggested to me that lever action shotguns and pump action shotguns are not so similar as might have been suggested or that I might have been advised earlier. I do not know the veracity of that and I wonder if the minister could explain in which ways they are similar and/or different. I do not know if the minister is a firearms expert either, so I would appreciate if he could seek advice.

The CHAIR: That is a very good question, member for Elizabeth. I, too, would like to know the difference.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Mr Chair, I will endeavour to do my best here. Ultimately, both have the capability to fire rapidly. In terms of the mechanism as to how that rapid fire is attained, one is via a pump and another is via a lever so, whilst they are slightly different, the concern around them and the need to regulate them and regulate them carefully is obviously around the ability to rapidly fire without having to reload all the time.

Mr ODENWALDER: So what this clause does then is reclassify. I do not know if I am using the right term, but it changes the status of the lever action shotgun to either a category B or a category D, depending on the number of rounds. Can the minister then explain what the differences are in the tests between A, B and D? What is the difference in rigour of the tests and what that achieves?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Obviously they have different tests. To obtain a category A test there are not reasons, if you like, that have to be disclosed in order to obtain—whilst all the other

measures have to be satisfied you don't necessarily have to provide a particular, specific reason as to why an A might be obtained. However, when you go B, D and those upwards from A, obviously you are required not only to meet the mandatory requirements but also to show a reason why the firearm is being acquired and used, and obviously there is a much more rigorous testing regime as the firearm strength capability to fire increases as well. It is a proportionate test, if you like.

Mr ODENWALDER: Let us take the highest category then, category D. Can you explain the testing regime? Can you explain what you would need to obtain a category D firearm, what process do you go through?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: You will need to illustrate that you have a genuine need for that firearm and that that need is not satisfied by a firearm that you possess at the moment. Of course, you also have to be a fit and proper person and all those other regulatory necessities as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr ODENWALDER: This amendment deals with trafficking and my questions are statistical, really. Can you tell us how many illegal firearms are currently estimated to be in the community?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I thank the member for the question. Obviously, one is too many, but we will have to take that on notice. Perhaps we will be able to furnish that information between the houses; we don't have that level of detail on us at the moment.

Mr ODENWALDER: Another statistical question which I am sure the minister will have to take on notice, but I wonder if there is a record of how many charges there are for underage possession of firearms or ammunition.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I will make that inquiry for the member for Elizabeth.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr ODENWALDER: This regards cumulative sentencing. I will try to wrap this up in three questions. My first question is a general one: are there any other offences within the Firearms Act which impose cumulative sentences on offenders, or is this a new provision?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Not that I am aware of, but again we can certainly look at that for the member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: I just want to get to the guts of when a cumulative sentence would be imposed. From my rereading of it, I might have been slightly wrong because it seems to only apply to a combination of offences. So if there is an offence of possession of a firearm plus a possession of ammunition then those two sentences are applied cumulatively. Whereas I was of the understanding, perhaps a misunderstanding, that what these provisions would do is impose a separate sentence for each offence more than two. Is it limited to two that can be imposed cumulatively?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: It is certainly not limited to two.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can the minister point to the section of the bill which extends it beyond two because, from my reading, if a person is convicted by a court of an offence against section 9 and an offence against section 31, the court must make the sentences imposed for the two offences cumulatively, and that is all it says.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Yes, so both sections, but there could be more offences caught within those sections.

Mr ODENWALDER: So you are saying that, in the drafting of this, an offence plus an offence equalling two offences could actually mean an unlimited number of offences, which would be sentenced cumulatively.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Yes.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth—

Mr ODENWALDER: I do have one more question.

The CHAIR: This will be number four.

Mr ODENWALDER: Will it?

The CHAIR: You are seeking clarification, I guess.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, I am seeking clarification, thank you. Given that then—and we will stick with subsection (1) because subsection (2) is similar—does the cumulative effect of the sentencing rely on two separate types of offences? Does it have to be an offence against both section 9 and section 31 for this to take shape or can you have, for instance, three offences against section 9 sentenced cumulatively?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: My advice with that one is that we will get some advice and perhaps provide it to the member between the houses.

Mr ODENWALDER: I would appreciate that. I will not ask any further questions.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (11:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth would like to make a third reading contribution.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:48): Yes, thank you, a very brief contribution. I want to thank the minister's staff and SAPOL for their information during the course of analysing this bill, and I also want to thank those legitimate and law-abiding members of the firearms community who reached out to me after this bill was introduced for their advice. I commend the bill to the house, as I would any other public safety measure.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:49): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I am counting and, as an absolute majority is not present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Motions

KANGAROO ISLAND WHARF FACILITY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:51): I move:

That a select committee of the House of Assembly be established to inquire into and report on:

- (a) the conduct of the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning in relation to the application by Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers to build a deepwater port facility at Smith Bay, Kangaroo Island;
- (b) statements made by the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning to the House of Assembly, including the estimates committee, in relation to her consideration of the application by Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers to build a deepwater port facility at Smith Bay, Kangaroo Island;

- (c) statements made by the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning to the House of Assembly, including the estimates committee, in relation to her knowledge of the contents of the State Planning Commission's assessment report on the Smith Bay port facility application;
- (d) statements made by the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning to the House of Assembly, including the estimates committee, in relation to her knowledge of a report commissioned by the government on potential port sites in Kangaroo Island;
- (e) statements made by the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning to the House of Assembly in relation to the ownership of land on Kangaroo Island by herself, her relatives or any of her related entities;
- (f) statements made by the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning to the House of Assembly in relation to her knowledge of the transport routes to the proposed wharf, in particular, the proximity of such routes to property owned by the Mayor of Kangaroo Island;
- (g) any conflict of interest, including identification, disclosure and management of conflict, or abuse of office by the Deputy Premier, Attorney-General and Minister for Planning in relation to her decision to reject the application by Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers to build a port facility at Smith Bay;
- (h) any failure to report and disclose any pecuniary interest;
- (i) any breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct or any breach of statute; and
- (j) any other relevant matter.

The committee may appoint senior counsel to assist it, with the Speaker to approve the terms and conditions of the appointment as established by the committee, and such counsel assisting the committee may examine witnesses before the committee, and for that purpose may attend all meetings of the committee and participate in the committee's deliberations.

The SPEAKER: Is the member able to provide a copy of the motion so that it might be copied and circulated? The motion, in an appropriate form, has been provided. I have asked that it be now copied and circulated.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is clear through the estimates process and answers given to the House of Assembly that we, the opposition, have sighted evidence and material that we believe warrant a select committee to investigate the conduct of the Attorney-General and Deputy Premier in her assessment of this application—whether, in fact, there is a deep conflict within her decision-making processes and whether, indeed, the parliament has been misled.

The opposition attempted to do this by a privileges motion and we sought your concurrence to give it precedence. You chose not to go down that path, sir. The opposition is in receipt of evidence that we believe confirms our suspicions that the Deputy Premier has indeed acted inappropriately in considering this matter.

We believe the way to flesh this out, of course, is to call witnesses, including the Attorney-General, her staff, members of the department, the Planning Commission and any other relevant agency to interrogate them and find out exactly at what depth and level this parliament may have been misled, whether there have been any abuses of office by the Attorney-General and Deputy Premier and whether or not the committee should recommend sanction against the Deputy Premier, either by the house or any other body.

This is a very serious and grave accusation that the opposition are making, but the only way we can get to the bottom of this is by a thorough and independent inquiry. The government will not launch an independent inquiry into this, so the house must take this into its own hands. The house must investigate this. If we do not, we will not get to the truth. We will not know exactly what has occurred. We cannot have planning ministers acting in their own self-interest.

I am sure that if the Attorney-General has evidence to exonerate herself she will provide that to the committee willingly and there will be no claims of executive privilege. Of course, this house will exercise its claims over all documents held by the executive to make sure that they are presented to the committee in a timely way. Hopefully, this committee can deliberate quickly and establish itself to get to the bottom of this to make sure that the people of South Australia know that we are all equal before the law and that some people are not more equal than others.

I commend this motion to establish a select committee to the house and I ask for unanimous support. I suspect I will not have unanimous support, but I do expect to have majority support.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:56): Unsurprisingly, the government does not support this politically motivated mudslinging and fishing expedition proposed by members opposite. It is absolutely true that no-one is more or less equal under the law. Absolutely that is the case. We subscribe to that entirely, but when the member opposite says that he wants to establish this committee to 'determine what depth the parliament was misled' there is no equality or fairness under this committee that this member seeks to put forward. It is very clear he has already made up his mind. He has already made up his mind; on what basis, who knows? We support the Attorney-General.

This is an issue that has been considered in this chamber already. This is an issue that the opposition has put forward through a privileges motion, fully considered and rejected. This is not new news with regard to the opposition trying to go fishing, to throw spurious suggestions out there, to try to throw a whole pile of mud and hope that some of it sticks. That is a completely inappropriate use of this parliament's time and of this parliament's resources in a select committee that the opposition suggests be established.

This issue has been canvassed in this chamber, it has been canvassed in the media and it has been canvassed in other ways and there is absolutely nothing that we are aware of to suggest that this select committee should proceed. So again for the member opposite to say 'Oh, well, we will just put this select committee up and if it's all okay we will just find that out' is very akin to some of the questions that we get in question time from the opposition. The opposition just says, 'Is it true, (a)? Is it true, (b)? Is it true, (c)?' knowing that those things are not true. It just throws them out hoping that somehow the mud will stick and there might be a headline talking about the accusations rather than the substance.

We will not support and we do not support the wasting of this parliament's time and committee resources, time and effort to see whether, hypothetically, some of the member for West Torrens's spurious accusations can get some traction. This issue has been considered already, this issue has been rejected already. What the member for West Torrens, the Leader of the Opposition and those opposite seek to do is a complete abuse of the processes of this parliament and the government rejects the proposal.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (12:00): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for West Torrens. In circumstances that I think are extraordinary, an entire industry—in fact, one of the largest industries on Kangaroo Island—has been killed off by a stroke of the minister's pen.

In the face of a report by an independent body, the State Planning Commission, which was the culmination of several years of investigation and assessment by multiple government departments and which ultimately formed the view that the Smith Bay port should be approved, we have to ask ourselves why the minister chose to refuse the application.

Why would the minister make a decision that flies in the face of expert advice? The only way we can uncover the truth here is with the establishment of a select committee to investigate what really happened, what influenced the minister's decision and whether the minister intentionally misled parliament in estimates and in this chamber in questions without notice.

The impact of this decision for the island is significant. The minister's decision has seemingly gone down the path of picking winners and, by implication, picking losers—all in the face of what appears to be significant property interests held by the minister, her family and her friends. We need to know what the impacts, financial or otherwise, are to those landowners from this decision. In fact, there were properties transferred by the minister in the very week of her making this decision—an extraordinary situation that we must get to the bottom of.

It is imperative that we have a select committee to investigate the circumstances surrounding the minister's decision and her statements to this place that, on the face of it, appear inconsistent and curious, to say the least. We need to get to the bottom of this, and the way to do that is for the house to investigate. If the minister has nothing to fear from this inquiry, it will find nothing, but there are too many questions and we need answers, and we need to start this investigation straightaway.

The house is aware that I previously asked questions of the minister about the Smith Bay port application. As a result of the minister's answer, I also raised concerns about the potential

misleading of the house and the estimates committee by the minister. The concerns raised were, firstly, the claim by the minister, in answer to a question regarding the assessment report, that this report only asked the minister to 'note' the report and the report never asked the minister to approve anything. I draw the attention of the house to page 8 of the assessment report, which states:

On this basis, whilst finely balanced, it is concluded that the proposal should be granted provisional development authorisation, subject to conditions.

Further, at page 182, the assessment report states:

On balance, the AR [assessment report] concludes that the proposal can be supported subject to additional requirements (including reserved matters for further assessment) and conditions as set out in the next section.

Secondly, there is the claim by the minister, as she stated in estimates, that she had a 'good read' of the report. She then stated, 'I am not sure whether there are any recommendations as yet,' and claimed that the report asked the minister to simply 'note' the report. If the minister had a good read of the report, as stated in the estimates committee, she must have read the 56 recommendations in the assessment report. Further, there is, in fact, no recommendation in the report asking the minister to 'note' it.

Thirdly, the minister claimed that the government had not commissioned its own assessment of the best location for a port to export timber from Kangaroo Island. This answer was in direct response to two questions: one asking the minister whether the government had ever commissioned its own assessment of a best location for a port to export timber from KI and a supplementary question as to whether there had ever been a process undertaken by government to look at where an ideal port would be located. The minister's answer was, and I quote, 'In direct answer to that question, no.'

The report, which as I have stated the minister told us in estimates she had had a good read of, on page 30 states:

To assist in the assessment and for the purposes of providing sector expertise additional to that available within government, Wavelength Consulting Pty Ltd was engaged separately by the former Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to undertake an independent desktop review of potential port sites to determine whether Smith Bay was an appropriate site for a wharf and port facility and to test the viability of alternative sites identified in submissions, as required by the Guidelines.

If she had read the report, as she stated in estimates, the minister would have known there was at least one government report that existed.

Fourthly, it is public knowledge that the minister and her family have for decades lived on the island and have land ownership on Kangaroo Island. When asked whether the minister or any relative or any related entity owned land on Kangaroo Island in an area near or impacted by the KIPT forests, the minister stated, and I quote, 'In short, no.'

The house should note that the minister received the assessment report in the last week of July and made the decision not to approve the application on 9 August. During this period of time there were four parcels of land where the ownership was transferred to relatives of the minister and her broader family.

It is of concern that these land transactions occurred between the time the minister received the report and made the decision not to approve the application. KIPT had been in this process with the government for approximately five years, and in this time—of just over a week—the land was transferred to relatives of the minister after receiving the report and before publicly stating her decision had been made.

Even though these parcels of land and other parcels owned by the minister and her family are within 10 kilometres of the KIPT plantations and, I understand, some are within hundreds of metres of the forests, the minister claimed there would be no impact by her decision. The impact of the forestry trucks alone cannot be ignored by any reasonable person.

Lastly, the minister told the house she was aware where Mr Pengilly, the Kangaroo Island mayor, lived and had in fact visited that property numerous times. The minister also claimed:

I think there was a question raised recently as to some transport issue in relation to this project and whether he would be affected by that. My understanding, the contribution on that, is that there is no proposed route past his house for loads of trucks in relation to that.

Members should note that page 153 of the assessment report—the one the minister stated she had had a good read of—makes it clear the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and the proponent, KIPT, had agreed on a preferred route which was going directly past Mr Pengilly's home on North Coast Road. In fact, there is a map of the proposed route on page 153. It is also worth noting that Mr Pengilly's property in part overlooks Smith Bay, which is the site of the proposed development.

It was this route past Mr Pengilly's home that was to be used by the forestry trucks if this project was approved. Having read the assessment report, this should have been well known to the minister. Of course, the close, longstanding friendship between the minister and her factional ally, the mayor, gives rise to concerns about a conflict of interest for the minister, given her decision means an enormous amount of forestry truck movement past the Pengilly property over a 25-year period will now not occur and the views of Smith Bay from the Pengilly property will now not be impacted.

While the Minister for Planning made the decision, the Attorney-General and the Minister for Local Government also saw that information, as they are of course one and the same person. The Attorney-General is the highest law officer in this state and has to be beyond reproach. Meanwhile, the Minister for Local Government should take action if they see a conflict of interest in local government.

All these concerns warrant a detailed investigation by the select committee. All these matters also give rise to possible breaches of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, but of course, with a minority government, the Premier, with the need of the Deputy Premier's factional support, is unlikely to act; hence, the need for this committee to be established.

Finally, I make the point that KIPT, as an ASX-listed company, having spent over \$5 million and five years on this approval process, needs to be considered with some respect. This project was a major project where the Minister for Planning decides the issue. It is not cabinet, it is not the house: it is just one person who makes this decision, so in these circumstances the process has to be free from conflicts of interest and misleading statements. If the minister made misleading statements, she not only misled the house but she also misled KIPT and their shareholders and the public as well. On this basis, I seek the house's support for this motion.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
 Noes 21
 Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Tarzia, V.A.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

Motion thus carried.

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

That the select committee be appointed consisting of Ms Michaels, Mr Duluk, Mr Cowdrey, Mr Treloar and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place and that it report on 18 November 2021.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

That standing order 339 be and remain so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication as it sees fit of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the house.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 21
Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Tarzia, V.A.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

Motion thus carried

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEVY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September 2021.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:24): After more than two years of delay, finally the government has garnered the wherewithal to bring this failed piece of public policy to the parliament's attention. In my time in parliament, this is one of the most disingenuous attempts at policy reform that I have seen. It was sold to the community as being necessary because, to quote both the Minister for Energy and the Treasurer in the other place, electric vehicle owners apparently do not pay their fair share for the upkeep of the roads. That is not a bit misleading; that is a lie. That is completely wrong, and it is deliberately put about the community in an attempt to deceive them in order to—

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: the member opposite has just accused me of lying and deliberately deceiving people. I ask that you direct him to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: The member having taken exception to the reference, I do ask the member for Lee to withdraw those remarks.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Minister for Energy and the Treasurer have deliberately set about telling the community information which they know is wrong—they know to be wrong, sir.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: you have just asked, and thankfully the member opposite has just withdrawn and apologised for saying that I lied and deliberately misled people. Now he has just repeated his accusation that I have deliberately misled people, and that is untrue. I ask you to ask him to withdraw and apologise again and not do it again.

The SPEAKER: On the point of order, the expression that the minister took exception to is no more or less in order when put in a different form. In the circumstances, I do ask the member for Lee to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I withdraw and apologise. We all know the member for Stuart, we know the sort of character he is, and I stand corrected. I understand that the member for Stuart could not possibly have known how wrong the information was that was being spread about by the government of which he is a member about this electric vehicle tax. To claim, falsely, that electric vehicle owners do not pay for the upkeep of the roads is blatantly wrong. It astounds me that a cabinet, let alone a minister who is a member of a cabinet, could consider a cabinet submission, which I am sure was appropriately and carefully drafted and only contained accurate information, could have allowed themselves to make a decision on the basis that it was trying to correct a wrong that simply did not exist.

These are the facts: every motor vehicle driver in South Australia pays a fee in order to have a driver's licence. Every vehicle that traverses our road network is required to be registered. The cost of that registration, along with those driver's licence fees, is hypothecated by law into the Highways Fund. It is the purpose of the Highways Fund to maintain our roads. Every single motorist pays those two charges. They have to be licensed to drive, and the vehicle in which they are driving has to be registered. It does not matter whether it is an internal combustion engine powered vehicle or whether it is a battery electric vehicle or whether it is a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle, all of those vehicles must pay the same registration, and all of those drivers driving those vehicles must be licensed.

It is clear that that information, which we were told was the reason that this policy was being introduced by this government, is blatantly wrong. They go on to say that electric vehicles do not use petroleum products in order to power them, and petroleum products, like unleaded petrol or diesel or other forms of petroleum products, are subject to the federal fuel excise, and that is what goes into maintaining our roads.

Well, that is wrong as well, blatantly and knowingly wrong. How could the government put around that information when it is clearly wrong? The fuel excise is not hypothecated into funding our roads here in Australia, and certainly, given that it is a federal tax, it is collected at the national level and certainly is not hypothecated into the funding of South Australian roads. So the entire premise of introducing this tax is based on misinformation from this government, and that is outrageous.

If you are going to pose a policy change, then it is an obligation of the government of the day to not only explain what is the policy change but also be accurate as to the reasons why. The only reason this policy change has been introduced by this government, pursued by the Minister for Energy and the Treasurer in the other place, is simply to raise more revenue. There is no other reason whatsoever. The introduction of this electric vehicle charge is not consistent with any COAG-mandated policy reform, let's be clear about that. There has been no decision at COAG or at one of COAG's subcommittees that this policy agenda be pursued, either collectively or individually.

So the further claim put about that 'Oh, well, Treasurers have agreed to do this' is wrong. There has been no communiqué of the Federal Council for Financial Relations that says all jurisdictions have committed to introducing this. This is simply an opportune time in the eyes of some to introduce yet another financial burden onto motorists, because when it comes to it this government have made an art form out of sticking their hands in the pockets of motorists.

Let's just look at their track record, shall we? Only a few years after the former Labor government reformed our CTP insurance scheme, which is now delivering motorists on average a cost saving of \$100 a year per vehicle, this government have chosen to do the exact opposite when it comes to motorists and jack up costs. In the 2019-20 budget, what did they do? They increased motor vehicle registration costs by 10 per cent—approximately five times the increase you would normally expect during a year. That is what they did to motor vehicle registration costs; driver's licence fees, just the same.

But, absolutely egregiously, they increased by at least 30 per cent the administrative fee that everybody who transacts in a motor vehicle-related bit of business with Service SA has to pay, and that raised an extra \$25 million a year from the change to one administration fee. Then it comes to all those fines and penalties that motorists sometimes find themselves the subject of, with speeding fines jacked up by nearly \$20 million a year. This government even had the gall to criticise the former government for not spending the Victims of Crime Levy each and every year on victims. Other than the token effort of trying to look after Henry Keogh, what did this government do? They increased the Victims of Crime Levy by 50 per cent, now more than \$90 per expiation notice and even more if it is a court-imposed penalty.

You do not have to take my word for it, sir: you can look at the budget papers. This financial year alone motorists are \$100 million a year worse off under this government than they were previously under the former Labor government—\$100 million. There are roughly, give or take, a million licensed motorists here in South Australia, so you do the maths: \$100 million divided by that number of motorists. How much worse off is a motorist here in South Australia because of this government, because of the initiatives the Minister for Energy and the Treasurer in another place have pursued? About \$100 each on average, that is how much worse off they are.

We were saving \$100 a year from the former Labor government's CTP reforms, and what does this government do? Take all that back in increases to state government taxes, fees, charges, fines and penalties. That is how this government treats motorists, make no bones about it. None of that is refutable; all of that is fact from the government's own documents.

We then come to the issue of how this levy is actually to be raised. It was the Minister for Energy in this place, in response to questions without notice during question time, who suggested that perhaps it might be necessary to track the movements of vehicle owners so as to accurately ascertain how far they travel so that the levy can be applied.

Can you imagine? Can you imagine having the Minister for Energy and the Premier require the installation of some tracking device in your car? That is one of the principal reasons why, as much as transport bureaucrats like to come up with various proposals for reform at a national level, the vast majority of those proposals do not see the light of day because the vast majority of them are not relevant to the needs of South Australian or Australian motorists. Just in my experience of dealing with the National Transport Commission, that is why these proposals do not go any further.

South Australians and Australian motorists do not like the idea of their government of the day tracking where they go. In fact, as one former federal transport minister, now long retired, said to me, 'This won't go anywhere, Stephen, because people don't like their government knowing when they visit their girlfriends.' It is not quite the way I would have put my objection to having my movements tracked, but nonetheless that was the advice that came from that federal minister.

Now that proposal has thankfully been shelved as part of the introduction of this policy, we have the idea that somebody who has an electric vehicle must declare to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, upon registering their vehicle, how far they have travelled in the last registration period. Maybe electric vehicle owners are all honest and maybe they will all declare it accurately, but maybe—if the government is right and other commentators about the motor vehicle industry in Australia are right, and as the number of electric vehicle owners proliferates in coming years—not all will be honest.

That raises the question: how will the government know whether an accurate declaration of the number of kilometres travelled has been given? This comes back to some sort of compliance regime, which the government does not speak about whether they have researched that or not. We do not know whether there will be the capacity for the government to reach into your odometer, from time to time, to try to ascertain information, should they suspect that you have not made an accurate declaration. Who knows? That sort of rich detail is yet another thing that has not been adequately thought through in the development of this regime.

The government would have you believe that this is a nationally mandated reform, which as I have already said is completely bogus, completely untrue and completely misleading. They say that as this has been introduced in another jurisdiction—so far, I understand, Victoria—we will be adopting their legislation insofar as possible, including setting the levy rate to apply per kilometre travelled. For a battery electric vehicle or for a plug-in hybrid vehicle, for example, that is either 2¢ per kilometre or 2.5¢ per kilometre.

In a rare moment of this government actually sniffing the wind and understanding how unbelievably unpopular their policy proposals are when it comes to tax reform—something they did not learn throughout the land tax debacle in 2019—they have said, 'Well, we will pass the law now, but we actually won't start implementing this for what we think will be about five years' time; who knows.' In five years' time, it is the government's expectation that 30 per cent of the light vehicle fleet in South Australia will be battery electric vehicles or plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. Well, that is going to require the J-curve of all J-curves.

The take-up rate of electric vehicles here in South Australia remains stubbornly low. While this government talk the talk on electric vehicles and supporting them, not only are they introducing a punitive taxation regime that cannot be justified on any basis—potentially scaring off purchasers of electric vehicles—but they have also done nothing to support their purchase by the local community.

At one minute to midnight—right at the last point of this legislation, looking like it is finally going to be brought to the parliament after two years of heel dragging by the government—they say, 'We are going to provide a grant of \$3,000 per electric vehicle and that will stimulate the uptake. We have budgeted about \$17 million or \$18 million for it. We are expecting about 5,000 or 6,000 vehicles will be supported through that \$3,000.' But here is the kicker: 'If you don't pass our tax, then we are not going to provide the incentive.' They think that this is some sort of sword of Damocles held over the parliament, some sort of bullyboy threat to try to convince us, to coerce us, into passing this measure.

We know that the threat of the tax far outweighs the small temporary benefit of that subsidy because do 5,000 or 6,000 vehicles get to 30 per cent of the light vehicle fleet? I am trying to think: do 5,000 or 6,000 vehicles constitute 30 per cent of the light vehicle fleet? I think there are 1.7 million registered vehicles here in South Australia. Admittedly, that figure includes buses and trucks, trailers and so on, but I think the number is something in the order of a million or even 1.1 million light vehicles. So to think that that temporary small measure is going to get in 30 per cent is laughable, absolutely laughable. This government are not genuine about getting us to 30 per cent. What they are genuine about is passing the tax so that it can be implemented no later than in five years' time.

This is being held out as being some sort of extraordinary policy reform, some sort of Keatingesque or Howardesque attempt at taxation reform according to the member for Schubert, who says that this has been long talked about at the national level but that finally South Australia is taking the lead. I know that the member for Schubert only had very brief occasion to go to transport infrastructure council meetings as minister, and those days are long behind him.

He might recall that the only discussion going on about road-user charging was for the heavy vehicle industry and not light vehicles, for the small proportion of vehicles on our roads that, incidentally, require the greatest cost being spent on our roads—that is, heavy vehicles, the one road user that have all their travel accounted for, including distance, location, destination and time for road safety purposes and also for business administration purposes. That was the only context that road-user charging was being discussed, not with regard to light vehicles.

The member for Schubert might want to ask himself: if this was such great taxation reform, why did it take until he vacated the chair around the cabinet table for it to actually come forward? Maybe it is because he knew that it was not a priority, that it was not such a great idea, or maybe just that once somebody else was in the chair who had more wherewithal and would finally have a crack at it. I do not know which of those two are true; nonetheless, a terrible idea it remains.

Now we are left with what the government's final argument is. That is, just like we have had a period of time in South Australia for the last 25 or 30 years when we have had a year-on-year indexation of government fees and charges, this government sneakily in this reform say that the charge per kilometre will either be 2¢ or 2½¢, depending on whether it is a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle or a battery electric vehicle.

What they do not tell you is that that applies in the past and that each year from then on—I think December 2019 or December 2020; I forget which of the two it is—those two figures are set, then those figures are indexed each year. So it actually will not be 2¢ or 2½¢ per kilometre, it will be five years of indexation at least above that. The question really is why the government would not be more open and more honest about what the actual levy rate is.

The last thing I will say is if this government wants to do something for motorists, let me make some suggestions of how they could make motorists' lives easier. Perhaps they could remove the proverbial finger and get on with some of the delayed infrastructure projects they have been dragging their heels on. Never has there been a term of government in recent history where a government has delayed and blown out infrastructure and transport projects like this government has.

Maybe they could stop going after motorists' hip pockets if they wanted to do something for motorists in South Australia. Maybe they could listen to some of their own backbench—or those who used to be on their backbench—about some of the transport priorities, for example up in the hills around Adelaide, if they wanted to do something for motorists.

If they want to do something for electric vehicle owners and the electric vehicle industry, maybe they could get serious about actually supporting the industry. Maybe they could provide a purchase incentive which will make a difference to the uptake of these vehicles throughout the light vehicle fleet, and maybe rather than just talking and putting out press releases about expanding a charger network they could actually get on with it. This is a dreadful idea, and of course we will not be supporting it.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:46): I will just say a few words on the Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Bill 2021. Clearly, we oppose the bill. The member for Lee has, I think, nailed the arguments put forward by the other side when it comes to this particular levy, so I will not go into detail about that.

One of the things we should always be mindful of, especially in the early stages of the startup of different technological approaches, is to not put barriers in the way, is to not flag disincentives. It is to encourage a direction that we are starting to go in as a nation, even though we are lagging well behind many other countries.

As a country member, I think electric vehicles are going to end up being a real plus. The capital cost has to come down, but the recurrent costs associated with electric vehicles are significantly less than for fossil fuel vehicles, and for that reason alone it should be welcome. One of the real bugbears for those of us who live in country electorates, and especially the more remote electorates, is the constant fluctuation of prices at the bowser as a result of a whole range of issues, global issues that impact upon what happens here in Australia when it comes to fuel pricing.

The shift to electric vehicles will facilitate a far greater degree of energy dependency and a consistency and a continuity when it comes to pricing, and far cheaper pricing when it comes to those recurrent costs of providing the energy for a vehicle. Of course, there is that other recurrent cost; the

maintenance of a vehicle is also significantly less when it comes to electric vehicles, so we should be encouraging that.

I will flag that there is clearly potential also for hydrogen fuel cells when it comes to the vehicle market. A record was set just recently when a vehicle travelled 1,224 kilometres on 5.5 kilos of hydrogen. That technology is also improving but also needs to come down when it comes to capital cost, and it will do so.

It is worth reflecting that the aim with hydrogen is to get it under \$2 a kilogram, so 5.5 kilos is not much hydrogen to travel well over a thousand kilometres in a particular set of circumstances, but nevertheless improvements are there. If you add the distribution costs, the retail costs and the fact that we can produce hydrogen in this country in the future, once again that improves energy independence. There are a couple of technology routes when it comes to our vehicle market that are worth contemplating.

One of the other elements when you look at the negative externalities when it comes to vehicle use is that many years ago I was playing with a proposition that even fossil fuel pricing at the bowser should be cheaper in the country given that the negative externalities of vehicle use in the country are less than in the city when you take into account the concentration of pollution and congestion in the city and what has to happen there. There is an argument for looking at those negative externalities.

One of the things about the introduction of either electric vehicles or hydrogen vehicles is it will address one of those important negative externalities because more people in this country die as a result of transport emissions than they do from vehicle accidents. That is something that is often forgotten. When it comes to electric vehicles or hydrogen fuel vehicles, we are going to end up with a far cleaner atmosphere and that will benefit people in our metropolitan areas.

There are a lot of pluses for going in this direction. I know that the people opposite are not opposed to electric vehicles, unlike what the Liberals had to say at a federal level, but this is the wrong way to go. We should be encouraging electric vehicles, not putting in place disincentives. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CONSTITUTION (INDEPENDENT SPEAKER) AMENDMENT BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:51): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith of the Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill 2021.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority of members not being present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

The SPEAKER: I accept the motion. The member for Florey might indicate: does the member for Florey wish to speak to the motion?

Ms BEDFORD: No, sir.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of clarification, sir: would it be possible for the member for Florey to tell the house why she seeks to suspend standing orders, what the purpose of it is?

The SPEAKER: The necessity to suspend standing orders is in order to move the substantive motion. In the circumstances in which the motion has arisen, the member for Florey might just repeat the proposed motion.

Ms BEDFORD: I will be moving that I seek leave to introduce the Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill 2021 forthwith so as to correct an anomaly I see in the house, sir.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24

Noes22

Majority2

AYES

Bedford, F.E. (teller)
 Bignell, L.W.K.
 Brown, M.E.
 Cregan, D.
 Hildyard, K.A.
 Malinauskas, P.
 Odenwalder, L.K.
 Stinson, J.M.

Bell, T.S.
 Boyer, B.I.
 Close, S.E.
 Duluk, S.
 Hughes, E.J.
 Michaels, A.
 Piccolo, A.
 Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.
 Brock, G.G.
 Cook, N.F.
 Gee, J.P.
 Koutsantonis, A.
 Mullighan, S.C.
 Picton, C.J.
 Wortley, D.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
 Ellis, F.J.
 Knoll, S.K.
 McBride, N.
 Pederick, A.S.
 Sanderson, R.
 Treloar, P.A.
 Wingard, C.L.

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

Cowdrey, M.J.
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)
 Marshall, S.S.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Power, C.
 Tarzia, V.A.
 Whetstone, T.J.

Motion thus carried.

Introduction and First Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (13:03): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

Sitting suspended from 13:04 to 14:00.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (OVERSIGHT AND ADVOCACY BODIES) (COMMISSIONER FOR ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

LEGISLATION INTERPRETATION BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTERVENTION ORDERS AND PENALTIES) BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (CPIPC RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD ZONE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 144 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reject the proposed Code Amendment to be applied within the Urban Neighbourhood Zone in relation to the land located

at 25 Pierson Street, Lockleys on the basis that it does not conform to the desired outcomes and performance outcomes of PlanSA's Planning and Design Code.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General Reports—

Report 12 of 2021—Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2021—

Part A: Executive Summary

Part B: Controls Opinion

Part C: Agency Audit Reports

Part D: Managing Climate Change in South Australia

[Ordered to be published]

Report 13 of 2021—COVID-SAFE Check-In Review [Ordered to be published]

House of Assembly—Parliamentary Service—Annual Report 2020-21

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and Office for Public Integrity—

Annual Report 2020-21

Judicial Conduct Commissioner—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Annual Report 2020-21

Adelaide Festival Corporation—Annual Report 2020-21

Adelaide Venue Management Corporation—Annual Report 2020-21

Art Gallery South Australia (AGSA)—Annual Report 2020-21

Auditor-General's Department—Annual Report 2020-21

Carrick Hill Trust—Annual Report 2020-21

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board—Annual Report 2020-21

Country Arts SA—Annual Report 2020-21

Defence SA—Annual Report 2020-21

Employment Tribunal, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21

Essential Services Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

Financing Authority, South Australian Government—Annual Report 2020-21

HomeStart Finance—Annual Report 2020-21

Industry Advocate, Office of the—Annual Report 2020-21

Infrastructure SA—Annual Report 2020-21

Libraries Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

Local Government Finance Authority—Annual Report 2020-21

Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

Motor Accident Commission—Annual Report 2020-21

Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21

Museum Board, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21

Premier and Cabinet, Department of the—Annual Report 2020-21

Procurement Board, State—Annual Report 2020-21

Productivity Commission, Office of the South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21

Remuneration Tribunal—

No. 6 of 2021—Determination—Accommodation Reimbursement and Allowance for Country Members of Parliament Determination No. 6 of 2021

No. 6 of 2021 Report—Accommodation Reimbursement and Allowance for Country Members of Parliament Report No. 6 of 2021

No. 7 of 2021 Determination—Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia Determination No. 7 of 2021
 No. 7 of 2021 Report—2021 Review of the Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia Report No. 7 of 2021
 No. 8 of 2021 Determination—Electorate Allowances for Members of the Parliament of South Australia Determination No. 8 of 2021
 No. 8 of 2021 Report—2021 Review of Electorate Allowances for Members of the Parliament of South Australia Report No. 8 of 2021
 No. 9 of 2021 Determination—Per Diem Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition Determination No. 9 of 2021
 No. 9 of 2021 Report—2021 Review of Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition Report No. 9 of 2021
 No. 10 of 2021 Report—Reimbursement of Expenses Applicable to the Electorate of Mawson—Travel to and from Kangaroo Island by Ferry and Aircraft Report No. 10 of 2021
 ReturnToWorkSA—Annual Report 2020-21
 State Opera South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21
 State Theatre Company of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21
 Tandanya National Aboriginal Culture Institute—Annual Report 2020-21
 Tourism Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21
 Treasury and Finance, Department of—Annual Report 2020-21
 Urban Renewal Authority (trading as Renewal SA)—Annual Report 2020-21

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

Attorney-General's Department—Annual Report 2020-21
 Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005—Review of Amendments to the Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009—Assumed Identities and Witness Identity Protection Annual Report from the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission—2020-21
 Equal Opportunity Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21
 Housing Trust, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21
 Human Services, Department of—Annual Report 2020-21
 Professional Standards Councils—Annual Report 2020-21
 Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995—Annual Report 2020-21
 Surveillance Devices Act 2016—Annual Report 2020-21
 Terrorism (Prevention Detention) Act 2005—SA Police Report pursuant to Section 48 2020-21
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Child Sex Offenders Registration—Savings and Transitional
 Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations)—Covert Operations—Savings and Transitional
 Independent Commissioner Against Corruption—Commission
 Judicial Conduct Commissioner—Savings and Transitional
 Ombudsman—Savings and Transitional
 Police Complaints and Discipline—Savings and Transitional
 Summary Offences—Savings and Transitional
 Surveillance Devices—Savings and Transitional
 Telecommunications (Interception)—Interception—Savings and Transitional

By the Minister for Planning and Local Government (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Planning, Development and Infrastructure—General—Temporary Accommodation
 Local Council By-Laws—
 City of Tea Tree Gully—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Roads
No. 3—Local Government Land
No. 4—Dogs
No. 5—Moveable Signs
No. 6—Waste Management
The Barossa Council—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Roads
No. 4—Local Government Land
No. 6—Cats
No. 7—Waste Management
Town of Gawler—No. 6—Cats

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—
Energy and Mining, Department for—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—
Health and Wellbeing, Department for—Annual Report 2020-21
Regulations made under the following Acts—
South Australian Public Health—Notifiable and Controlled Notifiable Conditions
Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products—E-Cigarette Liquid

By the Minister for Innovation and Skills (Hon. D.G. Pisoni)—
Adelaide Film Festival—Annual Report 2020-21
Construction Industry Training Board—Annual Report 2020-21
Film Corporation, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21
Innovation and Skills, Department for—Annual Report 2020-21
Jam Factory—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. R. Sanderson)—
Child Protection, Department for—Annual Report 2020-21
Safe and Well: Supporting Families, Protecting Children—Annual Report 2020-21
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Children and Young People (Safety)—Safety—Exemption from Psychological
Assessment (No. 3)

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—
Infrastructure and Transport, Department for—Annual Report 2020-21
National Heavy Vehicle Regulator—Annual Report 2020-21
National Rail Safety Regulator, Office of the—Annual Report 2020-21
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—Motor Bike Driver Licensing

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—
Recreation, Sport and Racing, Office for—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—
Animal Welfare Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2020-21
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium, Board of the—Annual Report 2020-21
Co-Management Board—
Dhilba Guranda-Innes National Park Annual Report 2020-21

Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park Annual Report 2020-21
 Lake Gairdner National Park Annual Report 2020-21
 Mamungari Conservation Park Annual Report 2020-21
 Ngaut Ngaut Conservation Park Annual Report 2020-21
 Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Annual Report 2020-21
 Witjira National Park Annual Report 2020-21
 Yumbarra Conservation Park Annual Report 2020-21
 Dog and Cat Management Board—Annual Report 2020-21
 Environment and Water, Department for—Annual Report
 Environment Protection Authority—Annual Report 2020-21
 Green Industries SA—Annual Report 2020-21
 Heritage Council, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21
 International Koala Centre of Excellence (trading as Koala Life Board)—Annual Report
 2020-21
 Parks and Wilderness Council—Annual Report 2020-21
 South Australian Water Corporation—Annual Report 2020-21
 South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board—Annual Report 2020-21
 Stormwater Management Authority—Annual Report 2020-21
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Radiation Protection and Control—Fees Notice (No. 2)

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

Bushfire Coordination Committee, State—Annual Report 2020-21
 Community Road Safety Fund—Annual Report 2020-21
 Police, South Australian—Annual Report 2020-21

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

Forestry SA—Annual Report 2020-21
 Primary Industries and Regions, Department of—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Minister for Trade and Investment (Hon. S.J. Patterson)—

Study Adelaide—Annual Report 2020-21
 Trade and Investment, Department for—Annual Report 2020-21

Ministerial Statement

GOVERNOR APPOINTMENT

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: On behalf of all members of parliament, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson AC on taking office as our state's 36th Governor. As Her Excellency has already demonstrated, she will be a Governor who engages with all sections of the South Australian community, having held an open day at Government House on Sunday within three days of taking her oath of office.

Much has been said about Her Excellency's more than three decades of distinguished diplomatic service to our nation. As a state, in welcoming her home we can look forward to her drawing on her background and skills as a diplomat to be of service to South Australia not only here but nationally and internationally as well. As such, I believe she will be one of the great governors of our state.

Her Excellency is married to Mr Rod Bunten and they have four adult children. Born in the United Kingdom, Mr Bunten also has experience as a diplomat, having joined the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office in 1984 and undertaking postings in the United States, Asia and Australia. It was while they were both posted in Hong Kong that Mr Bunten met Her Excellency.

I appreciate the wide community support there has been for the appointment of Her Excellency, including the warm sentiments expressed across the political spectrum. Prime Minister Scott Morrison has said that Canberra's loss is our state's gain. In welcoming her home, I know we all look forward to the work Her Excellency is now taking up on behalf of all South Australians, continuing to benefit the rest of our nation as well.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:16): I bring up the sixth report of the committee, entitled 'An inquiry into the Coast Protection Board and coastal legislation'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

STATE LIBERAL PARTY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Why do so many of the Premier's own MPs either threaten to quit to leave the Liberal Party, or actually quit to leave the Liberal Party, under your leadership?

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

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 97: the question contains argument—completely unacceptable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens! The standing order is taken pursuant to standing order 97. It asks why, it introduces facts. Arguably, it contravenes standing order 97. I will allow the question. Does the Premier wish to seek the call?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18): Thank you very much, sir. It's telling that the first question that the Leader of the Opposition asks after parliament resumes is to focus on grubby politics, as per usual. That's all they are focused on on that side of the house. By contrast—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Your divisions?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —those of us on this side of the house are focused unequivocally on getting through this coronavirus, making sure that we can have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a strong rebound and create as many jobs as we can.

STATE LIBERAL PARTY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is the Premier. Can the Premier name any other Premier in the history of South Australia to have lost more of their own MPs in one term than he has?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: the Premier is not responsible to this house for political history, regardless of whether the Leader of the Opposition is interested in it or not.

The SPEAKER: It might, moreover, be rather characterised as a rhetorical question. I uphold the point of order. Does the leader seek the call?

STATE LIBERAL PARTY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Yes. My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that his own leadership is a contributing factor to his own MPs either threatening to quit his party or actually doing it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19): As I have said repeatedly, I am focused on one thing in this state and that's getting through this coronavirus and creating as many opportunities for South Australians as we possibly can.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Not on Friday and Saturday night.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It has been a very tough time, sir, as you would be more than aware, for many people in South Australia but we have done relatively well. The vaccination program is rolling out. I look forward to continuing the strong economic growth that we have seen which emanates from our strong response to the coronavirus.

STATE LIBERAL PARTY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Given the important circumstances the state now finds itself in, does the Premier accept it is important to be able to provide stable leadership to the people of South Australia, rather than having a government imploding around him?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Premier seek the call? The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): The reality is we've got a strong plan for South Australia. We have had a strong plan since the very first day we came to office—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: With 25 MPs.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and what we are doing is we are delivering. How does that compare with those opposite who have now been in opposition for 3½ years? They are still yet to release any useful policy. The major policy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that they have announced—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —had a \$5 million black hole in it. So that's what we have had from the opposition: getting into the gutter as quickly as possible at every single opportunity. By contrast, we are implementing our strong plan, which is keeping our state safe and our economy strong.

NEXT STEPS PROGRAM

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:21): My question is for the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is providing better services by extending existing support through the Next Steps program for young people leaving care?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:21): I thank the member for King for her question and for her continued interest in child protection-related issues. The Next Steps program will expand on the success of the Marshall Liberal government's policy, Stability in Family-Based Care, which is a program that supports young people in both foster and kinship care to stay on to the age of 21. This initiative will provide stability post care and extend existing supports to young people in non family-based care, also known as residential care.

The Foster and Kinship Care to 21 initiative commenced on 1 January 2019 and gives carers and young people added stability and security and has been extremely successful helping over 100 young people. The Marshall Liberal government will provide \$2.7 million over four years for the Next Steps pilot program to expand supports for more young people leaving care up to the age of 21 years. The Next Steps pilot program is expected to start in January 2022.

This timely investment to support a young person's transition to adulthood will have a range of long-term benefits, such as decreasing the risks of homelessness, unemployment, mental health problems and financial stress and decreasing the long-term impacts on other areas of government, such as social housing, health and mental health. This initiative builds on other measures that we provide to support and assist young people to transition to adulthood, including:

- the Over 18 Education Initiative, which provides the carer subsidy and quarterly education grant to carers of young people completing education or training until achieving their qualification or until the age of 25 years;
- funding to Relationships Australia SA for post-care services, including counselling and mentoring;
- specialised support to access the National Disability Insurance Agency benefits and ultimately to ensure a planned and supported transition for care leavers with a disability;
- support to access resources through initiatives, such as the commonwealth-funded Transition to Independent Living Allowance and the Dame Roma Mitchell Trust Fund;
- support also to access services through the CREATE Foundation, such as the Sortli app, which was developed with young people in care and provides a range of information to assist them with becoming independent; and
- negotiated dental services to the age of 25 to better support our children, as well as ambulance cover to the age of 21.

This is why I am proud to be part of a Marshall Liberal government that—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —is committed to improving outcomes for our vulnerable children and young people to give them the best opportunity to succeed in life.

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

COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. When the Premier made a statement last week about the quarantine arrangements for double vaccinated travellers from interstate before Christmas, did he have the concurrence of the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): I'm not sure what the member is referring to in terms of 'concurrence'. We in South Australia are signed up to the national framework, which is a four-stage framework which relates to how we end state lockdowns and end state lockouts. This is something which, of course, the police commissioner, acting as the State Coordinator during this major emergency declaration, the Chief Public Health Officer and my office are all signed up to. This is the program which is being rolled out at the moment and of course is subject to us getting to 80 per cent double vaccination for those 16 and over.

COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Why are the people of South Australia hearing conflicting messages from the Premier and the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: Last week, the Premier told South Australians:

I'm hopeful all of those people coming back from interstate that are double vaccinated—that haven't been to exposure sites—will be able to come back and enjoy a relatively normal Christmas in South Australia.

However, today the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens, said:

It's important that the work is done based upon proper modelling and not just shooting from the hip. What we don't want to do is create unfair expectations and then have to change it in a negative way when we get closer to that 80 per cent target.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26): I don't see any point that has been made there whatsoever. The police commissioner was referring to the arrangements with regard to the testing that might occur as people come back into South Australia, which is yet to be determined and will be based upon modelling. There is modelling that has been commissioned—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —as part of the national cabinet arrangement. I have spoken about this on numerous occasions in the media, but we are as one in making sure that we can get to 80 per cent double vaccinated for those 16 and over as quickly as possible. Then, as soon as we get to that point, we have the opportunity to end state lockdowns and state lockouts.

What I have consistently said, though, is that we will need to continue to have test, trace, isolate and quarantine procedures in place so when people do become infected they will need to go into isolation and their close contacts into isolation. There will still need to be some public health social measures in place, and these are yet to be determined at the national cabinet level and will be based upon further modelling, which has been commissioned about five weeks ago by the national cabinet. The Doherty Institute is doing this work. Professor McVernon provided an update to national cabinet only last week and we are still waiting on that final modelling.

We still haven't determined in South Australia precisely what the testing arrangements will be and, of course, we need to wait until we get closer to the date that we open to determine what that risk is for people coming interstate. For example, sir, you will be more than aware that people who are coming from Queensland, the Northern Territory, Western Australia or Tasmania at the moment have no testing requirements, but from time to time people from those jurisdictions have had testing and isolation requirements.

We can only really determine that as we get closer and understand what that level of risk coming from those jurisdictions is going to be at that time. We don't want to create expectations that there will be no testing and we don't want to create expectations that there will be no quarantine because we need to determine—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: You created that expectation.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —what that level of risk is going to be. But the vast majority of people coming in from interstate, as long as they are double vaccinated and they haven't been to exposure sites or very heavily impacted areas, will be able to come in and then maybe some testing arrangements put in place as they arrive.

COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier get advice from SA Health before he made a statement last week on quarantine arrangements for travellers from interstate at Christmas? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: Yesterday, SA Health chief executive, Chris McGowan, told a parliamentary committee:

It is not our expectation that there will be no quarantine requirements even for double vaccinated people at this stage.

Further, he went on to say, 'I haven't provided him,' being the Premier, 'any advice on that', and, 'No, I am not aware of any advice to that effect.'

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): I think I have gone through this on multiple occasions. We are signed up to the national framework in terms of the removal or the end of state lockdowns and the rollout of the vaccination program. That has been on the advice of the Doherty Institute. It's also been on the advice of the AHPPC. We know that Professor Nicola Spurrier sits on the AHPPC. We didn't seek separate independent advice from Dr Chris McGowan. We signed up—SA Health, South Australia Police, the government of South Australia—to the national framework, and that was very much informed by science and evidence.

SOLAR ENERGY

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is improving access to solar energy for concession holders and cutting their energy bills?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:30): Yes, I can. It was a pleasure to be with the member for Newland in his electorate just over a week ago to share this information with local people. We went to the last election with a very firm commitment to reduce the cost of electricity, to reduce the number of blackouts and to continue to reduce emissions from electricity generation, and we are doing that: \$303 so far since the last election.

However, we do recognise that many of our policies are in partnership with industry and in partnership with consumers and that very often they require an investment from consumers: an investment in solar, an investment in home batteries, an investment in other opportunities. We are incredibly aware, on this side of the house, that not every household has the opportunity, not every household has the capacity, to make that investment, but we are determined to make sure that the advantages that we provide for South Australian electricity consuming households are there for as many households as possible.

So not only are we reducing the cost of electricity for households that just draw their electricity from the grid but we have a pilot program for 1,000 homes to be able to swap their cost-of-living and energy concessions in return for being given free solar on their homes. The modelling shows that households will be net better off between \$157 and \$525 per year per household. That is akin to voluntarily surrendering a \$450 concession—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —in return for a \$600 to \$1,000 per year return. The way this works is that we are doing it in a pilot group of suburbs. We've got about 300 of these opportunities taken up already.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: They are going extremely well. We are also finding that those households that participate get greater savings than the original modelling. We have done the modelling to have an estimate of what the savings will be. The reality so far is that those participating are receiving even greater savings. When we finish this one year, 1,000 home trial, we will be able to assess whether we can roll this out further.

Let me just reiterate: it is voluntary. We are sending information out to all the households that would be eligible in the suburbs that apply to the trial. If they would like to, then they approach the government, they get the information and they actually get a personalised assessment—look at their electricity bills, look at their roof, look at their electricity usage and their own personal circumstances, a tailored assessment of what their savings would be—and then they can choose whether they want to go forward. This is a fantastic program.

The shadow minister for energy and mining called this cruel and unfair: cruel and unfair to give people the option to volunteer to choose this money if they would like to, cruel and unfair to be given a 4.4 kilowatt solar system—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —if they choose, cruel and unfair to get additional electricity savings on top of the savings that the government is already offering them. If that's what those opposite think, if they think that's cruel and unfair, well—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —let them have that opinion. We have this offer. It is absolutely outstanding. The results are tremendous. It is voluntary. If people choose to stay as they are, they are welcome to stay as they are. If they would like to sign up, surrender their concessions in return for even greater annual savings, they just need to get in touch with us for a tailored quote to find out exactly how good this is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for answering the question has expired. Before I call the member for Kaurna, I call to order the member for Giles. I call to order the member for Playford.

COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:34): My question is to the Premier. Who makes the decision about quarantine arrangements for people coming from interstate before Christmas: the Premier or the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34): The directions are issued by the State Coordinator if a major emergency declaration is in place at that point in time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:35): My question is to the Premier. Following the resignation of the member for Kavel from the Liberal Party, did the Premier leave Adelaide to attend the Barossa Contemporary?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens might repeat the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Premier. Following the resignation of the member for Kavel from the Liberal Party, did the Premier leave Adelaide and attend the Barossa Contemporary?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35): I am happy to inform the house what I was doing on Friday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: At 5pm, I had a meeting with the President of Brittany, Mr Loïg Chesnais-Girard, and of course we—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Did you tell him about the subs?

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —spoke to him about our ongoing relationship with the region of Brittany. Members will be interested to know that we signed a new MOU with Brittany in October last year and we are very pleased to hear the ongoing support from the government of Brittany to continue with the excellent MOU that we have in place.

After that, I travelled to Angle Park, to the greyhounds, to see the fantastic work that is being done there—a big expansion of the facilities that are out there at Angle Park. There was a big crowd and I was very pleased to be there when the Minister for Sport and Recreation presented the Adelaide Cup.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Then I did travel to the Barossa to attend an installation for the Barossa Contemporary called Transcendence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for West Torrens, I call to order the member for Chaffey.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Given his previous answer, does the Premier consider it a wise decision to go partying in the Barossa rather than stay in Adelaide and work on repairing divisions in the Liberal Party?

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

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: That may well be what the member for West Torrens does every time he leaves his electorate, but to apply that argument to anybody on this side would be in contravention of standing order 97.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will leave for 10 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A. I uphold the point of order.

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

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters in our emergency services sector and supporting local jobs?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:38): I thank the member for MacKillop for the question. I know the member for MacKillop feels strongly about this particular area and he knows how important our emergency services are, especially in our regional areas. They do a fantastic job keeping us safe all year round.

I was pleased to visit a great local business called Agri-Bits in recent times. The SES actually has a five-year partnership with Agri-Bits, worth over \$4 million, for the delivery of trucks and also flood trailers. It's quite a significant partnership with this significant South Australian business, and it

has seen the delivery of 31 flood and also storm response trailers, the construction of 26 rescue truck bodies and also two trailer-mounted sandbagging machines. I know they have been very popular in recent times, sir, especially in your neck of the woods.

Of course, this type of significant investment results in local jobs, which is so important across our state and in our communities. Only recently, I paid Agri-Bits a business visit at their Wingfield factory and I met with Marco, who is their production manager. He is a fantastic guy. He showed me around what must be, I would say, 4,000 square metres in factory space and gave me an insight into the construction process of these trucks, trailers and also their storm vehicles.

It is very, very important that our emergency services personnel have the equipment that they need to do their job efficiently and effectively and, most importantly, safely as well. Agri-Bits has embraced the challenge of delivering innovative ideas that make operational processes such as sandbagging efficient but also safe for our emergency services personnel and the public as well. I have seen firsthand how important these trailers are which make a huge difference to this critical but what is a very labour-intensive task as well.

Our emergency services sector partners with many companies like them. Earlier this year, I joined the member for Hammond when we commissioned a new SES marine rescue vessel at the Meningie SES unit. What a lovely part of the world! The delivery of this new vessel actually involved contributions from a whole range of stakeholders like, for example, \$180,000 in capital funding from the Community Emergency Services Fund.

The vessel is 6.7 metres and it was built by what is another South Australian success story in Nautic Star. It was great to have both Tanya and Marco Bacic there in attendance at the vessel's commissioning. They have made a whole range of these vessels for us, and they are absolutely world class. It is great to see many of our agencies utilising them, not only here but also other agencies in other states.

Based at Lonsdale, Nautic Star is recognised nationally for its quality and its performance in boat building, and Meningie's new vessel is yet another example of the Lonsdale company's excellent construction. It is yet another example of a local South Australian business which is excelling, which is growing in its field. It's employing South Australians and delivering high-quality goods and services. The SES's partnership with Nautic Star is a fantastic success story and it's going to continue to ensure local construction, local jobs and outstanding results for our community as well.

The house will also be interested to know that the Meningie SES has recognised and honoured the longstanding ties of the Ngarrindjeri people to this country by naming the vessel *Yarli*, which is the traditional name of Lake Albert, which *Yarli* will monitor. I have no doubt that the capabilities of the new vessel will improve the safety of people in Meningie but also the Lake Albert area and contribute to a stronger and safer South Australia.

Our emergency services sector is proud to rely on and foster local South Australian businesses' jobs and ensure where possible that we are building what matters but also creating jobs for the future and also boosting our economy.

COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house what changes to cross-border travel arrangements he was able to facilitate while he was transcendental in the Barossa over the weekend?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42): I am not quite sure where the gist of this question comes from with regard to cross-border arrangements, if he is talking to the border arrangements with Victoria or other jurisdictions. But, as the member would be aware, this is the responsibility of the State Coordinator, who is the police commissioner, during this major emergency declaration. We work together to make sure that we have a framework in place, but ultimately that direction is put into place by the police commissioner.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:43): My question again is to the Premier. Did the Premier attend the \$390 per head Iridescence dinner at the Barossa Contemporary festival held on Saturday night?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): Yes.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:43): My question again is to the Premier. How many people attended the dinner?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): I think there were multiple sittings, but the sitting I attended—it's a dinner which showcases the great food capability we have in South Australia with our wine capability—I think that there would have been between 20 and 30 at the table. It's one single long table which is held at Yalumba. It was one of a number of events which was held over that festival. It's an interesting festival, Barossa Contemporary. We are really looking forward to seeing how this unfolds in future years. Of course, this was the first year that it was trialled. I think there was something in the order of 21 events, of which 12 were sold out. I think we can very much expect this to be very successful in future years.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:44): My question is for the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house about how the Marshall Liberal government is contributing to the COVID recovery in South Australia through construction, training and jobs?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:44): I thank the member for Elder for her question and also her interest in the construction industry here in South Australia. The Marshall government is creating jobs and supporting South Australians to get the skills and qualifications they need to work in rewarding careers, including within the building and construction industry here in South Australia.

Today, I tabled the Construction Industry Training Board Annual Report 2021, which highlights South Australia's achievements in training and job creation across the industry. Construction Industry Training Fund levy revenue for the 2020-21 period was \$28.2 million, an increase of \$7.9 million from the previous financial year.

This significant increase in levy revenues is credited to the success of the Marshall government's financial stimulus in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and programs such as the HomeBuilder grant, the Local Government Infrastructure Partnership Program and fast-tracking investment in infrastructure spending, including our \$17.9 billion investment in infrastructure. Despite the challenges presented by the pandemic, the CITB invested \$18.3 million across its three key programs over that period:

- 1,184 students participated in the doorways2construction school-based career pathway for building and construction. This reflects a 31 per cent increase in participation over the past five years;
- \$11.7 million was allocated to support a record number of 5,912 building and construction apprentices and included additional support to mature-age and Aboriginal apprentices;
- \$4.3 million supported 12,869 workers to complete subsidised construction skills training to develop their skills and career opportunities; and
- the tradie2trainer initiative was expanded, and 36 tradespeople across the state completed a Certificate IV in Training and Assessment.

This is important because these are people who are coming off the tools and they have that practical experience. We have record numbers of apprentices joining the construction industry, and now there are even more trainees and assessors to ensure they get quality training both on and off the job. This reflects an increase in the registered training organisation demand for suitably qualified staff to deliver building and construction training.

The CITB is part of our Flexible Industry Pathways in our South Australian schools. The CITB will grow and develop the doorways2construction initiative and it provides a gateway for industry immersion in programs from year 7—which, of course, will be the first year of high school from next

year, bringing South Australia in line with every other state and territory in the country—allowing younger students to gain hands-on experience in the building industry.

This year, the CITB's innovative Try a Trade program has been extended and expanded to include a female stream, offering training for females interested in trains—in trades, sorry—and, of course we would like to see more interest in trains as well. I was very pleased to be there last week down at Tonsley meeting a number of the young women who were in their second day of this program, with the Premier and the education minister and, boy, they really enjoyed the experience that they had and were very keen. They were from schools right across the metropolitan area and they really enjoyed the experience they had.

A record \$26 million has been invested by the CITB into the annual training plan, including more than \$1.2 million for programs in schools. The plan allocates more than \$19 million to support training for construction apprentices and over \$5 million to help existing construction workers to access more than 200 subsidised short courses.

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

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:48): My question is to the Premier. How many of the attendees of the dinner that the Premier attended on Saturday night paid for a ticket to the dinner? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition has been told that the only people who attended the dinner were the Premier, some social media influencers, tourism bureaucrats and a smattering of hangers-on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49): I've got no idea of the exact number of people, but I am happy to make that inquiry and come back to the house. I do think it's important, though, that we support our regions, and this line of questioning I find quite pathetic really.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Kaurana!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: A brand-new festival, a brand-new event for the Barossa. We know that tourism and the visitor economy is doing—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee! Members on my right and members on my left, I remind you that the minister, in answering a question, is entitled to be heard in silence. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can confirm to the house is that there was no Spanish wine served at that event. As you would be aware, sir, this was a function that was run by a private organisation, and I was very pleased, as the Minister for Tourism and the Premier, to attend.

As I said, I think it is extraordinary that the opposition would refer to people who attend an important regional event like this as 'hangers-on'. They should hang their heads in shame.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a new low. We know the visitor economy has suffered due to the coronavirus—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Kaurana!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we know the tourism sector has suffered throughout the coronavirus. We are doing anything we can to support the areas most affected, and some of that support comes through increased grants and some of it, of course, comes through new events and programs. I am very proud of the work the SATC has done in South Australia with projects like the Great State Voucher, but I am also very pleased that they continue an events program in a pretty tough period.

We know that events like cycling, the Tour Down Under, have been massively affected, and that's why it is important we continue to look to create new events, and this has the framework for a very exciting event for our state. I think, when borders allow, it is going to bring big numbers from interstate and overseas. These are the types of events we should be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —supporting, the private sector taking risks, investing in new product development to attract people into our state. What I don't support is the opposition speaking disparagingly about people who are risking their capital to bring people into South Australia—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to speak of them and refer to some of the guests as 'hangers-on'. I will get a list of the people who came to that event. I had an opportunity to speak to a very prominent winemaker from the Barossa, and I think he would be horrified to be referred to as a 'hanger-on'.

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

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I take my hat off to people like Charles Melton, who have invested their own private capital, produced an excellent product, exported that product around the world, and provided opportunities for our next generation to learn a craft. That's who I sat next to, and he certainly enjoyed the evening as well. There were a range of people there, but the barbs and political attacks from those opposite just serve to demonstrate to every single person in this state how petty, pathetic and unfit for office they really are.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is seeking the call. Before I call the member for West Torrens, I warn the member for Mawson, I warn the member for Chaffey, I warn the member for Playford and I call to order the member for Kaurana.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier pay \$390 to attend the dinner?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:53): No, sir.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier go on, after the Iridescence dinner, to attend the Transcendence dance party after the dinner? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Transcendence event was described by organisers as 'an underground club reserved only for the adventurous'.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54): No. I attended an event before the dinner, which was called Lightwaves, but I did not travel after the dinner to an event that is referred to by the member for West Torrens.

PREMIER'S EXPORT AWARDS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Minister, would you please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is contributing to the COVID recovery in South Australia through export?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (14:54): I thank the member for Chaffey. We have talked before about the importance of his region's exporters to South Australia. It was great to visit that region with the member for Chaffey at the start of the year, and I look forward to visiting his electorate later this year because there is no doubt that the exporters in his electorate have been hit hard not only by COVID and the challenges around international travel and how the global supply chain has been disrupted but also market access issues into some of our key trading partners—China especially.

Many exporters here in South Australia are working really hard despite these challenges because they know that helps grow their business and employs South Australians. It is really important that we celebrate their hard work, and that is why very recently we had the first Premier's South Australian Export Awards right here at the National Wine Centre. The theme of these awards was to recognise and to honour our South Australian exporters who have achieved outstanding successes and sustainable growth through innovation and commitment to help grow the South Australian economy.

Certainly, that theme encapsulates the importance of supporting our exporters, which is what the Marshall government certainly does here to help them make connections in a year when connections have never been so difficult. By naming these awards the Premier's Export Awards and giving his personal endorsement, it certainly highlights the importance that not only the Premier but this government places on exports to help grow the South Australian economy, to help to support South Australian businesses and ultimately jobs growth.

These awards recognised the cream of South Australian exporters, but there are hundreds of these businesses throughout South Australia—small businesses, medium businesses—and, of course, they employ thousands and thousands of South Australians, and they go towards helping grow exports. I spoke last time we were in parliament about our July export figures hitting a state record of \$13 billion, and that is after previous months hitting records as well.

It is great to be able to inform the house today that the merchandise export figures for the 12 months to August again hit a new state record: \$13.2 billion. This is a massive flow of money coming into the economy. It is \$2 billion up on this time last year, which is a credit to all the hard work that South Australian businesses have put towards their exporting, and I commend them and acknowledge their hard work.

I talked about the Premier's Export Awards, and we acknowledge some of those exporters. In the Agribusiness, Food and Beverages category Accolade Wines won for their hard work, exporting into the UK to help them expand. From a professional services point of view we had CMAX Clinical Research. Their exports are up 94 per cent in the 2020-21 year. They won the award for professional services.

Also, importantly, we acknowledge sustainability—making sure that, when they export, they are sustainable as well—and REDARC Electronics is a key industry manufacturing business here in South Australia. They have reduced their carbon emissions by installing solar panels. They won the

award for sustainability. Previously I have spoken about the award winner in the Manufacturing and Advanced Materials category, Lightforce Australia, which is really working to onshore their manufacturing here in Australia. That allows them to prototype and speed up route-to-market as well as production.

The Creative Industries category was won by Mighty Kingdom. They provide games to more than 50 million players worldwide, including to massive global companies such as Disney and Lego. In the Advanced Technologies category, Fivecast won for their AI-enabled security platform. They have experienced a 375 per cent export growth recently.

Overall, the winner of the Premier's South Australian Exporter of the Year Award was Accolade Wines, again taking into account the key challenges that we have had from COVID and market access issues into China. Congratulations to all of them. They are going to be a key route for our economy to recover from the pandemic by export. We congratulate them, and we know that by the Marshall Liberal government backing these exporters it will help them to grow their jobs and grow their businesses, which is good for all South Australians.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Did the South Australian government subsidise the \$390 a head Iridescence dinner at the Barossa Contemporary held in the Barossa Valley on the weekend?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:59): I think it's a matter of public record that the Barossa Contemporary festival in trial this year was something which was supported by the SATC (South Australian Tourism Commission), which of course operates independently of the government, but is provided with funding from the government. They were awarded money—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: With 100 per cent taxpayers' dollars.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —as part of that rollout.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have just been informed by the member for Unley that there was no Argentinian wine served at the Barossa on the weekend as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier detail to the house the total value of the South Australian Tourism Commission's subsidy of the Iridescence dinner and the Barossa Contemporary?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): I will find out that information and come back to the house.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. What was the capacity in the projected numbers for the Transcendence event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): I certainly don't have that information, but I'm happy to make an inquiry.

AGRICULTURAL SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is contributing to COVID recovery in South Australia by helping to fill agricultural employment gaps?

Mr Malinauskas: Here we go! He's getting ready.

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:01): I thank the member for such an important question. The regional areas are certainly being challenged by the current environment that we face, particularly around seasonal workers and in particular, I guess as we head into the grain season, there is normal need for a significant number of workers in that space in a seasonal capacity.

We have seen a huge grain crop planted this year: 3.9 million hectares have been planted in South Australia and 70 per cent was actually sown dry, which also adds to the challenge because much of that crop is actually going to mature at very similar times and put a real peak into the season that wouldn't have necessarily normally been there if it had been planted with a normal wet autumn. The fact that the rains didn't arrive until early June has certainly put extra challenges into this space.

The important thing is it is estimated this is going to be a \$2.8 billion crop coming out of the South Australian grain industry coming forward. This is a huge development and commitment into our state with that amount of grain crop coming forward, and it's certainly one of if not the highest likely in value.

I guess the issue about seasonal workers is certainly a challenge, particularly in this space. We have seen the ag sector particularly find this challenging as it is not able to necessarily source traditional workers from whether it be interstate or overseas to fill the job shortages. Backpackers were traditionally used, who may not be travelling around Australia as much, if they are even here. We also have grey nomads who travel for seasonal workers' jobs as well, so it is really quite challenging.

Recently, I was joined by the Attorney-General and the Viterra chief operations officer, James Murray, to highlight the thousand jobs that are available in the agriculture industry, particularly the grains sector. We have seen the challenges they are facing. A lot of the challenge is actually whether they have accommodation available for these workers in their particular areas.

Viterra certainly has raised this issue with the Marshall Liberal government and we have worked with them to look to find a solution. One of the options that was certainly put to us and we have been able to deliver is the ability to put temporary accommodation at the grain silo receival sites themselves. This is giving the ability to put a needs-based accommodation option in place that can be placed on site and allow those workers to actually commence that work when necessary.

The challenges that certainly face this industry are not just for the grain industry but also for the Riverland. We see the need for workers has been alleviated by bringing 800 seasonal workers in from the Pacific Islands through the Paringa facility that was set up there. We have seen \$6,000 on offer from the federal government to bring workers in to make sure that we have those workers in South Australia and in the regions.

It is important that we continue to work with industry, to make sure that we have those options going forward, to make sure that we are able to service and deliver that grain crop to the market and to make sure that the South Australian economy is kept strong by its traditional industries. As we see right here on the carpet, grain is such an important part of South Australia and will continue to be, and a Marshall Liberal government will work with industry to deliver.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:05): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his answer to the House of Assembly in this question time that he did not attend the Transcendence dance party? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In response to a question I asked the Premier earlier, and I quote, 'Did the Premier go on, after the Iridescence dinner, to attend the Transcendence dance party after the dinner?' the Premier's answer was, 'No.'

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:05): Yes, that's correct. I very distinctly remember leaving the dinner and driving home. I had an early morning appointment with the Treasurer at 7am and so I certainly didn't go to a dance party after the dinner on Saturday night.

It was a very busy day. I did a wonderful press conference down in the seat of Elder with people who were very pleased about their water price reductions—in fact, a more than \$200 reduction for the average household, so I can remember that the next morning. Then, of course, I went onto the Madonna dell Grazie di Panduri Festa, which the Leader of the Opposition also attempted—I mean 'attended'. He did attempt some Italian as well, which was very good, so we both had a bit of Italian language being spoken there.

Certainly, I did not travel to the event that the member referred to after the dinner. I did in a previous answer talk about attending an event on the Friday night, but this wasn't a dance party. I don't know the name of that, but it was essentially a light show which was held at Beckwith Park. I also attended at 6 o'clock on the Saturday night, prior to the dinner, an event called Lightwaves, which had some live music and, similarly, a light show.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:07): My question is to the Premier. How many people attended the Transcendence event over the weekend?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): I am happy to find out that information and come back to the house.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:07): My question is to the Premier. Is it true that the number that attended the event was considerably fewer than 50, even though the capacity was closer to a thousand?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): I'm not sure which event he is referring to—the one that I didn't attend, which I wouldn't have a particularly good knowledge of how many people were there. Certainly, all the events I attended apart from that dinner had more than 50 people there.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering smoother and safer roads across Adelaide and, in the process, creating jobs?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:08): I thank the member for Colton for that very important question. As he is well aware, we are investing \$17.9 billion on infrastructure across the state, and \$8.8 billion of that is going into roads and public transport infrastructure. I have spoken a lot in this place about the fact that we were left to fix the mess that Labor handed us when we took over government. Of course, a chunk of that was the \$750 million road maintenance backlog. That's what we were handed when we came into the government benches, and it beggars belief how the opposition let things get so out of hand and go to rack and ruin.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: standing order 98, rules applying to answers:

- (a) 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 minister started off his answer with debate about past performance.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the point of order for the time being. I am listening carefully to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport's answer. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is a fact that that was the road maintenance we were left with, the backlog that was there. It was such a significant backlog that we brought it to the federal government's attention and it is now an action item on the Infrastructure Australia priority list. So we got it on the priority list and we are getting on with fixing this problem.

Today, I am just going to speak about a fraction of the work that we are doing in resurfacing roads to make them smoother and make them safer, as the member for Colton pointed out. As part of our record spend, we are investing \$90 million on 65 kilometres of road, which equates to approximately 220-lane kilometres. That's supporting 500 full-time equivalent jobs in SA, which is vitally important, and the member for Colton is incredibly aware of that.

Resurfacing roads is very important for improving road safety and making everyone's journey home smoother and more comfortable. As part of this investment, we have already resurfaced and fixed parts of Henley Beach Road, which I know the member for Colton is very appreciative of—he uses that almost every day, as do his constituents—Fullarton Road, and once again the member for Unley is pretty stoked with that one, and we have also done sections of Darley Road, Kensington Road, McIntyre Road and Gorge Road as well.

These are roads that tens of thousands of South Australians use every day. They are getting smoother and safer so people get a safer trip into work, they get a safer journey home, and they get a safer journey travelling wherever they need to across our metropolitan area.

If you get in your car and drive out now, you will see works happening on Port Road, Marion Road, Greenhill Road, Golden Grove Road, Salisbury Highway, Richmond Road and obviously the South Eastern Freeway—ignored for years by those opposite, but we are fixing the South Eastern Freeway.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It doesn't stop there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Before the end of the year, we will be fixing more of Labor's road maintenance backlog. They liked talking about it, but they didn't do anything about it when they were in government though. But we are getting on with it. Before the end of the year, resurfacing works commenced on Anzac Highway—

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —Cross Road, Shepherds Hill Road, Stephen Terrace. He hates it.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The clock has repaired itself, sir. It was on four minutes.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. In the event of a technical glitch, members might assist the Chair in bringing that to attention. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I can go as long as you like. Anzac Highway, Cross Road, Shepherds Hill Road, Stephen Terrace, Crittenden Road—they don't like it, but we are fixing the mess they left. Glynburn Road, Montague Road and Payneham and Lower North East Road—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —happening right now: jobs on the ground for South Australians, building the infrastructure that's important to them. The Marshall government's resurfacing program touches all quarters of metropolitan Adelaide. My regional colleagues also know what we're doing out there to fix our country roads as well—\$2.8 billion to fix more than 4,500 kilometres of neglected country roads by the Labor government when they were in government.

I was actually on Eyre Peninsula with the member for Flinders, who secured a bucketload of investment for his local community. We saw firsthand the shoulder sealing work that's happening there and the resurfacing and overtaking lanes underway in one of South Australia's most beautiful regions. The Eyre Highway, the Tod Highway, the Birdseye Highway, the Flinders Highway and the Lincoln Highway, we were out there looking at all the roads and the work that is being done. These overtaking lanes were long called for but never delivered under those opposite; we are getting on and doing it now and it is generating jobs in the community as well.

It is clear those opposite didn't see the value in resurfacing our roads to make them smoother and safer and that's why they left that \$750 million road maintenance backlog. South Australians can rest assured, though, that the Marshall government will continue to build what matters, will fix the roads for South Australians, be it in the metropolitan area where people commute day in and day out or across the regions where they provide so much of the high productivity value to our state, and we appreciate the wonderful work that they do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Whether it's on Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, the South-East or up north—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —we are delivering. We are fixing the roads that were neglected and we are cleaning up Labor's mess.

BAROSSA CONTEMPORARY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:13): My question is to the Premier. Was the Barossa Contemporary a success?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:13): The Barossa Contemporary event was a preview event for the full event which will be held next year, a 10-day event. We feel very positive about this event.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But let's hear what others have said about the event because I think it is important. Rather than take my version for this, let's hear what Tourism Barossa chair, Jon Durdin, had to say. He said:

This festival is the type of initiative that the tourism sector and the Barossa needs as we look to connect to a new and diverse mix of visitors.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He goes on to say:

Given the success of this mere preview we can see it is bound to attract tourists from across the state as well as interstate and overseas as the festival grows and evolves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It goes on:

Barossa Contemporary is a welcome addition to our events calendar and will have a significant flow-on effect on our local tourism industry and community not only during the festival period but throughout the year.

That's what the Chair of Tourism Barossa, Jon Durdin, had to say. Let's hear what James March had to say. He's the Chief Executive Officer of the Barossa Grape and Wine Association. He said:

Barossa Contemporary's preview weekend blew us away. It was amazing to see new audiences in the region attending a diverse range of events in interesting locations across the Barossa. This preview has given us a taste of what's to come and we are confident and delighted that it will be a game changer for this community's arts and cultural fabric. This burst of energy and creative spirit will showcase Barossa in a new light to the rest of the world.

That's what the head of the Barossa Grape and Wine Association had to say. That's what the head of Barossa tourism had to say. We have heard what those opposite have had to say, talking down the regions, talking around the visitor economy, talking down those people who are putting their cash on the line to create opportunities for South Australia. On this side of the house, we will be backing opportunities to improve visitation to regional South Australia. We love the regions on this side of the house. We will continue that into the future.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the Premier just quoted two excerpts of a document or quotes that he had. I ask that he table those in full so we can see where they came from and the dates that they were made.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will check on those matters, member for West Torrens. Before I call the member for Flinders, I call to order the member for Elizabeth. I warn for a second time the member for Playford. I warn the member for Kaurana. I call to order the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and I warn for a second time the member for Lee.

WATER PRICING

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house about measures the Marshall Liberal government has taken to reduce water bills?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:16): It's a great pleasure to be able to answer this question because we were able to get hold of the figures on the weekend of how much South Australian households and businesses have saved since the Marshall Liberal government put massive downward pressure on water bills and delivered tens of millions of dollars back into the pockets and the wallets and the bank accounts of people and businesses all across the state.

Why were we able to do that? Well, I will be brief in this response because we do want to get onto the Independents. It is simply because we reversed the dodgy way that the previous government were cooking the books. We know—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: And we hear 'what?' from the other side, as if this is a surprise. It is certainly not a surprise for the member for Lee. We know the inflated regulated asset base was inflated for many years. When we came to government we asked Lew Owens, a respected South Australian businessman and leader, to look at the way that the regulated asset base had been calculated by the previous government. His independent review, his report, was quite damning. It was quite clear the previous government had inflated the regulated asset base to the level of hundreds of millions of dollars, which resulted in water bills being driven right up, ripping hard-earned money out of the households of South Australians across the state.

Since we came to office and wrote down the regulated asset base, as Mr Owens recommended we should as part of the 2020-24 SA Water regulatory determination, we have been able to reduce bills significantly: \$200 for the average household, \$1,350 for the average business—money back to South Australians so that they can choose what they want to do with it.

PARLIAMENTARY CODE OF CONDUCT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:18): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney update the house on the progress of the formation and implementation of a parliamentary code of conduct and confirm whether the code will need to be enshrined in legislation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:18): As the member and you, Mr Speaker, would well know, this is a matter or the subject of consideration by a joint parliamentary committee to determine on the question of the future of a parliamentary code of conduct, amongst other things. My

understanding is that, for example, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is on that committee. I can't recall all of them, but I know you, Mr Speaker, and the President of the Legislative Council are on it. I think the Hon. Mr Lucas and the member for King are also on it.

But, in any event, it's a joint parliamentary committee. There are representatives from both sides of the political party spectrum and Independents. So that work is progressing. As best as I understand it, they are giving consideration to a code of conduct for us as a parliament to ultimately consider and, therefore, it's not a matter for the Attorney-General to make a decision on. I have made it very clear in this house before that this is a matter for the parliament, not for the government.

There have been a number of other recommendations come from the reviews that have been undertaken in relation to conduct in the parliament, and they have been acted upon by the government. There is yet to be one area of legislative reform, which is on its way through to the parliament, which I am aware of, but otherwise that has been undertaken. But there are a number of subject matters that have been under consideration by this parliamentary committee and we look forward to receiving their report. I think, sir, you also chair that committee. I don't think I can help the parliament anymore. We will await the consideration of the report.

PARLIAMENTARY CODE OF CONDUCT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:20): Supplementary: I did ask at the end of the question whether the code of conduct will need to be enshrined in legislation.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:20): Again, I am not here to give legal advice, but I just mention to the member that, as the member would well know, we had a statement of principles which has been a guiding document for the conduct of members of parliament adopted by both houses of parliament. I sat on the committee, in fact, some 17 or so years ago with the Hon. Michael Atkinson I recall, and others, for the development of that statement of principles. They have been accepted as a motion of both houses of parliament for our consideration.

The codes of conduct are not always in legislative form for other professions and entities, but that again will be a matter for consideration of the committee as to how they wish to have it recorded and/or endorsed if it's the will of the parliament to do so.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:21): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise the house as to the process of the duty of care or obligations of the Public Trustee who may act on behalf of constituents who may or may not be from a non-English-speaking background? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have a constituent of Greek heritage who speaks and understands very little English and who has the Public Trustee acting on her behalf of all her assets. However, whenever she is supplied with a copy of her statements, they are always in English and the balances of her assets are not very well understood. She has been advised to hire a consultant to convert from English to her native language. I would like to understand or know how the A-G can provide assistance for persons who may be in this category.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:22): I think it's a very important issue and I am certainly happy to take up with the Public Trustee what services they provide in relation to translator-interpreter services and the like for non-English-speaking background clients of the Public Trustee.

I have responsibility for the Public Trustee, which is under a statutory body, and also the Public Advocate. As the member might know, we have about 700 South Australians who have the services of both; that is, they overlap for the services of both. One provides financial investment and support—I generalise there—and the other provides in relation to services for not just advocacy for people but obviously their welfare and service provision.

I am happy to have a further look at the matter. I do recall signing some correspondence very recently in relation to a number of these matters, but if there is anything further the member would like me to follow up I am happy to do so.

As to the first part of the question that related to what duty of care they have, I think it's important in any public administrative body that there is an obligation, if they are providing a service, to do whatever they can to make sure that that service is accessible, affordable and equitably provided. I make that general statement. I don't say it's necessarily a legal duty of care, but they certainly do have an obligation in relation to the husbandry and investment of the person's financial circumstances. That, in my view, should also be in relation to the information that is provided to the client of the Public Trustee. But, again, if there is any further information the member needs, I am happy to receive any correspondence or material he has to follow it up further.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Can the minister please update the house on the plans for a new CFS station at Lenswood? With your leave, and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

Mr CREGAN: I am advised that the station's amenities and parking are inadequate. There are also problems with water ingress into the building, and the station is located on a dangerous corner. Efforts to replace old appliances are impeded because new modern appliances don't fit in the outdated station buildings. I wrote correspondence in relation to this issue on 2 October and 16 October 2020 and received an acknowledgment on 17 November 2020, but to date this issue has not been resolved.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:25): I thank the member for Kavel for the question. Obviously, we are proud to be spending record amounts of money in terms of our emergency services, making sure that our state is more bushfire resilient for the next bushfire season.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: We have a very proud record when it comes to making sure that our state is as bushfire resilient as possible. You would be well aware that we are the first jurisdiction in all of Australia to commission our first and only independent recent review into the bushfire season of 2019-20. That was held by Mr Mick Keelty. A number of recommendations were delivered. All the immediate action items have been issued and delivered upon, and amongst those promises made that we have delivered are over 25 new CFS trucks right across the board, better safety equipment—things like thermal imaging cameras in every single group.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The Adelaide Hills are a very, very important part of the world and after recent bushfire events I did take the time to go and visit the member for Kavel's electorate as well as your own, sir, and I have been blown away by the hard work and the dedication of volunteers in the Adelaide Hills.

In terms of that particular CFS brigade, I know that the CFS are certainly undertaking a body of work to determine a future site that delivers value for money, but of course we certainly acknowledge and appreciate that the Labor Party didn't spend what they should have spent when they were in government in regard to emergency services.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: debate. The minister is now debating the answer rather than answering the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The question concerned certainly matters of context. Leave was granted to introduce facts that provided context and a degree of history. I do direct the minister to the question. The minister has the call.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Thank you, sir. Talking broadly about investment in our CFS, for example, it goes without saying that commission after commission made recommendations around automatic vehicle locations. The facts are that the former government didn't spend—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —a cent on that. Lenswood and other areas of the Adelaide Hills would have benefited from that investment, but former governments didn't spend a cent on it. What I will say is that we do acknowledge and appreciate—

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

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Point of order: debate, sir. I think the Speaker has already made a ruling upholding a former point of order. This is clearly debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! It's true to say I have just upheld a point of order in relation to debate. The question was quite specific in its terms. As I have indicated, it called for and referred to matters of context to a degree. I bring the minister to the substance of the question. The minister has the call.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Thank you, sir. I respect your ruling. We do acknowledge and appreciate the need for a new station in the Lenswood area for the Lenswood brigade. I know that the CFS is working hard to ensure that that brigade and also that community continue to have the facilities, tools and resources that they need to keep their community safe during the upcoming bushfire season. I do acknowledge and appreciate all the volunteers in the Lenswood brigade, and I'm certainly happy to raise this topic again when I next meet with the CFS chief.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:29): Supplementary question to the same minister: can the minister commit to resolving this issue before the fire season?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:30): As I pointed out, this government is spending record levels of funding on our CFS emergency services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I have pointed out the \$97.5 million that we are spending, making sure that, quite frankly, we make upgrades all across the state. The Adelaide Hills is an exceptional, important area of our state where we will continue to spend millions of dollars in upgrading facilities and making sure that we continue to be as resilient as possible come bushfire season. At the same time, there are also areas like Kangaroo Island and the West Coast and the South-East, so we will continue to work hard to make sure that we are as resilient as possible for the next bushfire season, right across the state.

COVID-19 SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:30): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the state government support for businesses impacted by COVID restrictions imposed last week in three local government areas in my electorate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:31): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. We know that all of Mount Gambier, in fact the South-East, was thrown into a great period of anxiety when an individual case came to light. We still don't have the

full details of how that occurred. It is always worrying when we don't have a linked transmission chain, and of course we had to take action.

This had a very significant effect on people who were in the Mount Gambier council area and also Wattle Range and Grant council. We thank them very much for their observance of the imposed restrictions and I was very pleased to see the very high testing rates which were evident in the South-East. The good news was that of all those tests that were conducted not a single positive case came back, so again South Australia is in that fortunate state—no new cases today and just seven active cases, all in the Tom's Court Hotel.

Of course, we do recognise the impact that this has had on businesses, families and individuals in the South-East, and we have put a package of support in place for businesses affected by these increased restrictions, commensurate with what occurred here in metropolitan Adelaide and right across the state. The Treasurer informs me that money is already flowing out the door.

This will provide some relief to those businesses, but the very best thing that we can be doing for businesses in the South-East, for businesses that employ people right across the state, is make sure that we can get the vaccination rate up to 80 per cent double vaccination rate for those 16 and over. When we get to that point, we can end the possibility of these punishing lockdowns which inflict such harm on the people of South Australia.

Ministerial Statement

RETURN TO WORK CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:33): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made earlier today by the Hon. R. Lucas MLC, Treasurer, in another place.

The SPEAKER: In relation to a point of order of the member for West Torrens earlier, making inquiry in relation to the tabling of documents, I am advised that the Premier was quoting from documents that are in the public domain. The Premier will not be required to table those documents accordingly.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: can we know what public documents they were?

The SPEAKER: Yes, the document is available.

Grievance Debate

STATE LIBERAL PARTY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:34): COVID has given the Premier and this government an opportunity to show the people of South Australia how they govern, but of course, what we have really seen is an example of how Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier govern. When you pull away COVID and look beyond the COVID response and at how the Premier is actually governing, it is a dumpster fire.

No other Premier in the history of this state has done more internal damage to their party than this Premier. It is unprecedented that a Premier elected with a majority at the last election is now in a scenario where he has only 21 votes on the floor of the House of Assembly—and it is down to one unique quality, the Premier's leadership style. There is no other reasoning for this.

The Liberal Party have long been known for being at war with themselves. The Premier was given much credence and accolades by the media and public commentators for having plastered over the cracks and healed the rifts, yet here we are with not one, not two, but three managers of government business; not one, but two ministers having to quit; one President of the Legislative Council; another Speaker; a whip. We have had backbenchers contemplating whether or not they would quit. We have had members forced to leave the Liberal Party and one who has now left because they were completely disillusioned with the leadership of the Liberal Party.

Take away Nicola Spurrier and Grant Stevens and it is there for all to see: a government that cannot govern itself cannot govern the people of South Australia. What happens to the people of this state when Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier are no longer making the decisions on behalf of our health, safety and wellbeing and it is left up to the people opposite, who cannot govern themselves?

We have already seen the confusion around Christmas, and we have now seen, with the Attorney-General, that a majority of this house thinks she has questions to answer. It goes on and on and on—let alone the work of the ICAC investigating members.

If this government were an animal, it would be put down. They are at the end of their life in three short years. They are an appalling government. They are a government that are so bereft of leadership that the Premier—

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

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Education!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —when he hears he has lost his majority in the house, his working majority in the house, what does he do but get in his government limousine and head off to a taxpayer-funded soirée two nights in a row. He is off there to Transcendence, Iridescence, or whatever you want to call it—a bit of meditation, a soirée, drinking wonderful wines with other public servants and no-one else attended to—

An honourable member: Social media influencers.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And social media influencers. That is where he is. Rather than trying to put back the pieces of his government, he goes off to a party twice, not just Friday night but also Saturday night. Can you imagine any other Premier in the federation, on hearing that they have now gone from 22 votes in the House of Assembly—which means that the member for Narungga can no longer tie the vote, giving the Speaker the casting vote—who would rather go to a party than immediately drive to the member for Kavel's home and implore him to stay, to hear his concerns on behalf of his constituents?

No, he went to dinner, he went to a party—and he did it again the next night. Then on Sunday he lost his voice. If that is the leadership style of this Premier, I hope Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier are in charge right up until the election because God help the people of South Australia if it is left to the Premier.

This parliament will now start exerting leadership. We have done that now with ministers who have flouted the standing orders, who think they can say whatever they want in here because they have treated their majority as a dictatorship. Those days are now gone. Ministers will be held to account for what they say in this place and, if they mislead us, they will be facing privileges committees.

MORIALTA ELECTORATE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:39): It is my great privilege to represent the people of Morialta in this house. I have done it now for nearly 12 years, and it is an extraordinary pleasure to engage with some of the most profoundly strong leaders in our community on a regular basis, through all sorts of voluntary associations.

One of the groups of which I am very privileged to be a former member and now an honorary member, along with the member for Hartley, is the Campbelltown Rotary Club. I would like to congratulate the Campbelltown Rotary Club and its president, Stephany Martin, particularly on the work they are doing, which was highlighted in the last couple of week, that is, bringing on the next generation of community leaders as the host club for this year's Rotary Youth Leadership (RYLA) awards.

A couple of weeks ago, the host club, led by its President, Stephany Martin, who is also a RYLA alumna, hosted a wonderful dinner to celebrate those awards, which I was very privileged to be able to speak at. I would like to congratulate the chair of the Rotary District 9510 Youth Leadership Awards, Helen Marshall, and the District Governor, Jeff Neale, who is a great South Australian and who gives so much to the community all the time, and this year he has taken on that special role. I congratulate the Project Manager and the District Youth Service chair, Damian Leach; the Leadership Manager, Jenna Casey; and the Operations Manager, Caitlin Marshall.

There are many roles throughout the week of the RYLA awards as these young people are given the opportunity to be advanced in their understanding of leadership and, indeed, its intimate connection with service, as it has. Some of those more hands-on roles fall to the mentors, and I

would like to congratulate those mentors: Kevin Read, Alison Michael, James Watson, Zahra Bayani, Lucy Stevens and Kaz Bahmanzadah.

Host parents through the week's camp were Jim and Margaret Beare, and the registrar, Margaret Northcote, who has done so many things for young people through her career as a teacher and as the first female club president of the Campbelltown Rotary Club a number of years ago. She makes an enormous contribution to the community across not just Campbelltown but the whole of South Australia. Also, as a near neighbour, I can advise the house that she is always willing to share a cup of tea, for which I am tremendously grateful.

Also at that dinner were a significant number of people from around the community who had contributed to the support and development of those fine young South Australians. As I said to the group of RYLA awardees that night, I cannot wait to see what these guys achieve in the years ahead, and I commend everyone from the Rotary organisation who has helped them on that journey.

In the time that I have available today, I also want to commend another community organisation which a couple of weeks ago, at the end of September, celebrated the 66th anniversary of the Maria Santissima di Montevergine festa. I was pleased to be joined by the Premier, as always; the member for Sturt, James Stevens; and the member for Hartley, Vincent Tarzia, who as always contributes to the event. There was, of course, a visit in the evening by the Leader of the Opposition. I commend him for that, and I thank the other Labor representative who came along to the mass in the morning.

It is an extraordinary event. This year it was wonderful to be back having the festa, not just the mass in the marquee but also festa celebrations throughout the day. It was an extraordinary effort. I believe they had in excess of three dozen COVID marshals to ensure that social distancing and the appropriate COVID-safe plan was put into effect. That was an enormous body of work.

Last year, it had to be only a mass, but for 64 years before that it had been a wonderful festa celebration, and it was wonderful to get back to that. I commend, as always, president, Domenico Zollo; vice-president, Fedele Catalano; and the rest of the committee: secretary, Maria Trajkovic; Nicola Zollo; Ursula Ricci; Michele Piteo; Phillip Izzo; Donato D'Ettorre; Ennio Cavaiuolo; Donato D'Ettorre; Michael Razzano; Anna Catalano; Carmela Placentino; Carmine Scalzi; Orazio Tedesco; and Mario Mignone.

All those people on the committee of the Montevergine festa have done a wonderful job, and it was extraordinary that evening to be able to share in the celebration of all those present. I have my own recollections of making the pilgrimage to the sanctuary at the top of the mountain and being able to remember that extraordinary vista, which I know my own children one day will be able to visit in memory of their heritage, their grandparents and great-grandparents through their mother's side.

We appreciate the opportunity provided by the festa committee to continue that memory of Montevergine and continue its celebration, which will happen for generations to come.

Time expired.

LEE ELECTORATE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:44): Last year, for the first time our community, and indeed communities around the world, celebrated the inaugural Probus Day on 1 October 2020. In the weeks while parliament has not been sitting, once again we have had Probus Day. It has been designed to line up with the United Nations Day of Older Persons, recognised around the world. These international days are used to raise awareness of particular causes and activities for communities, and so it is with Probus Day.

It is an opportunity to remind the community, and also members of Probus clubs, about the importance of social connections and support. While many of us would be familiar with the origins of Probus, or professional business network organisations, how we now experience them are opportunities for older people, perhaps including those who are retired in our communities, to meet, to gather and to enjoy each other's company and social experiences.

I am very proud that in the electorate I represent I have several Probus clubs, including the West Lakes Shore Probus Club, the West Lakes South Ladies Probus Club, the West Lakes Combined Probus Club, the Kidman Park Combined Probus, and the Charles Sturt Probus Club. Of course, there are many more Probus clubs across other parts of the western suburbs.

It has been a great pleasure, as it is with anyone many of us are able to bring into this place, to provide a tour of the parliament for Probus clubs. I have done that with several of the clubs in my electorate, but it was my pleasure last week to have the Charles Sturt Probus Club in for a tour of Parliament House. It is always an important activity for us to lift back the veil of parliament, so to speak, to not only show them around but explain how parliament works and some of its operations and conventions.

I am very grateful that for the attendees—somewhat limited as we continue to be through necessary COVID restrictions—Bob Williams, Grant and Lin Jewell, Mitzi Moyle, Colin and Margaret Bird, Thelma Foxen, Christine O'Connor, Jeff and Halina Parish, Jim and Glynis Pawlyn, Malcolm and Maria Thomas and Lynne Fisher, it was a terrific opportunity to experience just what the parliament has got to show members of our community more broadly.

I also wanted to take the opportunity to speak about another very important group in the middle of the Lee electorate and that is the West Lakes Sports and Social Club. Some of you might not be familiar with that club, but you would be more familiar with those that share and use its facilities. They include, for example, the SMOSH West Lakes Football Club, which is very well known in amateur league, women's football and a junior football circles; the Henley and Grange Baseball Club, a very strong and successful club in Adelaide's baseball competitions; the Port Adelaide Softball Club; and the West AFL Masters Football Club.

This is a facility that is quite literally bursting at the seams with clubs, with players and with activities. Across those four clubs, there are dozens and dozens of teams, particularly at the junior level. That is why over the course of the weekend I was very pleased to commit to SMOSH West Lakes that an elected Malinauskas Labor government would be committing up to \$3 million for the redevelopment of their clubrooms. This is a really important investment in the sporting futures of many families in the western suburbs.

Only a few weeks ago—in fact, it was back in May—one night after sitting I gathered here at Parliament House for dinner with some of the representatives of SMOSH West Lakes Football Club, including Scott Fitzgerald; Tara Hancock; Paul Cutler; Brad Smith; the coach of the women's team, Greg Phillips, a very famous Port Adelaide footballer; the president of the juniors, Shane Finney; as well as Dominic Hodges from the Henley and Grange Baseball Club; and Lynn Callaghan from the Port Adelaide Softball Club.

This investment is committed to by South Australian Labor and by me as the local MP quite frankly because those clubs deserve it. They have done an extraordinary amount of work over many years, building their respective clubs into the strong, successful clubs that they are and supporting so many people in the community, with very a strong juniors presence—apart of course from the masters club, as you would expect. There are thousands of families across the western suburbs who take benefit from the West Lakes Sporting and Social Club across those sporting clubs, and we look forward to continuing to support them into the future.

Time expired.

PETERBOROUGH GOLF CLUB

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:49): It is a great pleasure for me to share with the house the wonderful event that my wife and I attended in Peterborough on Saturday evening: the Peterborough Golf Club's end-of-year presentation night. I have very regularly been able to go to the season-opening events for the Peterborough Golf Club, but this was the first time I have been able to attend their end-of-season presentation night. I have to say it was absolutely fantastic to see the achievement of the golfers, particularly the young golfers in that club. It is a family club.

One member, Carol, when receiving an award herself, described the club in her short speech as a family. That has been so clear to me from my many visits to this club, whether directly for a golf club event or for one of the other community organisation events held at the club when club members are all pulling together to host and provide that service and of course raise some funds for themselves.

The most pleasing thing for me was to see the extraordinary achievement of the young golfers in the Peterborough Golf Club. Life member Peter O'Dea is the convener for the young golfers' program. He can be incredibly proud of what he and other members have achieved. A Peterborough Golf Club young male player and a Peterborough Golf Club young female player each won the Sand Greens Championship for state juniors.

Sand greens exist where you have a golf course in an environment where a green green, a grass green, is not practical because of the climate, so sand—or scrapes, as they are often called—is used instead. It happens all over our electorate of Stuart. For a young male golfer and a young female golfer from the Peterborough club to each be the junior state champion in that category is absolutely extraordinary.

Of course, Mal, as the male captain and Janina, as the female captain for the club, deserve to be very proud of what they have achieved. President Jeff Oakley can also be incredibly proud of the club that he leads. It is a club that provides an enormous amount of fun, a club that provides an enormous amount of camaraderie and a club that has a particular focus on the junior programs, as I have mentioned.

Lydia Borowicki and Alex O'Dea were the two extremely high achievers recognised on the night—both young players. In fact, if I have this correct, Lydia is still a junior golfer technically and Alex might be just on the cusp of leaving juniors and becoming a senior golfer. I apologise if I have that wrong, but those two were essentially the most successful male and female players in the club. Two relatively young players were the most successful two players in the club, which again speaks volumes for the club itself and for the junior program.

It was also fantastic for me to see the other more senior male and female players who were pipped at the post, at least on the female side of things. I think the competition was not quite so close on the male side of things. The more senior male and female players were very happy that players significantly younger than them had won through to be so successful in that way, and that is again another outstanding illustration of how this club works together.

The club has also progressed incredibly well in the last 10 or 12 years that I have had an association with them with regard to their organisation, their governance and their finances. They are a strong and stable club now. They always had the esprit de corps, the right people and the right reasons for existing. They have improved with regard to their governance and organisation as well, and their overall financial management. That has paid dividends for the club with regard to the programs that they can actually deliver, the support they can deliver to the younger golfers.

They have two driving tee netted areas which came in about three years ago. They are putting a lot of effort into coaching programs, so not just the more senior by age golfers taking aside the younger ones but actually getting proper coaching programs for them. They have invested in furniture and carpets. They are about to upgrade their kitchen. The sky is the limit for the Peterborough Golf Club and with those young golfers coming through, soon to become senior golfers, this club will only get stronger and stronger.

CARERS WEEK

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:55): Today, I would like to talk about a group of young people in our community who play a very important role. As members would be aware, this week is Carers Week. Yesterday, at our local sub-branch meeting, we had a speaker by the name of Emily Ritchie, who is a support worker for young carers with Carers and Disability Link, which is based in the Barossa and which also does work in Yorke Peninsula, Clare and the Adelaide Hills.

The purpose of Carers Week is to highlight the work undertaken by carers in our community and to also acknowledge the challenges they face and how, as a community, we can support the carers who do valuable work in our community.

Carers' Link Barossa and Districts was established in 1995. Since starting as a carers group, they have also added the work of supporting people living with disability to their portfolio. Carers' Link basically link people living with disabilities with carers and a whole range of services to ensure they can lead a meaningful life through the support they provide.

Today, as I mentioned, I would like to focus on one group of carers, namely, young carers. I understand that there are about 30,500 young carers in South Australia. The young carer is

essentially a person between the age of five and 25 whose life is impacted by the care needs of someone who experiences a chronic or long-term illness, physical or intellectual disability, mental illness, an alcohol or drug problem or has dementia or is frail or aged.

When you look at carers between five and 25, to know that in our community there are children as young as five caring for another person in their family really does weigh heavily on the sort of life they will live themselves. The young carer might be caring for a parent, a sibling, in some cases their own child, a grandparent, another relative or maybe even a close friend. The role each carer provides varies from carer to carer, depending on the needs of the person they are caring for.

The work young carers provide can range from emotional support to the very practical support of paying accounts and bills for the person who needs the support, and in some cases personal needs. As you can see from the wide range of activities that these young carers perform, it can be quite challenging for them, both emotionally and physically, and they do miss out on quite a bit in life because of this work.

To support young carers, Carers' Link has actually created young carer support groups to provide activities for young carers where they can get together and not only share experiences but get support through their peers. They provide outings, information, workshops, projects and peer support. This is designed to ensure that children or young people can live, as much as possible, a normal life, in other words, experience the things that they should be experiencing day to day but for their role as a carer. The reality of being a young carer does impose on your time to do things at school or outside of school or, if you are just out of school, to do things with friends, even the capacity to be able to go and work, etc.

Carers' Link also provide advocacy services on an individual basis or through group activities to make sure that these young people get a fair go. One of the roles they play is often liaising with schools, where teachers and school administrators might be aware of the young carer's role and why that may be an issue regarding their school performance.

Just to put into context the work young carers and carers provide in our community, it is estimated there are 2.65 million unpaid carers in our community across Australia. If we were to pay for the service provided, it would cost about \$77.9 billion or \$1.5 billion a week. In addition to the cost to the community, the cost to individual people in our community would be much greater if they did not have this emotional and other support.

Time expired.

NORTH ADELAIDE SOCIETY PLANNING FORUM

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (16:00): I rise to update the house on the North Adelaide Society's recent spring forum held at the North Adelaide Community Centre on 15 September. Now in its 51st year, the North Adelaide Society has been a strong and vocal group who have advocated for the interests and protection of North Adelaide, South Australia's oldest metropolitan residential suburb.

The theme for the evening's panel discussion was the community's involvement in planning and development matters. It was well attended by some 60 attendees and moderated by urban and regional planner Donna Ferretti. Throughout my 11 years as the local member, I have been a member of the North Adelaide Society and attended many of their meetings. It is plainly evident that the local residents cherish the historic character of North Adelaide. Indeed, the City of Adelaide is home to some 27 per cent of South Australia's state and local heritage places, with many of these located in North Adelaide.

Throughout the evening, it was clear that residents are very aware of the shifting nature of development within the state, and there is some concern about how this may impact the local community. The evening was an opportunity to discuss what is working and what is not working in the planning and development sector. Understandably, there was concern about the development at 88 O'Connell Street but also some questions about how the newly implemented Planning and Design Code would operate throughout the suburb.

I was happy to inform the audience that the code, which is been implemented for only six months, provides more opportunities for community consultation and participation than under the

previous system. Some examples include public notification for performance-assessed developments, better notification and community engagement for code amendments, access to all development applications in South Australia through the 24/7 online portal, as well as a newly implemented subscription service for local residents to sign up for updates on all development applications within their specified region.

Furthermore, the Planning and Design Code has been designed to provide clarity and consistency on policy matters across neighbourhoods and local government boundaries, replacing the 72 development plans into one standalone document. While the specific zoning policies contained within the code have predominantly been transitioned as like for like from the former development plans, there are several key themes regarding the amenity and livability for the new infill development, which were evident throughout the rounds of consultation.

Historic areas such as North Adelaide retain minimum block sizes, which means future developments will be provided on a one-to-one basis and will be in keeping with the heritage nature of the area. The reality is that the vast majority of developments occurring throughout the state are all from approvals under the old system. The Deputy Premier, in her capacity as Minister for Planning and Local government, has committed to reviewing the code at regular intervals, and there will be opportunities to make changes along the way.

The development application for 88 O'Connell Street was granted planning consent by the State Commission Assessment Panel (SCAP) at its meeting on 23 June 2021 and the development application was assessed under rules created by John Rau in 2012. SCAP is a committee that is independent from government and is required to undertake an assessment of the application in accordance with the legislated processes specified by the Development Act 1993. In its assessment of the development application, SCAP was required to take into account the relevant policies within the Adelaide (City) Development Plan.

In particular, in the Main Street (O'Connell) Zone, which specifies height limits for all sites, there is an exception for sites greater than 1,500 square metres in the area. These sites are further defined as catalyst sites. Accordingly, the site does not have a specific limitation on building heights. The catalyst site policy was introduced by John Rau through his ministerial-led Capital City development plan amendment in 2012.

Since becoming the member for Adelaide in 2010, I have represented the North Adelaide community on a number of planning and development matters, including the Channel 9 Site DPA, Capital City DPA, and North Adelaide Large Institutions and Colleges DPA, after Labor allowed the various institutions across North Adelaide to expand wherever they pleased.

I have worked tirelessly with the Lord Mayor and planning ministers to ensure that, rather than unfettered expansion, the institutions can now only expand to directly adjoining sites. While I believe there is more work to be done on this policy, it was acknowledged that there have been positive steps taken to protect the residential character of the suburb. I continue to be a strong advocate for the heritage and local landscape of the North Adelaide region and will continue to work tirelessly to ensure our region is well maintained for future generations to come.

PORT PIRIE

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:05): Today, I would like to talk about a project that has been handled by a student of the John Pirie Secondary School, entitled *Those Magnificent Men*. The project is by Emily Johncock. I would like to talk about another project that students of the John Pirie Secondary School have been undertaking on persons who came from Port Pirie, either born in Port Pirie or who had a very loving association with this great city. These people have gone on to be engaged in some form of milestone activities worldwide.

By November 1917, at the age of just 21, Charles Eaton was already a three-year veteran of trench warfare, an experience which no doubt steeled him for the terrifying task which he had volunteered to do. I reinforce that: volunteered. Air warfare was still in its experimental infancy and the idea of flying such a fanciful invention over a dark, cold London night must have drawn a lump in the young man's throat. Yet he was charged with doing much more than just flying. His job was to defend the great City of London from the German zeppelin airships and the horrible new twist of industrialised warfare that they represented—the aerial bombing of civilian populations.

Eaton acquitted himself magnificently in this baptism of fire and was soon flying bombing raids of his own. On 21 June the following year, his Airco DH.9 single-engine bomber was shot down over Germany. He was captured and sent to a prisoner of war camp in Holzminden. Unhappy with his new dwelling, as you would be in a prisoner of war camp, Eaton soon escaped but was recaptured very soon afterwards. He was then court-martialled and locked in solitary confinement.

Amazingly, Eaton again escaped, somehow crossing back over the fortified lines and rejoining his squadron in time for a few more commissions in the dying stages of the First World War. Bear in mind, this is the First World War. So highly regarded was Eaton's wartime flying record, he was given the task of flying the very top-level British diplomats to the historic Versailles peace conference.

Eaton moved to Darwin via India in 1923 and before long became an instructor in the infant RAAF. Here he was most noted for his ability not only to find lost planes and airmen in the vast Australian outback but then to also navigate his way back to the wreckages on horseback. He performed this feat on three occasions, earning himself the Air Force Cross for his 'zeal and devotion to duty'.

When the Second World War broke out, men with any combat experience were in very short supply. Eaton was posted to Port Pirie, where he was dedicated to run the Bombing and Gunnery School at the Port Pirie airstrip. I have mentioned this in previous grievance speeches. He would call Port Pirie home for the next 12 to 18 months; however, being in administrative duties was not for him. He needed to be part of the action. It was because of this that he insisted on a transfer to Darwin where he would be more in the thick of things. It was here that he assumed command of a small but very dedicated squadron of Wirraways with which they immediately set about terrorising Japanese forces throughout the Dutch East Indies.

Following the war, Eaton became a diplomat. In 1945, when Indonesia declared independence from the Dutch, the United Nations appointed Eaton as a consul-general to oversee the birth of this new republic, and he became Australia's first ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia.

Today, the road to Darwin International Airport and the land upon which it sits bear Eaton's name. A lake is also named in his honour there. He was also awarded an OBE among other titles. His favourite memorial, however, was the Charles 'Moth' Eaton saloon bar in the Tennant Creek Goldfields Hotel.

This assignment was undertaken by Emily Johncock, a student at the John Pirie Secondary School, who has done all the research required to bring this project to fruition. There were several other projects undertaken by students of John Pirie Secondary School; however, I have spoken to this house about four of these assignments, which were undertaken under the guidance of Aaron Ward, a teacher at the John Pirie Secondary School.

These projects will be awarded to each of the students at a school assembly by me when the opportune time arises considering COVID restrictions. Again, I reinforce the dedication and commitment of not only the people coming from Port Pirie over many years and centuries but also the students of this particular school. Roger Nottage has done a fantastic job there with the students. The students are very proud of their community and also their school.

MOUNT GAMBIER ELECTORATE

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:10): I rise to make a few comments about the COVID incident we had down in my electorate last week. It was quite an interesting time and I guess really strenuous and stressful for a number of businesses. When word broke that we had a positive case, it was the Monday of the long weekend, and it is fair to say that my phone did not stop ringing until late Monday night with businesses unclear as to what the impact was going to be for them.

I heard numerous personal stories about bookings that had been cancelled, empty dining rooms and the tremendous emotional and financial impact that COVID was having on the owners and, importantly, their staff. Many owners felt very responsible for their staff's wages and not being able to provide the hours or the shifts, but the full knowledge that bills still continued to come in certainly put added pressure on many of the businesses I talked to.

I spent most of Tuesday walking the streets of Mount Gambier, particularly the main street, and it is fair to say that on Tuesday it was like a ghost town. Most of the hotels that I went into had nobody or one or two people in there, and retail shops were telling me that they were 70 to 80 per cent down on a regular Tuesday turnover.

Of course, added to that, was the fact that it was the last week of the South Australian school holidays and many people were holidaying and touring through Mount Gambier and were essentially advised to leave if they did not need to be in Mount Gambier and, if they had planned to be in Mount Gambier that week, not to go. Of course, that had flow-on ramifications for our businesses but, pleasingly, the state government has stepped up to the mark with a regional COVID support grant for the Lower South-East.

My office has spent most of this week communicating with our business owners, highlighting to them that there are grants available: \$3,000 for eligible employing businesses and \$1,000 for non-employing businesses. To be eligible for the business at the start of the restriction period, Monday 4 October, they must have a valid and active ABN and be carrying on the operation of a business, be registered for GST, be operating a business in an eligible list of postcodes—that is, the Mount Gambier, District Council of Grant and Wattle Range councils—have a total Australian group payroll of less than \$10 million, not be engaged in illegal activities, have received a grant under the COVID-19 Tourism and Hospitality Support Grant, or be a business that has experienced at least 30 per cent reduction in turnover due to the restricted trading conditions over the week from 4 October to 10 October.

With that, I commend the state government for providing assistance in looking after the business community, but I would like them to go one step further. The impact was felt disproportionately by our accommodation sector, so I am calling on the state government to initiate a Great State Limestone Coast Voucher just for the Lower Limestone Coast in those three LGA areas.

This would be very similar to what has been proposed across the state: vouchers of \$100 to be used for accommodation or tourism experiences in those three LGA areas. This would attract people back to the accommodation sector, which was the hardest hit, and also promote Mount Gambier, the District Council of Grant and the Wattle Range Council as great places to visit, great places to bring the family and spend some time. In comparison to many other schemes around the place, like Fear of Missing Out Fridays, this voucher scheme would be greatly appreciated in promoting our region.

Bills

CONSTITUTION (INDEPENDENT SPEAKER) AMENDMENT BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:16): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill to pass through all remaining stages forthwith.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority of members is not present. Ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Ms BEDFORD: In calling for the suspension of standing orders, I want to continue with the movement through the house, through all stages, of the Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill so as to ensure that the public of South Australia has full confidence in the work of the house, and I believe that is a matter of the utmost urgency.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 22
Majority 2

AYES

Bedford, F.E. (teller)
Bignell, L.W.K.

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

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

AYES

Brown, M.E.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

NOES

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

Motion thus carried.

Second Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:23): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In so moving I wish to place these remarks on record. In moving this Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill, I seek to put in place one of the things in which I have an unshakable belief.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members who are leaving or otherwise moving through the chamber will do so quietly. The member for Florey has the call.

Ms BEDFORD: After 24 years in this place and, as Grandmother of the House, representing the people of my seat in the north-east, I have watched changes in the conduct of our parliament come in over that period of time—slight changes at first from time to time—which have incrementally led to the situation where I now feel compelled to do what I can in these changed circumstances in the make-up of the membership of this house.

Parliament must be free of any political influence, perceived or otherwise, and be beyond reproach and a beacon of best practice as it weighs and deliberates laws and amendments to legislation to present the best possible outcomes for the people of South Australia. We must do this in a transparent and logical way, in plain English, so our actions are easily understood.

Leadership of this house—of any parliamentary chamber—must reflect the standards expected by our constituents, the residents of South Australia, and be seen as not a reflection of the conduct of the past but, rather, an expectation on the conduct of the future of this house and a first step in restoring faith and respect and lifting our standards to the point that we, in the parliament, are held again in the highest regard and perceived as relevant to and in the lives of South Australians.

No-one can mislead the house, and this must be the basis of all our work. This bill is a first step and it will be closely followed by the introduction of a code of conduct, part of a suite of changes now supported by what I hope will be better scrutiny of the corruption, maladministration, misconduct parts of our practices and behaviours.

Democracy and the value of the vote are issues that have driven me in my public life, and that rigour now being extended to the operation of the business of this house must also extend to the operation of political parties, one of which will form the next government. They and we must be mindful of the reason we are here: to serve and protect this state and its people.

This work must be done in a chamber where the arbiter, an adjudicator, does so without fear or favour. This amendment, if passed, will begin a new chapter in the important period before us, when the state we all love comes out of the pandemic in a period just before an election, where our performances will be judged by the people we represent.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:26): I rise to briefly make a few remarks in relation to the bill, which has been introduced by the member for Florey to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Essentially, as I understand, the bill tabled today is to provide for the obligation of any person who is elected as Speaker while occupying an office to not be able to actively participate in the votes or be a member of a registered political party, as the office of Speaker is dependent on being held subject to a majority of members voting on a motion for removal and the obligation for the Speaker to be removed.

There is, essentially, a third provision, which sets out the conduct in the ballot in accordance with procedures as determined by the house, and of course that is a matter always for the house as to how they conduct their procedures. I see foreshadowed a number of amendments which also relate to a relevant election period, which I have only just received today. They purport apparently to deal with the opportunity for the proroguing of parliament during a newly defined relevant election period. Obviously, we will wait until the committee stage to identify how that is proposed to be enumerated and, indeed, how it is to be applied.

It is certainly unusual, but it is not unknown of course, for legislation to be passed on occasion when there is some merit in having some urgency. On hearing the speaker, I think her urgency is to capitalise on a change of political allegiance in relation to the house and want to take advantage of that. Again, that is the prerogative of the parliament. She also indicates that she wishes to pursue, under the same banner of the new flavour of the house, the statutory implementation of a code of conduct.

It is not the subject, on my quick viewing of this bill, that includes that at this point, but I remind members of the house that there is a joint parliamentary committee that is undertaking work in relation to a code of conduct. Of course, it is up to the member to decide whether she wants to pursue something without considering any recommendation of that committee and the work that has been undertaken by both houses of parliament for her code of conduct to be endorsed.

I would simply say, in that regard, which I think also applies to this house, that if there is to be a code of conduct for MPs, or if there is to be a new regime of independent speaker, then perhaps it also should apply to the President in the Legislative Council. I am not advocating for it; I just make the point that both houses are going to have to consider this matter and I think it is not necessarily one which suggests it should be dealt with with so much urgency.

On quick assessment, it appears we only need a simple majority vote to make these changes, but it is one where I think haste is certainly unusual, particularly as this house already has the capacity to make decisions in relation to the position of the office of Speaker. We do not need to have a change to the state constitution to deal with those matters if for some reason someone considers themselves to be a worthy candidate, other than you, sir—and I cannot think of anyone in the parliament who would be. But, nevertheless, that is a matter which I think has carried out the role in an exemplary manner.

There is no suggestion from the Speaker, at this point anyway, that there has been the introduction of this opportunity to produce this legislation because of some disquiet towards your role and I would certainly hope it had not been, because I would not endorse it. Nevertheless, it is a body of work which I think needs to have some further consideration and therefore I will not be indicating any support to this bill. I will listen with interest to the matters raised as to the basis of the amendments and how they fit in with this legislation. It seems to follow a different issue, but I am happy to have a look at that as we go through, of course.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:31): I can indicate, if it matters in private members' business, that I am the lead speaker for the opposition, but I do not think it does matter in private members' business. I just want to point out that the mother parliament, the parliament on which we base ourselves, has an independent Speaker. That Speaker is not contested at elections. That Speaker is elected and it is generally beyond political affiliations. They remove themselves from their party room.

We have a long tradition in this parliament of conservative, independent Speakers who have recused themselves from party room deliberations. We have presiding members in other places who have also removed themselves from the deliberations of party rooms. The principle about why you would want an independent Speaker is for the fair, independent and impartial deliberation of this house.

It is very difficult to have this debate without reflecting on the Chair, or any Chair's rulings, and I will do so very cautiously because I do not want to reflect on the Chair. It occurs to me that there are an inordinate number of opposition frontbenchers who are ejected during question time for breaching standing orders without a standing order or point of order being moved. Therefore, there is a breach of the standing orders, there is no point of order by any member to bring that breach of the standing orders to the attention of the Speaker, but the Speaker miraculously identifies it.

However, when there are numerous points of order about government ministers debating answers to questions—yes, occasionally they are upheld; sometimes they are not—there is a political bent, either voluntary or involuntary, in the way we conduct ourselves in this place because we are a small parliament in terms of scale and it is almost impossible for any member to conduct themselves, in the position you hold, Mr Speaker, independently when they sit in the party room with their friends and colleagues. Trust me, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If Texas Tim could listen, what I was saying is that no member in this place can do that. It is very difficult; hence, the importance of the constitutional amendment.

The constitutional amendment imposes on this parliament a rigour to ensure that the Speaker must be independent, must act independently and provide protections for the parliament to ensure it. Why? Well, why would we not want an independent arbiter of our debates, an adjudicator, who looks at the debates not through the prism of party political benefit as former Labor Speakers have and current Liberal Speakers have?

It is not my fault the Premier has lost his majority. It is not my fault he is now in a minority government less than three years after winning an election. That is his fault, and now the parliament is exerting its will. These are the consequences of a lapse of leadership. That is what happens when you spend more time at events than tending your garden, than tending to the people you need in this parliament.

So the parliament wants an independent Speaker. Why? Because we have all observed it; we know what it is like. I know how members opposite felt in 16 long years in opposition, and I know what it is like in three long years in opposition. Independent Speakers, independent adjudicators of debate, improve the quality of the parliament, improve the quality of question time and improve the quality of our discourse. How could anyone oppose it other than if you want to entrench partisan political bias in the immense and huge powers that the Speaker is clothed in? The Speaker, whoever it is, is clothed in immense responsibility and powers given to them by the constitution and the standing orders. Those standing orders allow the Speaker to even give precedence on debate in this house.

The opposition raised matters of privilege. There has not been one example, despite what I believe is overwhelming evidence, that privileges motions could have been justified. The truth is that in this house, in our system of government, whoever has the majority on this floor runs the place. If, for example, hypothetically a minister were to incorrectly fill out their register of pecuniary interests to the parliament, so what? There is no scrutiny; there is none. People are not even declaring their family trusts anymore. They do not need to because there is a majority in the house by the government, so therefore there is no scrutiny. You mislead the parliament; if you have the numbers,

there is no scrutiny. If you say something incorrect, who cares? If you mislead, who cares? If you do not declare a conflict, who cares? Because the parliament uses its majority to protect those ministers.

An independent Speaker, by compulsion of the Constitution Act, will be a defence against that and it will outlast this parliament. It will be a good reform that will set this state on a good course for good representative government. The truth is, I wager that probably since representative government has been in place in South Australia, more than often we have had an independent Speaker not from a political party. I suspect it is a relatively new occurrence to have organised political parties holding that office; and, when organised political parties hold constitutional office, it is used politically.

The parliament now, in this rare snapshot of time that we have where the government is in extreme minority and 24 members of the house are in opposition, think it is time for a change. They want independence in their Speakership, independence in the way the adjudication of debates occurs in this place. It is a good constitutional reform. The question is why would anyone oppose removing politics from the adjudication of debate in this house? Why are members of the government fearful of losing the protection of a constitutional officer? Why? Well, I have to say that the standing orders are observed in the breach rather than the rule.

I have been here 24 years and a day, along with the member for Florey. I have seen ministers come and go and I have seen ministers held to account, but the only time I have seen ministers held to account in this place properly by the parliament—not by the media, but by the parliament—is when there has been a minority government and we have had a crossbench strong enough to exert the traditions and standards that this place expects.

That is what is occurring now. It is a good reform. It is a reform that may come back to bite me and bite others on this side of the house, but I say that is a good thing. It is a good thing for our democracy, it is a good thing for freedom of speech and it is a good thing for our debates in this parliament and we should not be fearful of it. We should, of course, do all we can to support the crossbench in attempting to legislate the independence of the adjudication of the Speakership.

I also think it is important that privilege is upheld by an independent constitutional officer who does so in the interests of the traditions of the parliament set back from the House of Commons. That privilege is not there for us as individuals but for the public. That privilege is there to protect the public from the Crown. That is why we have it, so we can speak out. There is a reason we are summonsed to the other place, because the Crown cannot enter this room. There is a reason our Speaker is independent.

There is a reason we slam the door in the face of the Usher of the Black Rod—because this house is the people's house and the people's house should defend its rights and privileges to the very end. That means now a constitutional amendment to ensure that the person charged with defending those rights of this parliament is truly independent, without a partisan political motive. Who would be opposed to that? Well, it seems the Liberal Party. I think that says it all.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (16:41): It is a good thing we ran out of time for the member for West Torrens because I am sure he was going to lecture us about speeding next, about the dangers of speeding and how you should not speed and you should pay your bills and you should pay your fines. What hypocrisy from the member for West Torrens!

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Not only is it debate but it is also disorderly and against convention that an unparliamentary term like 'hypocrisy' is used in this place when referring to another member. Somebody who has been in here since 2006 should know better.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order in respect of debate. We are in the course of the second reading debate on the bill, so there might be a matter of relevance that might arise in due course. In the circumstances of the use of the word, I do not uphold the point of order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is just extraordinary that the member for West Torrens, with a straight face, would tell this parliament that because somebody is not a member of a political party

all of a sudden they have converted on the road to Damascus, they have left all their allegiances, all the factional deals that were done, all the branch stacking that they have been responsible for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —as members of their political party—and I am referring to the Labor Party because the Labor Party has a rule that if you vote against the party line you get the sack, you are thrown out from the party. This is very convenient for the Labor Party because we know on our side of politics that somebody can reserve their right, if they do not agree with the party, they can vote—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —they can cross the floor. They can vote and do that. There are no consequences for doing that, only to their own constituents. But in the Labor Party it is automatic dismissal. Look what happened to those two MLCs in the 1990s who voted for the leasing of ETSA. So bitter was the feud between Terry Cameron and his mate up there that they had to build a wall up in the opposition rooms so that the Labor Party did not have to look at those rats. They call them rats, people who rat on the Labor Party. So the member for West Torrens actually suggests that someone like Michael Atkinson, who is a foundation builder of the shoppies union power in the Labor Party, will all of a sudden, if he is elected as Speaker of the Parliament, completely forget all that—and do not forget this little tickler amendment that we are expecting to see introduced by the proponents of this bill later that you can rejoin the party.

Do you think that is going to happen in the Labor Party if you do the wrong thing? If you are a fair Speaker and you are responsible for the removal of a Labor minister, do you really think you are going to get your Labor Party membership back? No way. It does not work like that in the Labor Party.

As to the suggestion that the sycophants of the trade union movement and the Labor Party are going to completely forget about their allegiances and their friends and who they owe, it is all about deals in the Labor Party, intimidation and deals. That is how you get to where the member for Lee is, that is how you get to where the member for Playford is: intimidation and deals. That is how it is done in the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member for Playford or the member for Lee seeking the call? The member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is a personal reflection on me. I would like a withdrawal and an apology.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Innovation and Skills will withdraw and apologise for that expression.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Certainly, sir. I withdraw and apologise. Of course, we know how the Labor Party works.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister, resume his seat. The member for Playford.

Mr BROWN: I would ask the minister to withdraw and apologise for the reflection he made on me as well.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I withdraw and apologise, sir. Of course, we know how the Labor Party works, and it starts with 15 and 16 year olds who are forced to sit through a half-hour shoppies union induction on their first day at Coles or Woolworths or Kmart or any of the other retail—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —organisations this union represents. They are forced to sit there and listen to a union induction. The union induction tells them—they use a stick; they break a single stick to see how weak that stick is.

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

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is relevance, sir. This is completely irrelevant to the bill which we are seeking to debate.

The SPEAKER: I am listening carefully to the contribution of members on all sides of this debate. The subject matter of the bill, as has been addressed—and rather widely—concerns questions of independence and impartiality. It is important that members, in their contributions to the debate, confine themselves to matters relevant to the subject matter of the bill. To that extent, I uphold the point of order and I remind the minister that we are debating the specific matters that are the subject of the bill. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am simply using the example of how entrenched those who lead the Labor Party are in their relationships and how the machine—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —that is, the big unions like the shoppies union, how they manipulate—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the electoral system. They do deals with the big retailers so they can have access to 15 and 16 year olds and intimidate them to sign on to union membership.

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

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I raise the same point of order, that of relevance, about the same contribution that the member is now making again in a repetitive way that you have previously ruled on, Mr Speaker. It has nothing to do with the bill that we are debating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously upheld a point of order of the member for Lee. I draw the minister's attention to the subject matter of the bill. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The subject matter of the bill is about some magical amendment to the constitution that if somebody gives up their party membership all of a sudden they are a different person. That simply does not happen. It is a nonsense to suggest that by not being a member of a political party you do not favour a particular view or you do not owe people something.

We know how organised the system is in the Labor Party and how it is what we call a pyramid of power. Union members are at the base of the pyramid, but the wider the base of the pyramid the more quickly you can push yourself up to the pointy end and end up with a seat in parliament. So it is about controlling. Remember that these people do not vote for themselves. They have shoppies union representatives who get more votes—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the bigger their membership. But those shoppies members do not get to vote for who is going to represent them in the parliament. People like Peter Malinauskas as the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —leader of the shoppies union are the ones who decide who goes into parliament. Remember that he was the one who tapped Mike Rann on the shoulder and said, 'Time to go, mate.' His shoppies union mate Mr Jack Snelling was there with him. These are the allegiances. These are the relationships that are built in the Labor Party. If the Labor Party just stands over there and tells this parliament that by removing somebody's membership to the Labor Party all of a sudden they are independent, it is absolute nonsense.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is nothing more than a stunt and nothing more than an attempt to destabilise this parliament and this government that is doing enormous work for the economy here in South Australia, with the COVID response here in South Australia, keeping South Australians safe, keeping them in work, keeping them in jobs, as we are recovering from—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am a bit sick of those opposite making derogatory remarks about apprentices. I hear it time and time again. I know that there are many tradies out there who have apprenticeships to thank for the incomes they are earning and the terrific jobs and careers that they are delivering because of their apprenticeships. It just shows you how far away the Labor Party has moved from their origins, the fact that they use an opportunity like this to ridicule someone who has entered the workforce through an apprenticeship. It is absolutely outrageous and it tells you what the Labor Party stands for. They stand for themselves and political opportunism, and that is it.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:52): Well, how do you follow an extraordinary contribution like that from the member for Unley? Really, you must wonder—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Cheltenham and the member for Wright will cease interjecting. I am listening carefully to the contribution of the member for Lee. The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I feel for the electors of Unley having that to be the best effort to represent them in this place. How extraordinary! We get this diatribe. Apparently, it is a revelation to this place that the labour movement in South Australia, coincidentally founded 130 years ago in this state this year, comprised people from workplaces who joined together into a literal union and asked people to stand for parliament to represent their interests in here. Apparently, to the member for Unley that is some great revelation.

Then the concept of unionism about strength in numbers, making sure that those workers hitherto exploited by their employers should bind together for a common outcome, is apparently unpalatable in the eyes of the member for Unley and presumably those others on that side of the chamber. We are very proud of it.

To this assertion that suddenly you cannot become an independent in the chair, that people will be willing to relinquish their political affiliations once they sit in that chair, I would say even without having to leave a political party, we saw that. Those opposite—particularly the Deputy Premier, the member for Stuart and the member for Hammond over there—the short memories amongst the three

of them and others forget that when they were over this side, particularly between 2014 and 2018, they would have the entire first half of question time unfettered to ask questions of the government without interruption, without Dorothy Dixers being called, half an hour of questioning non-stop, no breaks after three questions in order to alleviate the pressure being experienced by a minister. That is what an independent Speaker can provide this chamber.

But we have been denied that for more than 3½ years. We have had this run sheet approach by the presiding officers in this place of making sure that we can give the appearance of having a question time, the appearance of government being held to account in this place and the appearance of practising responsible government in this state. It has been a sham and one protected by the numbers of the South Australian Liberal Party.

I know it is has been a strategy of the member for Dunstan, the member for Bragg and the member for Morialta, the leading lights of the moderates in the Liberal Party, to eschew any dissenting voices within their party and, in particular, in the cabinet to make sure that they dominate all those positions that come with the benefit of government.

What did they do when it came to selecting a Speaker after the election? Did they think, 'I wonder who's been in here for a long time? I wonder who's got the respect of the chamber? I wonder who understands the standing orders?' Perhaps you might think of someone like the member for Flinders, for example. No, it was announced on election night that we should give it to the member for Hartley as some sort of reward for beating off the demon that was Nick Xenophon's SA-Best party.

That is the treatment of the position of Speaker by the Liberal Party here in South Australia, and what does it mean for the rest of us? When there are issues of genuine concern—I am sorry, Mr Speaker, there is a stranger in the house calling attention for a member. Is there a government adviser for a private member's bill? Do we all invite our staff in now? Is that what is happening? Does she need the leave of the house?

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, sir. We will get back to this being a gathering of popularly elected members of parliament. Where do we see this and what does it mean for the rest of us in parliament? We are all, as I just said, popularly elected to represent our electorates. Some of us do that in the course of business, making contributions to second reading debates on bills. Some of us make grievance debates; others are required to hold the government to account, having shadow ministerial responsibilities. In any of those different hats that we might wear, we are constrained in doing so when the government uses its numbers to ensure that it protects its own interests and silences opposing voices in this place.

With all due respect, that is what we have endured for 3½ years. You might wonder why question times get rowdy. When a member of the opposition stands and raises a legitimate point of order because a minister is deliberately running down the clock of question time by waffling on about something that is purely debate and completely unrelated to the subject of the question, and we raise that with the Presiding Officer and it is overruled in favour of the government who is seeking to run down the clock of question time, then what do we have left?

The only forum left is interjections and then how is that rewarded? How is the silencing of dissenting voices in this parliament rewarded? We get booted out for it. That is the experience of the last 3½ years. Those members opposite might stand up and say, 'I can't understand where this is coming from. This is outrageous. This is unprecedented.' Well, do you know where it comes from? It is behaviour from that side of the chamber and what you instil in presiding officers in this place.

It is not very enjoyable, I can tell you, to have the responsibility to try to represent 25,000 or so electors and not be able to get their voices heard in here because you are actively silenced by the government of the day. I had never witnessed that sort of behaviour in all the years that I worked around this place in government or outside it, but I have to tell you it has had a sharp point in the last 3½ years.

Every single South Australian deserves to have their voice heard and heard equally in this place, not just if you happen to be located in an electorate where the government of the day happens to have a majority—but that is what we have suffered over the last 3½ years. You can throw up your hands and you can say that this is some great conspiracy against the operations of the house, or it

is some great overturning of decades if not more of history in this place, but nothing could be further from the truth.

This parliament was deliberately constituted in a way where, in its current iteration, we elect 47 representatives of the community. If they happen to be members of a political party or not, that is a matter for the composition of the chamber. Out of those 47, eventually a majority will emerge and, out of that majority, they will ask someone to lead them who will become Premier, who will go over to the Governor and seek permission to form a government in their name. That is what our constitution provides for.

The member for West Torrens is exactly right: we are basically constituted in the image of the House of Commons in the Palace of Westminster. They have an independent Speaker, and it works well over there. We have seen the independent Speaker in the House of Commons, particularly in recent years, work to hold the parliament to account, whether it be government or members of the opposition, members of minor parties or Independents. It is not too much to ask that we have the same here in South Australia, particularly when we have been exposed to the alternative.

There have been clear and obvious cases of ministers providing incorrect information to the chamber. You have to get to the realisation that it is being done deliberately because it is usually in the course of uncaringly and callously casting aside a point that is being made by another member of parliament or a question that has been asked by the opposition or a member of the crossbench. They will say anything—anything—to get past a period of questioning from this parliament.

That is a grievous offence to the house, to mislead the parliament. We are all given a privilege, but with it comes responsibility: you have to be correct, honest and diligent in dealing with the house—and ministers have not been. That behaviour has consistently been swept away with the rulings of the presiding officers, and that is unacceptable.

I came into this place, as a new member of parliament and a brand-new minister, quivering at the thought that I might get something wrong when I addressed the house. Now they do not even bother. If it helps their political argument, if it enhances their debate, they will say anything to make their point, whether it is correct or not. That standard has to be raised. That cannot continue, and that is why we need somebody who will take a genuine, independent approach to the presiding membership of the chamber.

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (17:02): I rise in respect of the bill moved by the member for Florey to change our constitution in regard to the independence of the position of Speaker. As you know, sir, and as all members know, this is a very powerful position. The houses of parliament themselves, the legislature, is a powerful institution which for some time over the past few decades—particularly in the lower house, where we have seen in place a majority of a particular party of a particular type—takes its bidding from the executive government. The executive of the day decides how things operate, the way it works.

We are not in that situation at the moment. We were in that situation in this house, but bit by bit the power dynamic has changed in this chamber and we are now very much in a hung parliament situation, where there is a real dynamic of every vote being up to the deliberation of the house in terms of where things will go.

In the previous parliament, of which I was privileged to be a member, most of the time, despite it starting as a minority government, it did the opposite. Instead of what has now happened, with the government getting smaller and smaller, the government votes in the previous parliament got bigger and bigger and bigger and so votes were assured. Now the opposite is true, and it does give this opportunity to consider the issue that has been discussed for many years as to whether there should be an independent Speaker in place.

Clearly, as has been discussed, this is a great tradition from the United Kingdom and the House of Commons, where for many years there has been a tradition respected, both in the way their chamber operates and by their unwritten constitution, that the Speaker be an independent position. The person who forms that position, while often being originally from a political party, no longer takes part in that political party and sits independently to arbitrate the house and decide

matters for the house in its operation, and that has worked obviously extremely well in the United Kingdom for hundreds of years. We do not see that here.

What we have seen regularly, particularly during the term of this parliament, has been Speakers from the political party of government—the Liberal Party—who have clearly at times felt the pull of the need to support that party through their deliberations. The difference really sits in terms of what we saw in the previous parliament, where we did have an independently minded Speaker in the Hon. Michael Atkinson—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia interjecting:

Mr PICTON: —who, as the former Speaker, the member for Hartley, says was a good Speaker and who was very generous, if I recall, to the opposition of the day in terms of the deliberations, perhaps with the exception of the member for Unley, but he was otherwise very generous in terms of the number of questions that were allowed. In fact, on many occasions he used the standing order powers to remove ministers from the chamber for disruption, including, I think, one former minister who was relatively close to the former Speaker.

This is very different from what we see in this house now. When the Minister for Police, the member for Hartley, assumed the Speakership we saw the dynamic change instantly, and we were back to a very party political way of operating the Speakership, and really that has continued over the past 3½ years with the current Speaker and the previous Speaker. This would seek to alleviate that.

This would seek to put in place a proposal where the member who took the Speakership would leave their political party—and I understand there would be some discussion as to whether there would be some opportunity for them to return before the election—and sit independently to make sure that they exercised their duties without the potential for any influence by their political party. We have seen this time and again in this chamber, particularly in question time, when the imbalance in terms of how the different political parties are treated is very shocking.

We regularly see the Premier display the most outrageous behaviour in this chamber for which there is no punishment ever meted out to the Premier. People on this side get the vast majority of the warnings and the expulsions from this chamber, whereas that does not apply to the other side of the house, and clearly politics comes into it.

I think it is very clear as well with respect to what I have seen as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, where recently we have been discussing a right of reply request from a Ms Sharyn White. She asked for a right of response to the parliament in relation to comments made by the member for Adelaide in which she regarded that the member for Adelaide had made inaccurate statements about the amount and nature of contact with her. She said:

The Minister has misrepresented Adoptee Rights Australia Inc., the organisation, and myself, both as Secretary of that organisation and individually.

And also:

The Minister has invaded my privacy by naming me in Parliament and making claims about my personal experience, which also has implications for the privacy and perception of the reputations of members of my ex family-by-law.

These were very serious issues which were raised in a very detailed account from Ms Sharyn White and which were brought to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration as to whether they should be tabled in this house as a right of reply. Following the standing orders, the committee then sought a response from the minister. The response from the minister, while denying some of the elements, did not even touch on the third element that Ms White raised, which was as follows:

The Minister had invaded my privacy by naming me in Parliament and making claims about my personal experience, which also has implications for the privacy and perception of the reputations of members of my ex family-by-law.

Here we have the member for Adelaide, who did not even raise a response to those elements in her response to the committee. Then, in the deliberations of the committee, we obviously had discussions about that. I moved a motion that this should be incorporated into *Hansard*. That motion was tied two votes all, along party lines, and the Speaker decided to vote with the Liberal Party

members on the basis, he said, that he wanted to maintain the status quo and would not form the majority in approving a motion.

However, that precedent only lasted a few minutes before the Speaker decided to form a majority with the Liberal Party to say that the statement submitted by Ms White had misrepresented the member for Adelaide in her statements before the house. Very clearly, I think this is an example where you can see the pressure put on the Speaker in terms of his party membership, rather than independently considering the matters at hand.

There were many other options available, including whether we would go back to the member for Adelaide and seek a further response in relation to the issues that she had not addressed in her response. There were options in terms of whether we go back to the complainant and seek her further particulars in relation to the complaint that she had made.

Here we have a situation where the Speaker voted with the Liberal members as a casting vote to dismiss this complaint and so that will never see the light of day on *Hansard* in this parliament; whereas if we had an independent Speaker who was not concerned about their party membership, I think that would have been a very different story and those concerns that were raised by Ms White, which hopefully will see the light of day through other fora, would have been tabled in this house and that right of reply would have been available for some very serious issues, including breach of privacy that Ms White had regarded.

I hope that this bill will get the support of this house to make sure that we have a parliament that is presided over independently and without the influence of a person being in one political party or another.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (17:12): I rise also to support this bill and to put on the record my thoughts about how important it is to have someone who brings independence to the Speaker's role. I have been in here for nearly 16 years and have seen Speakers from both sides, and in the four years before that I witnessed Peter Lewis and Bob Such as independent Speakers—maybe Peter Lewis is not the right person to single out as a great example of being an independent Speaker; he may have had a few personality potholes. However, I think Bob Such did an extraordinary job as an independent Speaker.

I have seen, in the past 3½ years, without reflecting on anyone who might be in the chair now, the way that our side is treated compared with the other side. When we look at the number of people on this side who are sent to the sin bin or named, if you do the stats, they would far outweigh those on the other side. If we go back even further, before my time in here, I think there were stories going around; I think it might have been Graham Gunn, when he was the minister, who threw someone out—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: When he was Speaker, not minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sorry, when he was Speaker. I think he might have thrown someone out for raising an eyebrow. That person obviously was not on his side of politics.

The move to follow the Westminster tradition of having an independent Speaker is a good one. It is one that would be welcomed by people in the general public who perhaps do not know how our system works; that it has generally been the government that provides the Speaker. It is something that our communities and our constituents would welcome, and I very much support this proposed change.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (17:14): I also rise in support of this bill moved by the member for Florey and, of course, with the support of the opposition. The truth is, I have not in my time in this parliament thought a great deal about the ability for us at law to instil better principles within the stewardship of the Presiding Officer of this place.

As one of the newest members in this place—with the member for Elder still in this place—there has been at times, in my view, a degree of significant impartiality and non-partisanship on behalf of the Presiding Officers. I reflect on the former Speaker, the Minister for Emergency Services, and see him longingly wish for the great days when he was Speaker when there was a bit less scrutiny and a little less need to answer pertinent questions from the member for Kavel, as we saw in today's question time.

The one thing that is in my mind is the question around good governance and not necessarily in this place, but the need to bring good governance to this place. On reflecting on this bill, I have turned my mind to some of the lack of governance and the lack of leadership that this parliament, and this house, has seen over the last 2½ years of my time in this chamber. It is very clear that this parliament, and this house, operates in an incredibly unique legal construct. At times, it could be accused of operating in a legal black hole.

There has been an incredibly serious workplace incident that has occurred—well prosecuted, well spoken about—which I will not go into the detail of today. But what is very clear about that very significant workplace incident, and a series of workplace incidents over the years, is the lack of very clear human resource/duty of care/leadership from Presiding Officers. That is no reflection on the current Speaker because this is a product of the legal construct of this place.

The desire and the need to bring good governance to this workplace are the same and as acute as the need to bring good governance and good practice to any workplace when it comes to impartiality and when it comes to exercising proper duty of care. I know that a series of committees are looking at this at this stage, but I do hope there is cross-party whole-of-parliament support for reforms to the overall legal construct that will bring employment to this parliament. There are too many workers in this parliament who feel ostracised, who feel alienated, who feel unable to speak about harassment, who are unable to speak around and raise complaints because of the lack of a clear, responsible officer in their mind and at law as well, and that needs to change.

What needs to be brought to this chamber is a legal construct of impartiality in the Presiding Officer, and that is what this bill does by requiring the Presiding Officer to not be a member of a political party. We have heard various albeit minimal contributions from the government benches at this stage. Of course, we were all floored and completely blown away by the deep, academic approach of the member for Unley in his contribution. I think the next thing he was going to do was talk about fluoride in the water and contrails—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Complain about it.

Mr SZAKACS: Complain about it, that's right. Frankly, if I am drinking the water that he is, then I will be complaining about it as well, because certainly his contribution was way off the reservation. But what he showed us was his hyperpartisanship and what it brings when it means a complete and utter void of judgement.

The member for Unley's judgement, the member for Unley's subjective and objective intellect that he brings to arguments, is through a partisan lens at all times such as his complete and utter distaste, as the member for Lee had put it, of the collective, of the fact that the Labor Party 130 years ago was proudly formed by workers who believe, and continue to this day to believe, in the power of numbers.

I sure as hell hope that the member for Unley is not on the UN peace team for the government benchers who are approaching the crossbench at this stage, because I tell you who also believes in the power of numbers, and that is the crossbench. The crossbench grows every single day because of the lack of leadership of this Premier who would rather run off to the Barossa and party than sit there and break bread with disaffected party and caucus colleagues of his. It is that hyperpartisanship that the member for Unley demonstrated that shows me why this bill to amend the longstanding practices of the partisanship of the Speaker is so important.

Before I came to this place—I know, much to the disgust of the member for Unley—I was a trade union leader, but also within that capacity I was a company director and I sat on a superannuation board of directors. I will tell you one thing that is very clear in the corporate world, and many of those on the other side of the chamber would absolutely, no doubt, agree with me: the critical importance of an independent chair.

In superannuation—particularly industry superannuation—and also in companies that appoint non-executive directors, the longstanding principle of independent chairmanship is critical to corporate governance. The idea that industry superannuation funds—which are, at the core, stakeholder based and shareholder based—step above that to appoint non-stakeholder, non-shareholder directors as a chair is critically important. It brings better decision-making. It brings better impartiality. It brings better outcomes for those members of industry superannuation who count on

their board of directors to make the best decisions in their sole decision-making in their interests. That is what this bill attempts to do.

It may not be perfect. It may not seek to shed a natural and fundamental inclination of a person elected to this place regarding their policies. It may not shed a person's natural inclination to be community-focused rather than, as those are on the opposite benches to ours, this idea of trickle-down. It may not shed the idea that tourism is not focused around niche events that the Premier gets to attend on the taxpayer dime rather than working-class, community-accessible events like the Adelaide 500; it might not shed that.

What it will do at law is show our constituents, the public of South Australia and every member elected to this place, that the Speaker must—not should, but must—at law, per the constitution of this great state, rise above party politics and separate themselves out, no matter how much that may be against their natural inclination, against their core. It is against our core on this side to step away from the collective.

We have seen, as has been demonstrated, in just the three years of the life of this Marshall government how it is not against the natural inclination of the Premier to usher his caucus members out the door and onto the crossbench. Notwithstanding that, this is a bill of merit. This is a bill that will make the operation of this chamber better, and it will be a bill that I hope will bring better outcomes for the people of South Australia. That is why I, and we on this side, will be supporting it.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (17:24): I certainly am supporting this bill. I have done some research on the Speakers over time. I think that the independence of the Speaker is important and that the capacity of the Speaker to demonstrate that independence and impartiality in judgement over the house is vital.

I was thinking about it as in sport, in that it is very hard to maintain impartiality in judgement when you are refereeing and umpiring contests. I do feel for Speakers who are connected to the parties they represent and their difficulties. The casting vote in a tie on government bills is always given to the government by the Speaker at this point. It does not necessarily reflect what the community wants, needs or expects. I think an independent Speaker will assist in that.

The history of the Speaker is interesting. In school tours we will often, in that pantomime way, re-enact the dragging of the Speaker up to the chair because of the fear of the retribution they might face in judgement. Maybe in having an independent Speaker, I do not know whether that whole issue is lost. We might just say, 'Up you go,' and change the way we re-enact, although I hope we still respect the theatre of parliament. I found the following quote regarding independent Speakers in Australia in 2015 in the federal sphere:

Parliamentary democracy relies on the parliament, as an institution, functioning to hold the government to account. Without a truly independent Speaker presiding over how that accountability takes place, Australia's parliamentary democracy is deficient.

I think that is an interesting quote. As I was doing this and starting to write more notes on what I would perhaps say, I listened to the member for Unley, and I was seething while I was listening. I have held onto something for some time regarding my first ever meeting with the member for Unley.

First of all, I was not a trade union leader. I was not a member of a political party until some fire burnt within. There were several things that ignited that fire. You know why I am here. You know the story of my journey as a nurse and then losing my son and working in the community to make change. The first time I met the member for Unley was when I was invited to give evidence at the Social Development Committee in 2012 or 2013, when they were doing an inquiry into something to do with alcohol and the service of alcohol to minors.

I was terrified of coming into this place, but in the lead-up the Hon. Russell Wortley from the other place made me feel very calm and relaxed about coming and doing this. He said, 'The people on there, the members of parliament, want to support you and hear your evidence.' That may have been the case for the good Independent Bob Such, who was my local member, and the good Frances Bedford, member for Florey, who was the Labor person on the committee, and I believe the Hon. Kelly Vincent was another member of that committee.

As I gave the evidence as to what had led to the death of my son and the behaviour of young people under the effects of alcohol, I was then subjected to the member for Unley questioning my parenting in the middle of a committee. In the middle of the Social Development Committee, that man questioned my parenting of my 17 year old, six foot five inch, 94 kilogram son, who was out with his mates after winning a game of football, only at midnight, with one carton of beer between four of them.

He questioned my parenting. How dare he! I will not be lectured about parenting by him. How dare he! I have held that in here for the whole time that I have been in this parliament. I sat there and I listened to that rubbish come out of his mouth about unions and all that carry-on that he brought to this debate. How dare he! After six or seven years I have held this in my heart. I say shame on you, member for Unley. You are a disgrace.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (17:29): I, too, rise to speak in support of this Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill. I do so because, as the member for Lee spoke about at length, I also utterly believe in the right of every member of this house to equally have the right to speak, to participate in any debate they choose to participate in, to raise points of order, to question, to raise issues about the conduct of members in this house and, crucially, to be heard and to have decisions made in relation to the issues they traverse determined with utter impartiality.

We would all agree that it is an absolute honour to take your place in this house and represent the people, the community who have voted for you, and to bring what is important to them, to their families and to our whole community to this place to public attention. We would also all agree that when we are not heard, when debates are guillotined—as they were just last sitting week—when our points of order are ignored, when we are chastised for speaking up and when our complaints about treatment in this house are ignored, the voices of those we are privileged to represent are silenced.

Silenced they must not be, and for them not to be silenced we must have a Speaker who rules without fear, without favour and without affiliation, without bias and with utterly equal treatment toward every member of this house, as is the case, in essence, in Great Britain, where the Speaker may not run as a candidate at an election with party affiliation but must run as the Speaker.

The role of Speaker must also pose a positive influence on the broader operations of this parliament, with the interests of the parliament, its reputation, its history and its need to reflect community standards at the forefront of the role. I wanted to reflect on that broader role of the Speaker through some of my own experiences.

I think we were all very proud to celebrate 125 years since South Australian women successfully fought for the right to vote and to stand for parliament, making us the very first place in Australia and the second place in the world to achieve that. I had the privilege of being involved in the suffrage committee of this parliament with members from both this house and the Legislative Council.

At about the time of those celebrations, I hosted a number of women from my community and from other areas of South Australia here in Parliament House for a particular celebration. I had been thinking a lot about what had happened on the day that those women visited, and I had been thinking a lot about how welcoming and inclusive this place may or may not be. After pondering those issues, I took it on myself to write to the then Speaker of the House of Assembly. On 18 December 2019, I wrote to the then Speaker and the letter reads:

Dear Speaker,

As you are aware, today our State proudly celebrates 125 years since women successfully fought for the right to vote, and to stand for parliament, making us the first place in Australia and the second in the world to achieve this.

As we celebrate this important step forward, it is important for us to ensure our Parliament is inclusive of women in every way. I ask that the following issues particularly impacting women be expeditiously resolved.

Our Parliament lacks family friendly facilities. Earlier this year, I had a group of community event members visit me in our Parliament. A number of women in the group brought along their infants and toddlers. At different points during the visit, these women required the use of a change table and a quiet place to feed their babies.

Whilst we secured a place for breastfeeding, it was not a place that would accommodate all women who may require this space at different times. Despite a thorough search across the building, I could not locate a change table.

It is important that our South Australian Parliament is a place that includes and welcomes all and is an exemplar of being friendly and open for families. I ask that change tables be immediately purchased and placed in appropriate areas, and that an appropriate area be designated for breastfeeding and for the storage of expressed breast milk.

The Australian Breastfeeding Association provides advice and assistance to ensure workplaces and public spaces are accredited in terms of the provision of these appropriate spaces. I have worked with them on these issues in the past and would be very happy to contact them and to arrange a meeting to discuss this matter.

I would also very much appreciate the opportunity to meet with you to discuss and progress these matters, and to identify other mechanisms that we could implement to improve how welcoming and appropriate our parliament is for women and indeed, for all people and families.

Could you please contact me to advise of a suitable time to meet about these matters should you wish to do so?

Again, it is important that our State celebrates 125 years since the achievement of a significant milestone for women that we contemplate and implement the improvements that we can continue to make.

Thank you for your assistance.

That letter was written on the day that marked 125 years since South Australian women successfully fought for the right to vote and stand for this parliament. The letter was written on 18 December 2019. To date, unless I have missed it (and I am very sorry if I have), I have not received a response. I have not received a response, other than to notice that about a year after writing that letter there was finally one change table—one year after I wrote the letter—put in one set of women's toilets on the lower ground floor. I guess I should take that as my response from the Speaker.

I note that various committees of this house have now progressed some change, but certainly not all the changes that were suggested in that letter. I am sure that other members would have suggestions about how we can make this a much more inclusive family-friendly place for all. But, given the offer to meet about these matters was never accepted by the then Speaker, it is hard to have that conversation.

As I said, I think that it is incredibly important that the Speaker plays a role in upholding the dignity that should be associated with this place. I thought I had 20 minutes but I only have 10, so I am going to very quickly refer to a couple of other examples. One was earlier this year, when I tried over and over and over again to suspend standing orders to speak about the need for an urgent inquiry into sexual harassment in this workplace. I tried and I tried and I tried.

The frustrating thing was that, yes, it was frustrating that we could not have the standing orders suspended, but it was also very frustrating that every single time I tried over and over again to talk about the prevalence of sexual harassment in our community, to talk about the need for us to be an exemplar in terms of being free of sexual harassment, no matter how much I tried I was not allowed even to speak, let alone begin a debate about the importance of these particular issues.

On another occasion, I was speaking about Wicked Campers. For two years—two years—I had a bill in this place calling for a ban on vehicles with those incredibly offensive slogans, two years with debate after debate after debate and people standing out on the steps. Once in here, once in this place, I read out some of those slogans, and what should happen but the Speaker asked me not to read out those slogans.

However, I could never actually have the bill debated so that we could ensure families, children and people in our community did not have to read those slogans out on our streets. But certainly, as was the point I made on that day—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HILDYARD: —the Speaker ruled that those slogans were too offensive for this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time—

Ms HILDYARD: I have been trying to get your attention for some time, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time has expired.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (17:40): I rise to make a brief contribution to this very important bill. As others have noted, this South Australian parliament has a very proud history of

firsts and of leading the way nationally and internationally. We all know the stories of suffrage, we know, thanks indeed to the work of the member for Florey, of the work of Muriel Matters and of the suffragettes in South Australia before her, who led the way in South Australia to establishing South Australia and the South Australian parliament as leading lights in the parliamentary system across the world.

What we have a chance to do today is do that again in Australia. We have the chance to establish a truly independent, impartial Chair on these proceedings. There have been arguments made at the federal level and in other states that this should be the case, and I think it is time that we put our stamp once again on the parliamentary system across Australia and establish ourselves once again as leaders in this field.

As observers of this parliament over recent years may have noticed, I spent a long time on the government backbench and, while there were some frustrations spending time on the government backbench, I am sure it was not as bad as spending 16 years on this side of the house. During that time, I did have a lot of time to think about and to observe the processes of this place, both as an ordinary backbencher and as Chair of the Economic and Finance Committee and subsequently as Chair of an estimates committee.

Extra to those committees, I was involved in various informal groupings of people from both sides of the house who looked at ways we could reform particularly the parliamentary committee system, and often we would turn to questions of the Speaker, but obviously none of that was resolved. We did get quite far, in fact, on some questions of committee reform, but for one reason or another those fell by the wayside, and I do note that there has been a recent select committee or a standing committee looking at these matters, and hopefully we will hear from them soon.

I also got to see during that period the Speakership in microcosm as Chair of an estimates committee over four years. We all know the problems—and we discuss this every year in this place—and we discuss the problems with estimates committees. As I said, it is a microcosm of the way the Speakership works, and we know that the Chairs of the estimate committees are selected from the government and essentially steer the estimates committee in a way that favours the government. There is no doubt about that. We have seen that starkly over the last three years. I like to think I was an impartial judge presiding over the committee, but of course in recent years we have seen that tradition fall away.

As I said, this is a chance for us to really make our mark on the parliamentary system in Australia. The position of Speaker, as the member for West Torrens alluded to, is an ancient position. It is almost as old as the parliament itself, as the mother of all parliaments herself, but that position has evolved over time. Initially, the Speakers of the House of Commons—I cannot remember what they were called for the 100 years before they were called Speakers—were essentially agents of the Crown to one degree or another and they were seen as such by the members of the House of Commons.

It continued that way for 500 years: the toing and froing between the Crown and the parliament was in many ways played out by the role of the Speaker. It was not until the 19th century that the British parliament really cemented and established the Speakership as impartial and independent. It is an important tradition, and it is a tradition that, sadly, was not conferred on the colonies in the 19th century in quite the same way.

I think this is our chance to catch up. I think it is a chance to use the mother of all parliaments as a model for our parliament and be seen in a true leadership position within Australia. This is a reform I think is long overdue. I look forward to majority support in the house for this measure and I commend the bill to the house.

Mr BROWN (Playford) (17:45): I rise to make a brief contribution on the bill as someone who has not been a member of the house for very long, only a very short period of time in fact, but someone who has had some involvement in previous parliaments, including one in particular where there was an independent Speaker of this house between 2002 and 2006. Whilst other members have talked longingly of the period of time when the Hon. Bob Such was Speaker of the house, not too many people have spoken in great praise of the time when the Hon. Peter Lewis was Speaker of this house.

However, there are many things that I would like to say that I think reflect positively on that time. One of them is the fact that because there was an independent Speaker and, indeed, a minority government, it was very hard for those of us who were working for government ministers to have any great safety or surety as to what rulings might be made by the Speaker on things such as issues of privilege or other rulings that the Speaker was required to make.

Indeed, other members of this house who were advisers at the time will say that you were very, very careful to make sure that your minister did not do anything that could be considered as being misleading to the house. I can absolutely assure you of that. If your minister put a hair out of line—although it is true that some ministers got a bit more leeway than others—you were always sure he would be in serious trouble. Everything was checked, double-checked and triple-checked to make sure that in no way could anyone say that a minister had misled the house in any way.

While I know that some ministers did get into trouble from time to time, now that quite some time has passed I can say that I think most of them deserved it. I think ministers who got into trouble during that time when Peter Lewis was Speaker of this house certainly had let their standards slip a little bit and so got what they deserved. Unfortunately, I cannot say that is something that exists at the moment.

In my experience in this house, things such as the quality of answers to questions and the quality of ministerial statements delivered by ministers in this house pale in comparison to those delivered between 2002 and 2006. I think a lot of that has to do with a general arrogance that has crept into this government, a lot of which comes from the fact that they feel safe and secure—rightly or wrongly, I make no opinion about that—knowing that they do not think they are going to have any problems with the Speaker's rulings. That, I think, is unfortunate, and one reason why we need to look at the independence of the Speaker and adopt the proposal that has been put forward by the member for Florey.

I would also like to take some issue with the comments made by the member for Unley. I know lots of other members have done that and I am sure other members will do that following me. I do not want to take too much issue with the rant, if one could describe it as such, against collectivism that we got from the member for Unley. We are used to that from him. We know his particular views. It is well known amongst the Liberal Party. I have had a number of conversations with people on the other side about the member for Unley and his views, and their views about the member for Unley.

However, one thing I would like to talk about is that he has in his mind apparently this idea that someone who is covered by the bill will be some sort of creature of a political party, will always be harking back at the political party and always trying to do the political party's bidding. I would like to say that in my mind the person who most embodies this concept of an independent Speaker is in fact the member for Flinders.

The member for Flinders, to my mind, is the sort of person we are talking about when we are talking about an independently minded Speaker. I know the member for Flinders is intending to retire, unfortunately, at the next election, but I can see someone of his ilk and stature fulfilling the obligations that are put forth by this particular bill, leaving their party and being a fine independent Speaker of this parliament. He is the person I think we should all keep in our minds when we are talking about this particular piece of legislation, when we are talking about the sort of person who would fulfil this role.

It is important that the Speaker fulfil not only the obligations given to him or her by standing orders, but also the common law requirements, the historical obligations that go with this particular role. It is also important that the person who has these obligations be independent, because I know the role can weigh on the person who has it.

I have had a number of conversations over the years with Speakers—most recently you, sir, but also the member for Hartley, who was the Speaker before you—and I am acutely aware of the so-called twin obligations that weigh on members not only as an independent Speaker here in this house but also as someone who is a member of a political party who has weighing on them obligations to their colleagues, who expect to be given an easy run because they are a member of the same political party. Ministers expect to have an easy turn from them because they are members of the same political party.

These are obligations that weigh on Speakers, and one way of allowing Speakers not to have these things weighing on them, these swords of Damocles hanging over their head, is to free them from that political party membership. So I would like to thank the member for Florey for bringing forward this bill to do just that. There are obligations on the Speaker that could be better done by Independents.

Earlier we heard people talk about rulings the Speaker makes, and how it is important that the Speaker makes those rulings independently, but there are also other things we need to consider. There is representation on the JPSC, which the Speaker chairs every second year; that needs to be independent as well. We cannot have that being the plaything of a political party, and have the Speaker being someone who has to check back with their political party as to what they want them to do. We need them to think independently about administering this place.

It is also important that we have someone who is independent so that they can represent this chamber more broadly and publicly, not only with those who visit here from time to time but also in terms of the community outreach that the Speaker needs to perform to let people know about the obligations that exist and what the chamber actually does. These things also need to be independent.

We have heard about the very common corporate practice of independent chairs for corporate boards, something I know is becoming more and more prevalent; in fact, it is very much seen as being best practice for corporate boards in this country. If we expect businesses to have independent chairs, why should we not expect this parliament itself, this sovereign entity which passes the laws of the land, not to have someone who is independent? It is ridiculous for us to put those obligations on business but not be prepared to do it ourselves.

The other thing I would like to talk about is the notion of a code of conduct, which has been raised more frequently in the last few weeks. In the opinion of some it seems that the legislation introduced into this chamber by the Attorney-General to amend ICAC could unfortunately have created a situation where obligations on members of parliament are not as strong as they should be. The way to make sure those obligations are strengthened is to have a code of conduct, so it is important that the person who is involved not only in developing but also enforcing that code of conduct be independent of the control of political parties.

I believe the best way to make sure that happens in the future is to pass the bill that has been presented to us by the member for Florey. With those few words, I urge all members to support this legislation so that we have a truly independent Speaker, so that we lead the way again, and so that South Australia shows it is committed to an independent Speaker.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (17:53): I also rise to speak in favour of the member for Florey's bill on amending the Constitution Act for an Independent Speaker, and I commend her for taking this step forward in the progress of this parliament.

As you are aware, Mr Speaker, all our traditions in this place are largely taken from the Westminster system. Looking around at the green carpet in the House of Commons (as it would be in the United Kingdom), we see the executive branch sitting opposite us there. We see a lot of the conventions coming from the Westminster system; however, one of the conventions we have not taken is that of an independent Speaker. It struck me when I entered this place how difficult it must be for someone in your position, Mr Speaker, given the requirements of a Speaker, to fulfil that role while being a political party member. It must be actually very challenging.

The first independent Speaker I met was the Speaker for the Cook Islands. It was a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting held here in Adelaide, pre COVID days, so it must have been 2019. She was a lovely lady by the name of Niki Rattle, and she talked to me about not being a party member of either party and being truly independent.

She talked me through what she saw as her duties as Speaker, including allowing members to speak, whether they were from the government or from the minority. She talked to me about ensuring that members on both sides adhered to the rules of debate. I think it is very obvious, when there is not an independent Speaker, that sometimes that does not happen. Sometimes members on the government side are not necessarily called on to adhere to rules of debate as stringently as members of the opposition are.

She also talked about regulating the time allocated for debate, which our Clerks help us with greatly in this place. Ruling on disputes on procedure and protecting the rights of minorities are some

issues that she mentioned to me. I imagine that if you are not an independent Speaker, it would be very difficult to be able to achieve that. Mr Speaker, you and the member for Hartley are the Speakers I have seen in my very short time here. I understand that you have attempted to do that as best you can, but there are also situations where I am astounded at some points of order during question time, for example. From my perspective, I think, 'Well, of course that is a valid point of order.'

That is not to question your judgement, Mr Speaker, but there are some situations where I think it must be very difficult to be truly independent and make those independent calls. The only way to really do that is to adopt the member for Florey's amendment bill and actually have an independent Speaker who is not a member of a political party. I think that would make this place a better place. I think it would make it a fairer place.

Obviously, other commonwealth parliaments around the world have adopted this and seen the benefits of it, so I think it is high time we take the seriousness of the Speakership and see it as a seriously independent role and one in which we will want an independent person who is not a party member to sit and regulate how this chamber operates. Unfortunately, the Speakership at the moment seems to be a bit of a prize for the government.

At the last election, we saw the member for Hartley get the prize because he managed to slay Nick Xenophon in his seat of Hartley. Perhaps it is a prize for you, Mr Speaker, in some regards. I think in the past it has also been seen as a prize to be dished out by the government of the day rather than seeing the seriousness of the Speakership role.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Are they going to give it you now, are they?

Ms MICHAELS: If the Attorney wishes me to be the Speaker, I am happy to take that role and be fiercely independent in it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

Ms MICHAELS: I do think that particular parts of the day, particularly question time, would work much more smoothly and be much fairer to both the opposition and the crossbenchers if there was an independent Speaker. I commend the member for Florey for bringing this to the house, for bringing us to the modern world, in many respects, in this place.

Some of the other things I think that we do need to take account of in updating the parliamentary process are ones we have spoken about in the Standing Orders Committee in terms of how this parliament operates for family friendly work hours, for example. We have only just recently managed to change standing orders to allow the feeding of babies in the chamber. These are all things we need to take seriously, and we need to progress how this parliament operates for the benefit of not only the current sitting members but also future sitting members. I think this is one of those issues that I think is very important and I commend the member for Florey for bringing this to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:59): Obviously, I have a lot of time to make my contribution. I will put on the record that I have absolutely no interest in being the Speaker. That might come as a surprise. I did work part time for a Speaker of the house on one occasion—Lyn Breuer, who was very proud to be the first female Speaker of the house.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 until 19:30.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Giles is continuing his remarks.

Mr HUGHES: Yes, I am continuing my remarks. Where was I before dinner? I was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You were only just into it I think.

Mr HUGHES: I was confirming the fact that I had absolutely no interest in being a Speaker. We have already had one Speaker from the seat of Giles, and I think one is enough, and at least that Speaker covered herself in glory, being the first female Speaker in the history of this parliament. So that is something where you do go down in history—a proud moment for the former member for Giles, Lyn Breuer. I am sure that, when I confirmed the fact that I had no interest in being a Speaker, I heard howls of disbelief: how could I not take on a position like that?

The reason I could not take on a position like that is that I used to play for an amateur soccer team in Whyalla called Westlands United. It was partly a works team, but it had a few hangers-on from elsewhere. We were not playing for sheep stations; we were an amateur team. It was an amateur team noted for its capacity to down a few pints and have a few smokes before we even got on the pitch, and then at half time you had to top that up with another few pints and another few smokes.

Despite that, we were not all that bad when it came to playing soccer. But what was incredibly important, and something that we always paid attention to, was the quality of the referee. We wanted a referee who was objective, a referee who was balanced and a referee who, if he was going to do us for our transgressions, would do the same to the other side. Some of the referees in Whyalla did have a hard time. My brother was one of these notorious supporters of the Westlands United Soccer Club, which just celebrated its 50th anniversary. He was actually a very good player, an A-grade player, but as a spectator he was absolutely terrible. It would be a stream of invective directed at the referee. I have a lot of respect for referees.

I have a lot of respect for referees in soccer, for umpires in footy, for those people who have to make the decisions on the pitch. The role of the Speaker is not that different. It is somewhat more complicated. Your knowledge base has to be deeper when it comes to parliamentary process, when it comes to convention, when it comes to precedent and when it comes to the history. You always have some people who are able to assist you in that process—but the role of the Speaker in the house is incredibly important.

When the member for Florey moved this bill I thought, 'Good on her. I think that is a step forward.' When I first came to this place back in 2014—and I thought maybe I was just naive—I thought the person who took on the role of Speaker should be independent or at least semi-independent. I think there is something to be said for that. In fact, I would have gone further. I was one of those people who had an inclination to maybe see the role of Speaker as being a judicial appointment. I have heard strong arguments against that and I have heard arguments for it, so I am not going to go into that space today. The important thing is that there needs to be a strong sense that the Speaker of the house is, to a degree, independent, objective and balanced because that then assists with improving the standards in the house across the board.

I am not going to reflect upon any Speakers. I have only been kicked out the once, and I think on that occasion I deserved it. I am not one of the more unruly or noisy members of this parliament. I always remember Gary Gray saying to me that he spent years getting into parliament, so why would he do something as a frontbencher to get kicked out? That was his approach, and different people have different approaches, so it is horses for courses at different times.

When we look around the world, we see different jurisdictions handle this in different ways; different parliaments handle this in different ways. I developed a significant degree of respect for the Speaker of the British parliament when they were going through that whole Brexit debate. I watched what he had to go through and what that parliament had to go through, and he managed to keep his cool and actually be very balanced about it while being mindful of his role: precedent, history and convention. I thought the way he handled that was a credit to him.

I do not have full knowledge of all the Speakers in this chamber, in fact, very few of them. I am sure there has been a mixed bag over the years. So the idea that we could have a Speaker with a greater degree of independence is something that I think we should welcome. They say that a week is a long time in politics, and a few days has been a long time in politics in this state with the shift in dynamic. I am wondering, given that we are here and looking at the role of the Speaker, whether we should look at some of the other things that we do in this place. I would be a person who would be more favourably disposed to a greater number of issues being considered by committees.

One thing I was staggered by when I came into this place, given that lots of places had done efficiency drives and the rest of it, was how much time we actually waste in this place. There are times when I have heard people read out the same prepared lines—multiple speeches with the same prepared lines. I think to myself, 'What? You don't even look at what you are reading and what other people have already said and you say exactly the same thing.' Often, it is just a variation on a theme, but usually it is just the theme over and over again. I sometimes wonder: would we not be better served to have a lead speaker and maybe a second speaker from each side and from the Independents? It would save a lot of time.

There is an irony in that given what is going on here—anyway, I have said it. It reminds me of the song from Talking Heads, *Psycho Killer*: 'Say something once, why say it again?' This is a house where repetition is shaped into a real art form, so I think we should be very open to what the member for Florey is trying to achieve here. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the concept of having a Speaker who is independent. As I have indicated, we have seen other jurisdictions, other parliaments, have Speakers who have a degree of independence from the party that they might well have come from. I referred to the Speaker of the British parliament during Brexit, the way he handled that and the pressure that was on him, which at the time was enormous.

So maybe a new day has dawned with the shifting dynamic in this place, with the shift in numbers, and something positive might well come from that. As the member for West Torrens said, this might come back to bite us on the bum if we are in government, but he welcomed it—he welcomed it. I think it is important, and I think it is something that the people of this state would agree is important.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (19:39): I rise to speak on the Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill 2021, a bill moved in this place by the member for Florey, who herself has served as Deputy Speaker in this place. In effect, if this bill is passed it will amend the Constitution Act 1934 in relation to the position of Speaker.

The position of Speaker adopted from the Westminster system is a very powerful position, as you would be aware, Deputy Speaker. I think it is fair to say that many who have served in this place while the member for Croydon, the Hon. Michael Atkinson, was Speaker would agree that he was indeed mostly impartial as a Speaker. In fact, there were times when some of us thought that he was too hard on those Labor members of his own party.

Interestingly, the member for Giles was talking about not having been kicked out of this place, and I note that the rules governing the Speaker and the rules governing the President in the Legislative Council in relation to being able to remove someone from the house differ considerably. The rules governing the position of Speaker under the Westminster system in Britain, however, differ from those that govern the office of Speaker here in Australia.

In Great Britain, for example, the Speaker may not run at an election as a candidate with party affiliation, but must do so as the Speaker, and in the British system the presiding member of the House of Commons on taking up the position must resign from the political party to which they belong. They are not able to involve themselves in political activity, not only while holding the position but even when they are no longer in parliament, when they leave.

There would be some Speakers over the years who would have liked to adopt the British system, I am sure, where if they stand for re-election they are not opposed by the major political parties. It is said to enable them as a Speaker to exercise their powers without fear or favour, and their independence in office extends to how they vote in the event of a tie, with convention dictating that they vote in favour of continuing the debate or maintaining the status quo, and that is not something I can say that we have here.

It is interesting to read what is written about the Presiding Officer's position in other parliaments. In Canada, for example, the Speaker is nearly always elected from the party in government, similar to what we have here, and is supposed to avoid partisan political activity. They are not required to make a complete break. However, when running for re-election, incumbent Speakers are usually careful to avoid partisan statements that might prejudice their perceived impartiality in the future. Again, that is something that we do not see here, and I am sure that many would like it to stay that way.

In New Zealand, it is important that the elected Speaker is not biased towards any political party. This is to ensure that parliament has an equal chance to contribute to the debates and to take part in other business in the house. The Speaker of New Zealand's House of Representatives is allowed to maintain links with their political party, but they are not allowed to show political bias when chairing business in the house, and the Speaker must not show preference or disrespect for any political party, for the government or in opposition. It sounds familiar, not unlike what we have here in our parliament.

It is legendary in our federal parliament in the House of Representatives that when Bronwyn Bishop was the Speaker between the years of 2013 and 2015, I understand, she removed around 400 members of the House of Representatives, and of those 393 were from the Labor opposition—393—with only seven from the Liberal government, of which she was a member. When I was looking up those figures I had to go back and check them because they seem almost unbelievable. But I do ask: where is the impartiality there? If the bill before us is passed, it will mean that a person elected as Speaker of this house will not be able, while holding the office of Speaker, to be a member of a political party.

It would also mean that a person elected as the Speaker while occupying that office would not be able to actively participate in the votes and proceedings of a registered political party. It is worth highlighting that this does not include votes and proceedings of the House of Assembly or of parliamentary committees.

Further, should a member of a registered political party who is elected as Speaker not resign from that party by the end of the day on which they were elected to the office of Speaker, it would come into play that at the end of that day they immediately vacate the office. The Speaker could, under this bill, be removed as the Speaker on a motion by any member of the House of Assembly, approved by a majority of members of the House of Assembly.

There is also in this bill, moved by the member for Florey, a transitional provision which states that the person holding office as the Speaker of the House of Assembly immediately before the commencement of this act continues to hold office until the first sitting day of the House of Assembly occurring after the commencement of this act. So as to the current Speaker, that may or may not affect them under the current circumstances should the bill be passed.

Interestingly, history reveals that in our South Australian parliament there have been a number of occasions—six, I believe—on which the Speaker of the House of Assembly was not in the governing party. Independent MP Tom Stott was elected Speaker following the 1962 election, which had resulted in a hung parliament. The Liberal Party offered him the job in order to retain government. Stott held this position until Labor won in 1965 but regained it under similar circumstances following the 1968 election, then retiring at the 1970 election. He had a considerable time in that position.

Further hung parliaments led to Speakerships of Ted Connelly under Labor from 1975 to 1977; Norm Peterson, again under Labor, from 1989 to 1993; and Peter Lewis under Labor following the 2002 election. When Lewis resigned on 4 April 2005, he was replaced by fellow Independent Bob Such, who held the job until the following election. Many of us here in this place can remember that.

In Australia, both at the state level in the House of Assembly and at the federal level in the House of Representatives, our Speakers are meant to be impartial. However, they are able to remain—at the moment—an active member of their party room and they can also stand for re-election as a party member. In fact, they can continue to campaign for their seat at election time just as any other candidate can and it is fair to say that their position and political future depends on the ongoing support of their party. It will be interesting to see, if this bill passes, how that plays out. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (19:48): I rise to speak in support of the Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Bill 2021 introduced by the member for Florey. The ambition of this bill is to confirm and maintain the utmost independence of the role of Speaker in our South Australian parliament and to have that independence confirmed within legislation. How will this work? It will work that the person has been elected and must not, while occupying the office, be a member of, or actively participate in the votes and proceedings of, a registered political party. In addition, a member of a registered political party who is elected as Speaker and who does not resign from the party by the end of the day on which they were so elected will, at the end of that day, immediately vacate the office of Speaker.

In this context, a 'registered political party' has the same meaning as in the Electoral Act 1985. When I started to write some notes about this issue, I thought I should acquaint myself with the actual functionality and the role of the Speaker as the Presiding Officer of the House of Assembly. In my research, I was drawn to Edwin Blackmore, who was an assistant Clerk of the parliament in 1885. To remind ourselves, they listed duties as such:

The ordinary duties in the Chair consist—

In presiding of the deliberations of the House, and maintaining order:

I know sometimes we need a little bit more control than always, but order is the desire here. It continues:

In counting the House before the business is commenced, and at any time when attention is called to the state of the House:

In calling upon Members to speak, to put the questions and move the motions standing in their names, and bringing up Bills:

In putting questions for the decision of the House, and declaring the result by voices or by divisions:

In giving a casting vote where necessary:

I experienced that just recently during the debate of the multicultural bill, when we had even numbers on either side about a particular amendment and the Speaker was required to give a casting vote. Alas, it did not go my way, but I had not actually seen that happen very often in my nearly 10 years in this house. Blackmore continues:

In receiving Reports from Committee of the whole House:

In receiving and communicating to the House Messages from the Governor, and from the Legislative Council:

In announcing vacancies and the issue of Writs:

In reporting Assent to Bills:

In adjourning the House, whether on motion or from want of a Quorum.

These are just the basic things the Speaker does, but when you reflect that this comes from words written in 1885 it is important for us to reflect on the Westminster system and how well it has treated us here in the Commonwealth of Australia and in the South Australian parliament and throughout the world.

Whether it be Canada or New Zealand or Great Britain, we have many jurisdictions using very similar rules that were set down hundreds of years ago. But they do change from time to time and they change because it is the will of the parliament to change. They change because they need to be updated. They get changed because of concerns of the people elected to this house.

Most importantly, we should remind ourselves of the focal point of what a Speaker does. They are constitutional, procedural, administrative matters on behalf of the house—not on behalf the government, not half of the opposition, but on behalf of the house. That took me to some brief research about some comments about independent Speakers. I have heard other people speak here about Great Britain and the use of an independent Speaker.

There was an article a few years ago by Ryan Goss, who was a lecturer in law at the ANU. He talked a little bit about why we should consider a fully independent Speaker here. He was reflecting on the Australian parliament at that time in 2015. I think the member for Torrens reflected on that time as well about certain antics of a Speaker of the house, but they are worthy of raising today. He talks about Great Britain having an independent Speaker who is more than a fair umpire, the fact that a Speaker in the House of Commons resigns from their political party and therefore the Speaker speaks for parliament, not for government.

In this article, Ryan Goss reflects on Walter Bagehot, the political writer from the 19th century. He says:

...one of parliament's most important jobs is:

...watching and checking the ministers of the Crown.

So this is something that has been reflected upon for many years. It is something that, although the system serves us very well, means that we should consider roles from time to time. He looks at the fact that Great Britain has a truly independent Speaker, who allows the parliament as an institution to be separate from the government—to keep ministers accountable. The independent control enhances the accountability of the government.

I thank the member for Florey for bringing this forward, because that is what she is aiming to do—to enhance the accountability of the government to the people of South Australia. This is their

house, the South Australian parliament. I have just hosted an event, had people here and said, 'Welcome to your house,' because it does not belong to us as politicians: it belongs to the people of South Australia.

In this article, Ryan Goss gives an example of what can happen in the House of Commons and I think this is quite interesting. It provides, above and beyond question time, something called 'urgent questions' on very important issues of the day. As we reflect on looking at an independent Speaker and having that within legislation, maybe there are some other elements which we could consider on very important matters which are urgent for the day to be asked above and beyond.

I stand in support of this amendment bill to reflect on the role of the Speaker and to remind ourselves how important it is that the Speaker must act with both authority and impartiality. They are fundamental to our system of democracy and laid the foundations for which we stand here today. I support the bill.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (19:56): I come to this proposal by the member for Florey without unfettered enthusiasm. While our side of the parliament has indicated that we will be supporting it—and I do support it—I do not do so assuming that this is an easy change to make, nor that it does not come at some cost. This is a difficult thing to do, to change the nature in which a Speaker is considered to be a Speaker, depending on their connection to a political party.

The two concerns that I come to this with are, first, that I am a believer in political parties. Unlike many people—increasing numbers of people—in this parliament, I do not see myself ever wanting to leave the political party of which I have been a member since I was 15. I think political parties are fundamentally a force of good in our democracies, although I also appreciate that there is a very serious role for people who are independent members of parliament.

The second area, and I am certainly not the only person who feels that way on this side but neither would I say that I am necessarily in a majority, is that I have a lot of time for our current Speaker. Our current Speaker was the Chair of a committee that I still sit on and I think he is an honourable person, a thoughtful and intelligent person, and I think he seeks to do his job well. That is not necessarily the view that is entirely shared by everyone on my side, but it is one that I hold sincerely.

In no way is this a proposal, from my perspective, that is a reflection on the current Speaker. It is, however, a reflection on the way in which the Speaker's role is used, the way that it is required to conduct itself, and perhaps also the way in which the public regards the role of Speaker.

The idea of an independent Speaker is not unique and it is not new. As many other speakers on this side have canvassed, it has been the Westminster tradition for some time—around the time, I believe, that political parties first came into being—the question of how the person presiding over the chamber ought to relate to those loyalties that political parties require. It seems to work in Westminster.

There are various other versions in other parliaments that come within the Westminster system, but it is the one in the UK that is the most explicit. I do think, though, that some consideration ought to be given to the role of the Speaker in relation to the Speaker's electorate. I personally would be interested in an amendment that allowed a Speaker who is an Independent to reconnect with a political party in the context of seeking re-election.

I have thought about it in my own terms. I am very proud not just to be the member for Port Adelaide but to be a Labor Party member who represents the seat of Port Adelaide, and a lot of my electorate feel the same way. They often introduce me as the Labor member for Port Adelaide, even though strictly speaking I am the member for all of Port Adelaide. I would not want to go to an election in my seat, in my community, not proudly part of the Labor Party, even—and I personally will never aspire to be Speaker—in the instance that I was required through a role that I held here to be independent of the political party for a time.

So I think there may be a way to accommodate—and we will see what happens in the committee stage—an independent Speaker who is also then able to connect with their political party as they run for election. I think we can hold those two thoughts separately. But the question of why have an independent Speaker I think really arises from the conditions, rules and expectations that sit around a Speaker acting as this sort of presiding officer.

I have now seen four Speakers in the nearly 10 years that I have been here and they have all operated in their own individual ways. Although they have all been members of a political party, they have in their own different ways endeavoured to operate within the existing system, some of them more critical of people on their own political side than others.

There may well be a dispute about Speaker Michael Atkinson. Where we sit is where we stand, so we experienced what we experienced, but I certainly found the experience as a minister of being reprimanded in questions that I was answering in a way that has not been replicated with subsequent Speakers when, for example, information has been very widely available in the public.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: He was mainly concerned about your grammar.

Dr CLOSE: And he did occasionally text me in Latin, indeed. That happened during a question I was answering. He gave me the Latin expression for something I was trying to say. So certainly we all have our own way and style, but my point is more that that is occurring within the context of the Speaker having been appointed by the party of government, usually the party of majority, although not necessarily, as we have been discovering.

So that person comes from the government, is appointed by the government and is part of the government's party, but is then expected to independently oversee the implementation of the standing orders, to reprimand behaviour and to act in a fair and so-called independent manner, and that is not easy for the Speaker.

I have to say that I like the current Speaker very much, but I have seen very bad behaviour not being dealt with on one side and what I would regard as milder behaviour being treated much more firmly on the other. I think we are only human if we understand that the considerations that go into how someone hears and sees and then acts on what is in front of them are informed by who you belong to, who you are part of and who you spend time with.

Speaker Atkinson removed himself almost entirely from the Labor caucus. I do not know if that has happened subsequently and I do not know if it happened before, but it is one way of attempting to say, 'I'm not really part of this decision-making group. I will sit out of that.' It is trying to find an accommodation for dealing with the challenge of needing to in fact treat all sides of parliament equally and dispassionately.

A different way of doing that is exactly what the member for Florey has suggested, which is to say that, for the period you are in that role—not you, sir, of course, as Deputy Speaker as I do not believe there is any suggestion that your role would change—the Speaker would step out of that alignment or that connection to a political party and all of the loyalties that go with that in order to enable them not only in practice but also with the comfort of the rules around them to be able to be truly dispassionate.

If we had a Speaker who was not a member of the governing party, the government would not expect them to treat them more gently. Whereas now I wonder if the Premier maybe gives a little bit of an eye to one of the two Speakers we have had since the election, in that 'It is okay if I am shouting across or I am saying things to the other side. It is only when the Leader of the Opposition or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition says things that there ought to be a reprimand.' That gets removed by a Speaker not just hoping to be independent, not just independent in theory in the role, but actually declared to be independent from the political party. It may make it easier for any Speaker to do their job well.

I certainly think that this would be attractive to the public. I think the public would expect that the person sitting in what is in some ways the judicial chair, the presiding chair, would enforce the rules dispassionately, and the public would probably find it very attractive to have that person not being tied to the loyalty of a particular political party and particularly not, of course, the party that otherwise also has the numbers and has the capacity to give future largesse.

Although, as I say, I have not come to this with immediate enthusiasm and I do not see this as being something that is clear-cut, I do think, having had the time to consider the precedents and consider the purpose—the intention the member for Florey has come to this with—that it probably is an advance for our parliament and is one that the public would welcome.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (20:06): I might make a small contribution to this debate and welcome the opportunity to discuss this important issue because I think this issue is in some ways symbolic of other reforms which we may have to undertake in the parliament if we are to survive this century and gain the trust of the people who elect us to this place.

I think the idea of having an independent Speaker would certainly enhance the way the chamber operates and so I thank the member for Florey for bringing this bill before us. I am hopeful that the bill will be successful but if it is not I think that the debate in itself is worthwhile having, because it does challenge what we have seen in the time I have been here, almost 16 years, and challenges the way we think about this chamber.

That brings me to the next point: what are the benefits of having a potentially independent Speaker? I should say at the outset that in what I am saying, as other members have said before me, this is not a reflection on any Speaker. This is about the position of Speaker, rather than the current incumbent or previous incumbent.

All the Speakers who have held that position in my time in this chamber have had their strengths and some have had fewer strengths than others, but all of them have done the best they can, but all of them have been members of parties and all of them have, to some extent, been influenced by that relationship to their party.

My personal view is Speaker Atkinson was probably the one who had a slight independent streak about him and would often chastise our side of parliament as often as he would the other side of parliament. From that, I have some insights into what a potentially independent Speaker could do. In terms of the benefits of having an independent Speaker, I think something very important that is perhaps lost in this chamber, but also lost in probably all lower house chambers in all Australian territories and jurisdictions, is that often the parliament and the executive become one.

The reality is that if you have a majority party who heads this chamber and the Speaker is one of that party the line between the executive and the parliament is a very fragile line and invariably, because the Speaker's position relies on the support of their own party, that must influence, if not consciously then unconsciously, the way they may vote at times in their position. That is not suggesting anything improper. That is suggesting it is just a political reality. So the idea of an independent Speaker would certainly remove that sort of restriction or constraint or that pressure or bias from the Speaker of the day.

I think it is very important. It is an important distinction in our democratic institutions that the executive and the parliament are two separate institutions, but the reality is that in practice they become one, because when the major party that forms government also controls the Speaker and the chairmen of all those committees, etc., it is very hard to hold the executive of the day accountable for their performance.

Other speakers have alluded to that in terms of question time. In question time you can see, if you like, the brutal end of the strong link between the executive and the parliament in the sense that while the rules say ministers can answer questions in whichever way they wish, at times they do not even go close to the question which is asked. With an independent Speaker, I think that would change, and that would change for the better.

That would change for the better not only what happens in parliament in terms of accountability of the government of the day but also how the people outside this chamber would perceive us. That is very important, because we are, sadly, on a trajectory whereby people have less trust in our institutions. Unfortunately, both governments and the parliament have less trust today than they did some years ago. We need to redress that if we are to maintain a civil society. So I think that break in the strong nexus between the executive and parliament is an important one.

An independent Speaker would also give the opportunity for the Speaker to be a defender of the legislature much more clearly and speak on behalf of the legislature rather than speak on behalf of the majority party of the day. I think that is a benefit too: the Speaker can actually speak with confidence not only of the majority party but of all of the parliament. I think that is an important distinction and a very important thing to do.

That said, I know some Speakers and particularly some Deputy Speakers have done a very good job in that regard, but the reality is that they are still seen to be a member of that party, although

they have tried their very hardest to be impartial, and I think that within those restrictions they have done an excellent job.

The Speaker would also become a much more effective voice for the house rather than a voice for the party, because if they are independent there is no obligation upon them to actually speak on behalf of their party or be seen to speak on behalf of their party. They would speak on behalf of the parliament itself.

They are some of the things I think are worth considering in the context of this bill. They are some of the strengths I see in it. I am happy to listen to what may be some of the drawbacks. One drawback that has been brought to my attention is that if a member of a political party has to resign their position to become the Speaker, it then means that political party is minus one member on the floor.

In the English parliament, where that happens, it is not such a big issue because they have a membership of 650 MPs. In a chamber of 47, one vote is perhaps more valuable. One in 47 is perhaps more valuable than one in 650. Having said that, even in the British parliament it is a problem, because I think Margaret Thatcher came to government as a result of the previous government, the Callaghan government, losing a vote of confidence by one vote. The Speaker at the time was a Labor Speaker; had he been on the floor, that vote of confidence would not have got across the floor, and we may not have seen Margaret Thatcher for some time.

So that is one of the drawbacks. But one has to weigh up the drawbacks against the benefits, and from my point of view at this stage, certainly from what I have heard today, the benefits of having an independent Speaker outweigh the potential drawbacks.

One of the things I do, as all members do, is do tours of parliament, particularly with students. I know some members of parliament on the other side like to bash the unions, etc. I do not necessarily do that. I am quite complimentary about some famous Liberal premiers. One of the things we talk about, though, is the bar and how it defines the floor of the chamber. I explain to them how important that definition is, what it is about. It is about the battle between the then monarch and the legislature about power and who represents the people and how, I think it was James II—I am happy to be corrected—was put on the throne.

Mr Brown: Charles II.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Sorry, Charles II—I am corrected. After the Cromwell period, Charles II was put on the throne. It was done on the basis that he and his heirs and successor would never interfere with the running of the people's chamber. That is very important because, previously, Speakers had been, to some extent, targeted by monarchs if they did not toe the monarch's line; in fact, I think seven Speakers lost their lives. They were beheaded by the monarchs of the day for not doing the right thing, as the monarchs saw it.

One of the Speakers was beheaded about 510 years ago during the time of King Henry VIII, who decided to behead one of the Speakers, Edmund Dudley, because obviously Edmund Dudley did not do the right thing according to the king, apart from his poor wives of the day, who from his view did not do the right thing by him.

The role of the Speaker is very important. I understand the first Speaker was appointed in 1377. Over time, the position has evolved to maintain the independence of the Speaker. The independence of the Speaker is important even today, as the member for West Torrens says, in our mother parliament of England. For those reasons, I wish to support this bill.

Mr GEE (Taylor) (20:16): I am happy to support this amendment to the Constitution Act 1934 moved by the member for Florey. I am really not surprised that this amendment is now before the parliament. I think that for any thoughtful person this amendment makes a lot of sense. It is a bit threatening to people who have belonged to a political party for a long time. Some people have been in political parties for their whole working life and do not like the thought of having to resign from the party they belong to and love. I would hope that if a member of any party or from the crossbench took the opportunity, with the support of the parliament, to be Speaker, they would have the full support of the political party they belong to, and they should welcome that decision.

I think most people are like me. As immigrants, I grew up in a house with my brother. We were very close—only 11 months apart. Looking back at it now, it seemed quite harmless, but I would say there were not many days when we did not fight; we fought a lot. Those were the days when we had one car in the house. Dad was at work. Mum would look after the house and get us off to school. If she wanted the car, she would have to drive my dad to work early in the morning. If she had the car for the day, she would have to get us from school and then pick my dad up from work.

I do not know why it was that my brother and I fought. It was very physical. I do not think we enjoyed it; I do not know what it was. My mother used to deal with us fairly. She always dealt with us equally. Whatever the punishment was, it was the same for both of us, my brother and I. I think we did break a lot of furniture and a lot of belongings, which she loved and were probably irreplaceable, not that we understood that.

One thing I will always remember is that if it escalated to the next level where she was going to tell my father, then it was brutal. In today's sort of thinking and language, you would think it was highly inappropriate. It would just be brutal. Even the punishment we received from my father would always be measured out in equal terms, but I tell you what was worse than the punishment—waiting all day for my father to get home, just waiting. I would be looking and thinking of all the arguments I could use to put to him that it was my brother's fault, and he would be doing the same, working out that he was in the right and I was in the wrong.

It was great to know at that time with my parents that they were not aligned with me or they were not aligned with my brother: they were aligned with each other and there was independence there. I always knew that they loved me, but imagine if they had taken one side over the other person's side? That would have been absolutely devastating. There was always that independence. For me, I grew up believing in independence. It did not hurt us—well, it did hurt us a lot, but we got over it because we were young and strong.

Another thing I wanted to say is that I am really surprised how large the crossbench is now, but I think that is an indication really of what is going on within the government. I have tried not to go over what everyone else has gone over, but a lot of the speeches have talked about the past, but I think we have to talk about the future and we have to talk about reform, and this is a positive reform.

It may be difficult for people who are members of political parties—not just the crossbencher who could become the Speaker but people who are in political parties. If this amendment bill is successful, then political parties have to work out how the party is going to support the person who becomes the Speaker. As I said, it is a challenge for somebody who has been a part of a party and loved that party all their lives then suddenly have to resign from that party.

Ms Bedford: It's not that hard. Buckle up, buckaroo.

Mr GEE: No. The member for Florey reminds us that as the longest serving person here in the parliament—

Ms Bedford: Female.

Mr GEE: —female, also with the member for West Torrens.

Ms Bedford: Joint parent of the house.

Mr GEE: Yes, and the house is in good hands. I think it is a credit to them that they are the ones who have brought this forward and spoken on it so well. As I say, I am surprised that this has not been brought forward before. It just makes sense, it really does. This sort of reform is possibly what we need here.

I was listening to the member for member for Giles talking about refereeing and everything like that. It is another indication. After going through it and working out that you need independent parents who are going to treat you fairly, you then go into sport, where you can take out some of your aggression. Again, you rely on those people to adjudicate and not to be aligned with one side or the other, and it is difficult. I have refereed a few games in my life.

In my previous role within a union, the nature of the automotive industry was that most people had to live in a 60-second cycle and you had to really improvise. You did not have time; you could not just stop one thing and shut down thousands of people. You have to be able to move and you

have to be able to think. You have to have people who can make up their minds and make decisions that never hurt other people—they are always impartial.

One of my roles was as a returning officer and, for some reason, instead of having elections every four years or two years, we used to have elections every year, so I would be running probably 200 to 300 elections a year as the returning officer, and maintaining that impartiality is very similar. A lot of these chaps, living in a 60-second cycle, would rather go outside and sort it out than stand around a ballot box and have a vote. So there was a bit of crowd control going on as well, similar to the role of the Speaker, I guess, in trying to maintain order in the house. I know it is difficult. I have to say that I have only had one warning in eight years, from Speaker Atkinson, and I think it was a mistake.

An honourable member: It was unfair.

Mr GEE: I think it was unfair, it was. I felt like it was being impartial, and I decided to never let it happen again.

Members interjecting:

Mr GEE: I have learnt my lesson.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We will let the member for Taylor complete his remarks. Thirty seconds to go, member for Taylor.

Mr GEE: We should move on and get to the vote. I commend the amendment to the house.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (20:26): I rise to offer some brief remarks on the bill. It is often said that kids ask the toughest questions and that has certainly been my experience when taking students through this place on tours of Parliament House.

In gathering my thoughts to say a few words this evening, I had cause to reflect on the fact that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait flags are only flying in this chamber now because a year 6 student from Surrey Downs Primary School by the name of Bella was courageous and had the wherewithal to ask a question of me about why they were not hanging here already. That completely stumped me and I did not have a good answer for her, but there began a process by which collectively we came together and we now find these flags hanging where they should always have been.

It is also on these tours that I have met a couple of students who were very well versed in our system of government, surprisingly well versed, and who asked me some very tricky questions about how our parliament functions. I am sure something that we have all done on occasion is attempt to in some way dumb down our explanation of the functions of parliament because we think that is something that we need to do for students.

I was certainly caught napping on an occasion when I was describing the role of the Speaker and likened it to an independent umpire. A student on this occasion put up their hand and said, 'But isn't the Speaker also a member of a political party?' Of course I said, 'Yes, that is correct, or that is normally the case.' The student then went on to ask, 'In that case, how can we assume or believe that the Speaker is therefore an independent umpire?'

I think these kinds of interactions with our young people and the incisive and clear way that they see the world, and the clear way that this young student on this occasion saw the partisan nature of the Speaker role in our modern system of government, really goes to the heart in a much clearer way of the nonsensical nature of how it currently functions probably than we could ever explain ourselves as adults. As has been said by many members of this chamber who have spoken before me this evening, these were practices that were put in place before the party system was entrenched like it is now.

Another one that comes to mind is the deadlock conference, which I have had, I will not say the pleasure, but the experience of being a member of once as a member of parliament and of dealing with on a couple of occasions as a staff member. The deadlock conference was devised at a time when members of parliament participating in that conference could be relied upon to represent the views of the chamber in which they sat.

It was supposed to be a meeting of the two chambers: members of the House of Assembly were there to represent the views of their chamber and members of the Legislative Council were there to represent the views of their chamber. Of course, in our modern system of government it is absurd to expect members of parliament from each chamber to cross party lines and come together to represent the views of that chamber and that chamber alone, and not let party politics bleed into that process in any way.

There are a number of longstanding traditions and processes in this place that were put in place and devised with very good intentions, but at a time when the party structure was not as entrenched as it is now. Because of that, some of those processes have broken down and do not function the same way they once did. That in itself is probably reason enough to mount an argument for the need for reform of or change to the Speaker's position, regardless of which party is in government.

It is possibly greater now than it has ever been because of the fact that the two-party political system is more entrenched now than ever, and therefore the possibility or likelihood that office bearers such as the Speaker are able to act independently, free of any inference or partisanship, is probably far more unrealistic now than it has ever been. In many respects, that incongruence between what the role of the Speaker is supposed to be and what the role of the Speaker actually is undermines the integrity of our whole parliamentary system.

Our young people—and I include myself in this category—at a young age had it instilled in them that our system of government was a beacon of democracy that had some very important checks and balances in place that operated free of partisanship and bias—things like ministerial responsibility, which were to be enforced by independent office bearers who had sworn a sacred oath, etc. I guess once you learn of what is now the partisan and party political way in which office bearers are chosen, it is a bit like arriving at the Emerald City and drawing back the curtain and seeing the Wizard of Oz for what they really are.

I am sure it is a bit like that for our young people as well, in the sense that we teach them all these important lessons about the things that hold our democracy together, the things that keep our government functioning, but then they learn that the person we so regularly refer to as an independent umpire on our tours of this place is actually chosen by the party governing at that time.

When I consider these things it makes me look at the story we tell the students who come on those tours about how the Speaker used to be dragged to the chair unwillingly. I tell that story now really more as an example of how brutal and barbaric our practices used to be and how far we have come. Whilst not for a second do I advocate for us to return to any of those kinds of barbaric practices, the fact that we now give the Speakership up as a prize of government instead of being a role that was, back in the day, incredibly difficult and possibly life threatening, probably goes to highlight that we have in some way lost sight of what the role really needs to be.

Although in the scheme of our democracy, in the scheme of our government, this is perhaps just one small cog, I have always fundamentally believed that collectively making improvements in these kinds of areas can go a long way overall to restoring the deficit of trust we have in politics and politicians, which is something we in this chamber deal with every single day. Not only do we have very important roles in terms of legislating for the state, we also have roles we need to play in trying to restore that deficit, to build trust with the community, to build trust in our systems of government, to build trust in our elected members of parliament. In that spirit, I commend the bill to the house.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (20:34): I would like to thank all members for their contributions and just make a note on something the Attorney-General mentioned. I have no plans for an additional or extra code of conduct other than the one being worked on by the committee elsewhere. It is not about some new thing.

Returning to the bill, this is not a new notion for me. This is something I have thought about long and hard for many years and I have been surprised now to find some happy co-travellers on this path. As I said, I thank all members for their contributions. This bill is not about the past or any former member. It is about freeing the incumbent Speaker into a position where they are able to make frank and fearless rulings in the house without fear of retribution from either side, because that is what independence is going to bring to this chamber.

I have actually seen the best and worst of all things here in parliament from both sides. I believe firmly in the two-party system, which is our greatest strength when it works, but I do not think it is actually working at the moment, and I believe it has become one of our greatest weaknesses or problems. Parties themselves must return to their democratic ways. Unless members here in this house respect the position of Speaker and the law we are making here tonight, nothing is going to change the behaviour in this house.

Behaviour has to improve. All members must be heard in silence. It is the worst possible nightmare for anybody in the chair to try to organise unruly behaviour. We must all understand we are being watched by our constituents, and our behaviour is not appreciated. We are not held in high regard.

As an Independent, I have sought changes in this place for accountability for us. I have been lucky enough to bring forward petitions with at least 10,000 physical signatures to trigger a report—not that that in itself is any great spark, but it is better than we had; petitions had no weight at all. We have managed to get extra questions for Independents at question time, much to the horror of everybody I know, but it has been able to see real questions be asked in this place.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It's nice to occasionally get a question.

Ms BEDFORD: That is right, but I mean in the old days when I sat on benches in a party my questions were real questions, and I had to fight long and hard to get my real question.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Unfortunately, we cannot point fingers, because any number of questions on either side of this place are absolutely ridiculous.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Yes, I know. We heard them today.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Ms BEDFORD: Which question of mine did you not like today?

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will cease interjecting.

Ms BEDFORD: We have also managed to have extra grievances, and I really do thank and acknowledge the current government for having the—what is the right word, Attorney-General?—wherewithal to grant that to the Independents. We have appreciated that, and it has been productive. I want to thank them for allowing us to have the extra staff that has meant we can do this work in this place, because without a party structure or support from a machine behind you, the work of an Independent is arduous.

It is in allowing the Speaker independence that we ensure the office of the Speaker can be effective. I have to commend the current Speaker, Speaker Teague, for his work in instigating today of all days the Muriel Matters Award. I must also acknowledge the work of the Minister for Education. It has been truly wonderful to see a new generation of young people out and about being active in their communities and ready to make change.

Speakers can and must be independent and free to make rulings without fear or favour. If we cannot respect the Speaker and their rulings and each other, we are not going to be able to uphold the expectations of the people of South Australia. Quite the reverse of suggestions today, rather than destabilising the government, I see this bill as a way to reinvigorate the parliament and therefore the government so they can deliver good government and legislation to the people of South Australia. I think with those remarks I might leave it at that and commend the bill to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Florey has moved that the bill be now read a second time. Before I put the question, I need to inform the house that, as this is a bill to amend the Constitution Act and provides for an alteration of the constitution of the Legislative Council and/or the House of Assembly, its second reading is required to be carried by an absolute majority.

Ms BEDFORD: Would you like me to draw attention to the state of the house, sir?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, there is no need to do that, because I have not quite finished yet, member for Florey. In accordance with standing order 242, I see that there is not an absolute majority present, so we will ring the bells.

An absolute majority being present:

The SPEAKER: I will put the question that the bill be now read a second time.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 24
Noes 22
Majority 2

AYES

Bedford, F.E. (teller)
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.
Cregan, D.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Duluk, S.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

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

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I ask the mover of the bill to indicate who she has consulted on this bill.

Ms BEDFORD: It may—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Ms BEDFORD: It may surprise the Attorney, perhaps, I have not spoken with her, but it is something I have been interested in since almost my earliest days in parliament. It became more of a passion, so to speak, after my visit to Westminster, where I met Speaker Bercow and spent some time with him, and again when I spoke with the Speaker in the parliament of New Zealand and had contact with the office of Speaker Jenkins in the federal parliament.

It is something I have been thinking of for quite some time, and I have consulted with the crossbench most recently when it became apparent there was some interest in my proposition. It is something I have been raising from time to time with anyone who has had anything to do with me.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Do I take it the mover is suggesting that apart from the persons who have been in office that she has indicated—

Ms Bedford: Apart from who?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —those Speakers or others she has referred to—there has not been any consultation with any other person?

Ms BEDFORD: Do you want me to name everyone I have ever spoken to about this?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, on the bill.

Ms BEDFORD: On this particular bill today? Parliamentary counsel have had most to do with it, because we have had something similar in my bag of tricks for some time, but they have reworked it today for me.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In the 24 years that she has been in the parliament, can the member for Florey indicate on how many occasions she has introduced a bill of this kind?

Ms BEDFORD: You have been here for most of those years. You know I have not done it at all. I am not a fool who will introduce things when I know they have absolutely no chance, although petrol was such an occasion.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The Attorney has had three questions. Are there any further questions on clause 1? If not, I will put the question.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: During the time that the member for Florey was the Deputy Speaker, did she attend her Labor party room meetings?

Ms BEDFORD: Well, that is an interesting question. Of course I did, but if anyone had studied my time here in parliament they would know I have been on the outer since the first day I arrived here. In fact, I can remember one particular day when I lost a vote 31-1 to try to be Speaker in the party room, so there is no need to indicate or imply that I have ever enjoyed anything in the Labor Party other than contempt most of the time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My question is to the member for Florey. I am somewhat confused after the line of cross-examination by the member for Bragg. This relates to the position of Speaker, doesn't it, not Chair of Committees, not Deputy Speaker?

Ms BEDFORD: Correct. It says 'Independent Speaker'.

The CHAIR: Thanks, member for Lee. You have made that point.

Clause passed.

New clause 2A.

Ms BEDFORD: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bedford-1]—

Page 2, after line 9—Insert:

2A—Amendment of section 6—Place and time for holding Sessions of Parliament

- (1) Section 6(1)(c)—before 'prorogue' insert 'except during a relevant election period'
- (2) Section 6—after subsection (2) insert:
- (3) In this section—

relevant election period means the period commencing on 1 July in the year immediately before a general election of members of the House of Assembly is held in accordance with section 28(1) and ending on the day of that general election (and includes, if the *Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Act 2021* comes into operation during a relevant election period, the remainder of that relevant election period).

This clause is to prevent parliament from being prorogued during the period leading up to a state election. It does not affect the power to dissolve parliament for the purposes of the election. It ensures, rather, the current session of parliament continues until the election. The amendment will apply to the current pre-election period as well as future ones.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Is it the intention of this amendment to facilitate continued sitting up until 15 February 2022 or thereabouts as caretaker?

Ms BEDFORD: Absolutely.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Does the member have any intention of identifying the proposed sitting days for the purpose of that?

Ms BEDFORD: At this stage, as far as I am concerned, it is just the sitting days on the calendar, although I have an appetite to sit perhaps the optional week but that is just me. That is going to be up to parliament, obviously.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Does the member have any proposal that we sit during December and January and up until the middle of February?

Ms BEDFORD: I do not think that is up to me. I think that is going to be up to the parliament.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My question though is: was that the proposal—

Mr Picton: You have had three questions.

The CHAIR: Just take a seat for a moment, Attorney. I was just about to make the point, member for Kaurua, that the Attorney was seeking clarification on her previous question and if you read the *Hansard* you will find that. You will know that, as Deputy Speaker, I have allowed that from time to time.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As a matter of clarification, is the intention of the mover of the bill though that we do sit up until mid-February?

Ms BEDFORD: No.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Would the measure in the amendment preventing parliament being prorogued enable a select committee, for example, constituted of the house, to continue sitting beyond perhaps a parliamentary sitting date that might be agreed to?

Ms BEDFORD: Yes, as far as I am concerned everything is going to be up to the house to make those decisions.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Would it prevent the government of the day essentially stopping those sorts of either parliamentary sittings or select committee hearings or a continuation of those sorts of parliamentary processes?

Ms BEDFORD: Yes, in the appropriate circumstances that would be true.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Did the member consult other members of the South Australian parliament in regard to this clause or any clause in the bill and, if so, when did that consultation start?

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: I did not hear the last part of that question. I cannot hear.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: My question was: did you consult other members of this parliament about any clause in this bill and when did that consultation start? When did you first speak to a member of parliament in the South Australian parliament about this bill?

Ms BEDFORD: As I have said, this is not something that has come out of the blue. This is something that I have spoken to other people about for many years but it would be fair to say it is only in recent days that I have talked to the crossbench about it and that is why we are now where we are.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: When? What is the date that you started speaking to the crossbench? Which crossbench member did you speak to and did you speak to any other members of parliament?

Ms BEDFORD: I do not think this is relevant to the bill at all.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Florey. Minister, we are asking questions in relation to the amendment which seeks to insert new clause 2A. The Attorney has already canvassed the consultation that may or may not have occurred and that was during clause 1. That was your opportunity, so rephrase your question, please.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Was this clause inserted to satisfy a request by any member of the Labor Party?

Ms BEDFORD: Absolutely not. I have been autonomous of the Labor Party for many years—many, many years.

The CHAIR: Attorney, you have asked three questions—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Okay, I will go to clause 3.

The CHAIR: —and I have allowed you an extra question for clarification, so I am going to put the question.

New clause inserted.

Clause 3.

Ms BEDFORD: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Bedford-1]—

Page 2, line 16 [clause 3(2), inserted subsection (4)]—After ‘registered political party’ insert:
, except during a relevant election period

Amendment No 3 [Bedford-1]—

Page 2, line 17 [clause 3(2), inserted subsection (5)]—After ‘elected as Speaker’ insert:
(other than during a relevant election period)

Amendment No 4 [Bedford-1]—

Page 2, after line 23 [clause 3(2), inserted subsection (6)]—Insert:

relevant election period means the period commencing on 1 July in the year immediately before a general election of members of the House of Assembly is held in accordance with section 28(1) and ending on the day of that general election (and includes, if the *Constitution (Independent Speaker) Amendment Act 2021* comes into operation during a relevant election period, the remainder of that relevant election period).

I am happy to move these amendments en bloc because they are all for clause 3. They talk about making sure that the person who is acting as the independent Speaker has the opportunity prior to an election to recommence their membership of a party in that election period, whichever party they are in. This is not designed to install necessarily only an Independent person, it is actually about making sure all members have the opportunity to be a Speaker and that once they are they have the opportunity to be independent of whichever party they might be in.

The CHAIR: Just before the Attorney speaks, I will clarify that the member for Florey has moved three amendments, amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4 standing in her name, en bloc. You have done that, member for Florey; I am just reminding the committee that that is what has occurred.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In the event that there was an early election—that is, prior to 1 July of the preceding year—what provision is made for a person who may be Speaker who is independent to join a political party?

Ms BEDFORD: Again, I do not see how there would be an early election.

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: I cannot hear you with your mask on. Do me a favour and let me hear what you are saying.

The CHAIR: In fact, member for Florey, it was an interjection, so there is no need to respond.

Ms BEDFORD: I know, but I am trying to be as fair as I can be. I do not understand how there can be an early election, and if there were I am sure the parliament would have the wit to organise that. The intention of this is to make—

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

Ms BEDFORD: You are interjecting again and I have been told not to listen to you.

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

Ms BEDFORD: Yes, but you are not supposed to be interjecting. If the parliament does not have the wit to understand the intent of this, which is not malign but about trying to do something good, if we cannot work our way around it, then we really should not be here. It is fairly obvious and I have been assured by parliamentary counsel this is what it is supposed to achieve to give that person who may have had to relinquish a party membership the opportunity to take that up again to run as a party member for that next election, whenever it occurs.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that these amendments will allow that, if it is in the relevant election period—1 July to 1 March in the election year, the third Saturday, etc., so in that nine-month period—the Speaker could rejoin a political party or join a political party, whether it is rejoining or not, for the purposes of preparing for the following election. How do you expect that they will be able to undertake their role independently as Speaker for what might be the first five or six months of that prior to the election in operating as Speaker that is different to what they do in the first three years and three months of the electoral cycle?

Ms BEDFORD: Working on the theory we have fixed terms, you are now trying to predict an occasion where there might be an early election—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, this is normal. So let me just clarify. My understanding of this amendment is that Speaker can join or rejoin a political party in that last nine months for the purposes of being able to be part of the election as an endorsed candidate for a particular party. How are they able to undertake their duties independently for that nine months, which, for some reason or other, you are providing in the bill they have to have independence and no political alignment for the first three years and three months of that electoral cycle?

Ms BEDFORD: That gets back to the fact that we do not have that informal understanding that exists in the United Kingdom.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Well, we don't. In the United Kingdom, the Speaker does not have a party, the Speaker is not challenged. Here, we are trying to allow the person who is charged to run the house in an impartial fashion the right to be able to take up party membership or rejoin a party or run again under a party umbrella in their seat at the appropriate time when an election is called.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: From 1 July to at least November/December, they are going to continue to be the Speaker of the house, which is a period that they are purportedly continuing their role as Speaker, ostensibly independently, and now will be a member of a political party, which is the antithesis of what you are proposing here, namely, that there be no political allegiance during the time of their tenure as Speaker.

I realise that amendments Nos 2, 3, and 4 are designed to enable them to rejoin and be part of that banner for the purposes of the forthcoming election, but how are they able to undertake their role of independence for those five or six months, during the parliamentary sitting week, when, for some reason, they cannot do it in the preceding three years, three months?

Ms BEDFORD: That is like walking and chewing gum, is it not? I am sure whoever we put in the chair, or whoever is in the chair, is going to be capable of doing that.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The question then is: if they can walk and chew gum at the same time for those nine months, why can they not do it for the other three years, three months?

Ms BEDFORD: Well, that is—

The CHAIR: I am actually having a lot of trouble hearing both the questions and the responses here. I would ask the members asking the question and the members answering to direct their questions and answers through the Chair, otherwise I am going to miss it.

Ms BEDFORD: If we had the exact replication of what is happening in the United Kingdom, none of this would be happening, but we have not got that here. We are trying to come to a position where we can have a Chair able to chair impartially and still enjoy the ability to rejoin a party at the time of an election, if they are in a party.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: So—

The CHAIR: No, Attorney, you have had your quota of questions.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, there are three amendments being put at once here, so I would ask your indulgence, Chair.

The CHAIR: Yes, alright. I will come back to you, Attorney, and I will make a decision on that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Just while the Chair is considering how many questions somebody gets on three amendments—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Minister, I am going to interrupt you. Fear not, I am not intimidated by the Minister for Education. The Minister for Education has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. I was clarifying what you had just said and I thank you for that.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! I know it is the evening—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: My question is to the proponent of the amendment and the proponent of the bill and I just seek clarification. The member has put forward a bill which, as I understand it, is on the basis that she thinks that somebody might be intimidated by being a member of a party room and therefore unable to conduct themselves independently.

I think she or members may have offered as evidence of that Speaker Atkinson removing himself from a party room, albeit I certainly did not see any independence that followed from that. Indeed, it was the wherewithal of an individual Speaker in that circumstance—one who was not running for re-election.

As far as I can gather from this amendment, what the member is proposing is that to remove somebody from a party room for three years and three months is desirable, but at the very moment when they are seeking to run for re-election—when they are potentially offering themselves for preselection in the party from whence they came or another party—at that moment, nine months from an election, when the parliament might be at its most febrile in most people's experience, the member is putting forward an amendment, as far as I can tell, that would reinstate somebody in their political party and therefore, potentially, have them at that same threat of loss of preselection or potentially the opportunity to gain a preselection if they are joining a new political party, as may be the case.

If the member thinks that this amendment is worthy of consideration—unlike the UK where nobody runs against the Speaker in their seat and they have many hundreds of members of parliament, that would mean that people do not feel the need to run against the Speaker given that it is unlikely to have an impact on the outcome of the election. Given that difference, if the member thinks that it is therefore necessary to allow the Speaker to join a political party, then for what purpose has she introduced this bill at all?

Ms BEDFORD: Only if that person wishes to be in a party, because they may not wish to be in a party. Once they are free, they might like being free.

The CHAIR: Attorney, by my calculations, you have had four questions already. Given that they have been moved—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Here we go—Atticus Finch.

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, pipe down. Given that you have had four questions and the amendments have been moved en bloc, I am considering them as one.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Can the member for Florey advise when she first started consulting the member for Kavel about this bill and these amendments?

Ms BEDFORD: It is actually the other way around, if you think about it. I do not have legal experience. On the other two occasions I have had a private member's bill—you might not have been here—much to his horror, the member for Croydon or Cheltenham or whatever he was at that time, Atkinson, came downstairs and championed the bill for me not because he wanted to help me but because he wanted to put everybody else back in their box, so I merely asked the member for Kavel because he has some working knowledge of the law.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: When did you first discuss this bill with the member for Kavel and what input did the member for Kavel have into this bill?

Ms BEDFORD: I asked him for his help this evening. If you would like to look at my phone, I am happy to show you.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: So are you ruling out that—you have had no conversation with the member for Kavel on this bill prior to tonight? Is that what you are saying?

Ms BEDFORD: It is actually the other way around. I raised it with the crossbench.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Why did the member choose 1 July in the year preceding an election for this amendment rather than the time at which a redistribution is finalised and therefore the seats for the coming election might potentially be available for a Speaker to determine whether or not their own continuation in this house was feasible with or without the renewal of their membership or newly joining a political party?

Ms BEDFORD: I was advised by parliamentary counsel that this was necessary because of the funding disclosure period. If you have other information, share it with the house.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: On that basis, the purpose for the date 1 July is so as to marry up with the funding and disclosure period, as required under our state election laws. Given that the bill has been provided to the parliament and the people of South Australia for consideration in one day, which is unorthodox to say the least and usually as a result of significant—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Like a COVID bill or a supply bill or those other pieces of government legislation that you have rammed through in the last 18 months without notice or warning.

The CHAIR: The member for Lee is called to order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I might need to start again. On the basis that parliamentary counsel provided advice to the member for Florey, which she confirmed has not been circulated to the public outside of the broad conceptual stage previously and certainly not the detail of the bill and certainly not the detail of this amendment to the bill, which has been introduced since the bill was introduced earlier today, the member for Florey, potentially with the support of the Labor Party and some of the crossbench, is proposing to amend the South Australian constitution on several hours' notice with detail she has identified needs to be amended.

As I understand it from her last answer, she is saying that it has to be married up on 1 July that the independent Speaker can renew their membership of the Labor Party or the Liberal Party or whatever other party they want because it ties in with the funding and disclosure threshold for which there is a reporting requirement through the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia.

I note that the member for Florey has said that is the reason for that date, rather than any other period, because it will tie up with the member's potential re-election expenses. Notwithstanding

that the purpose of the bill is to increase independence, and given that the redistribution now comes out sometime before 1 July in the funding period and it is open to any political party to pre-select their candidate well before 1 July in that funding period, it therefore makes it, I would have thought, the easiest way for a political party to pressure a potentially independent Speaker under the definition of this to have preselection prior to 1 July in that period.

Can I ask the member firstly whether there was any consideration given to potentially not doing this bill in such an unorthodox fashion, given its incredible impact on the constitution. Usually bills that move through more quickly are done so in consultation with significant amounts of the relevant government agency involved or indeed, as was the case in the ICAC legislation, as a result of a parliamentary committee inquiry over extended periods of time.

Has the member for Florey discussed this amendment with the Electoral Commissioner of South Australia, who is indeed responsible for the policing of the basis for which the amendment the date of 1 July has been chosen?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Every member has an opportunity to ask a question during committee stage.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The member for Florey has the call.

Ms BEDFORD: I think it is again back to walking and chewing gum. If we cannot find an independent person, or a person prepared to take the chair in an independent fashion, who then can have an eye to other things, I do not see the problem. I see this as being entirely workable. I am sure each of us has a—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Is it the vibe?

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: It is clearly not the vibe for you, unfortunately, sir, but it is brought to the house with the best of intentions. You may doubt that and you are entitled to doubt that, but it is not here to be mischievous or create trouble or further rancour in the house. It is actually a genuine attempt to raise the standard of debate and to reinforce ourselves in the public eye as being a place of the best behaviour with the best of intentions. I am sorry if you cannot see that.

The CHAIR: The Minister for Education has already had three questions and I will remind—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The CHAIR: The member for Lee, unfortunately, is warned. We have a way to go in this committee and I suggest you be cognisant of that. Before I call the member for Schubert, I will just remind members that should these amendments pass we then have the opportunity to question the member for Florey on clause 3 as amended.

Mr KNOLL: The fundamental premise, I understand, of this bill and this clause is, as the member for Florey suggests, to have an independent Speaker because inherent in that statement is the fact that an independent Speaker is going to somehow elicit different behaviour from a Speaker who is not independent.

I note in that that the situation of having a minority government is a situation the upper house has found itself in—I think the last time there was a majority by one party in the upper house it was maybe in the early nineties somewhere—that they have had some 30-odd years now of minority government situation in the upper house. They have not seen fit to need this requirement and have been able to operate in a fair and impartial manner, as I think this house has too. They have had the power to undertake this style of amendment, have not found the need to, yet we hear on the first day of finding ourselves in this situation this needs to be jammed through without any due process.

My question is: if a Speaker who was a member of a political party resigns that office as is the intention under this, what inherent in that resignation is going to change the behaviour that they would undertake sitting in the chair?

Ms BEDFORD: Their oath to the Governor.

The CHAIR: Before you go, member for Schubert, could you repeat your answer please, member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: Their oath to the Governor.

Mr KNOLL: That answer to me is entirely unsatisfactory because that oath to the office that the Speaker holds exists regardless of whether someone is a member of a registered political party. The job that the Speaker undertakes—the role that they undertake and the oaths that they make to deal fairly and impartially in this chamber—exists regardless of whether the member is a member of a registered political party and shows that this legislation is nothing more than farce. It is childish, and it shows that once again there are people in this chamber who want to spend much more time worried about their own internal matters as distinct from looking after the best interests of South Australians.

Members interjecting:

Mr KNOLL: Explain to me how this helps the people of South Australia. It does not—and if it did, then those who are pushing this bill would much prefer to allow it to have the scrutiny and time and due processes that are normally afforded to these things. Certainly in my time in this place the only other time I have seen something jammed through in this way was the last day of the last parliament when the fairness clause was got rid of without any public scrutiny and debate.

With regard to legislation on ICAC that recently went through, I was satisfied by a parliamentary committee—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: The leader is called to order.

Mr KNOLL: —as well as a committee of members from across parties, across two chambers, that looked at that legislation tightly. When it comes to COVID emergency legislation, we were dealing with very specific time frames. There is absolutely no reason given for why this legislation needs to be jammed through today. Again, I would like to give the opportunity to ask the question: explain to me why—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Schubert, can you just take your seat for a moment. I will allow you to continue shortly, but I remind all members that every member in this committee has the opportunity to ask a question or make a contribution and be heard in silence. Whether you agree with them or not, they are allowed that opportunity.

Mr KNOLL: Whether the Speaker was a member of a political party yesterday and resigned that office today or whether they remain a member of that political party will make absolutely no difference to their conduct as Speaker—none, absolutely none.

An honourable member: How do you know?

Mr KNOLL: Because they take the same oath. It is the same job. To try to suggest that by not being a member of a registered political party somehow somebody becomes automatically impartial and fair is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous.

What is worse is that what we have had all afternoon is a degree of self-righteousness from those opposite, who now have found some sort of magical moral compass. After decades and decades of partisan Labor Speakers in that chair, today is the day they have had an epiphany, and today the reason they have had that epiphany is that the numbers in this house changed.

The fundamental arguments behind this legislation have not changed. They are the same as they were when this parliament was brought into session some 160, 170 years ago. It is just that today there is a crass political opportunity. That is fine. That is the parliament's prerogative, but what I will not stomach without rising and talking to is this—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr KNOLL: —self-righteous indignation which shows that those opposite pushing this bill—

Mr PICTON: A point of order—

Mr KNOLL: —are much more interested in political games—

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: —and internal parliamentary matters than governing the people of South Australia.

An honourable member: Sit down!

The CHAIR: The member for Schubert will sit down.

Mr Whetstone: Shut up, Bignell.

The CHAIR: The member for Chaffey is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: I am warning people. The member for Chaffey is warned. Two warnings and members will be out of here.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: There is a point of order that I am trying to hear.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The CHAIR: The member for Chaffey is warned for a second time.

Mr PICTON: Mr Chairman, I fear that the member may have strayed from the amendments at hand.

The CHAIR: Well, I must admit there was a lot of interjection going on right throughout the member for Schubert's contribution, and as a result of that I found great difficulty hearing all that he was saying. Member for Schubert, can you pay attention, please. Have you finished your contribution? Would you like to couch a question for the member for Florey?

Mr KNOLL: I would like to ask the member for Florey if she has thought through any of the potential unintended consequences of this amendment, especially with regard to removing the ability of governments to prorogue parliament for the whole variety of reasons governments may need to prorogue parliament.

The CHAIR: So the question is about proroguing particularly.

Ms BEDFORD: I took the counsel of parliamentary counsel because the intent of the bill is not to allow parliament to be destabilised in any way. It is envisaging that this is going to make a difference to the way the parliament behaves, so that this may be the very last time we have a debate of this nature. Wouldn't that be super? It is trying to look at the eventuality that we are not disadvantaging the person who is Speaker, who chooses to take that oath and remove themselves from any party influences and then be able to take that up again, should they wish.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have another question.

The CHAIR: No, unfortunately. But I am going to remind you, minister, that should these amendments pass we will have an opportunity to question clause 3 as amended.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Minister, you have had your three questions.

Amendments carried.

The CHAIR: We now come to clause 3 as amended.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: So, member for Florey, we now have a situation where a Speaker for three years and three months is obliged to have the independence that is specified now, proposed in this section, but has the opportunity to join a party in the last nine months. Although I

am still somewhat puzzled as to how they can do that, the inconsistency is, as I see it, between their capacity to do that in the first three years and three months but not in the last nine months, especially when they are coming up to an election and might potentially have an opportunity to utilise their position as Speaker not to be impartial as such. Nevertheless, my question is: you are satisfied that you think a Speaker is capable of doing that in the last nine months?

Ms BEDFORD: I do not think we should get hung up on the notion of 'last nine months'; 1 July is there for the purpose of other things. The Speaker would not be looking to rejoin a party, if that were that person's wish, until the election is called.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have understood this, if I can be clear: during the relevant election period they in fact can do just that. From 1 July, they can actually now, with this amended motion, rejoin in this last nine months. So come 1 July they might think, 'Okay, I'll rejoin my old party, join a new one.' They will be supervising the Speakership for the next five or six months at least, but under your proposal we might be going up to 15 February. Are you satisfied that if they are undertaking the role as Speaker in that period or part thereof they are able to do that in a nonpartisan way?

Ms BEDFORD: It would be my hope that that person would not be joining a political party again until the election was called, but it gives them the ability to do that. It is either going to work or it is not. If the parliament does not wish to respect the person in the chair and the intent of this bill then you do not have to vote for it. That is what we are down to tonight.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Just a second, I have not finished. If we are trying to give the parliament the opportunity to have an impartial Speaker, we also have to perhaps try to look to that person and not disadvantage that person, and that is all I am trying to do.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can I just clarify, because this bill came in today and then we had amendments. I am assuming you provided the instructions for the initial bill. At what time did you decide that you needed to allow the Speaker to have a chance to rejoin a party and put these amendments in?

Ms BEDFORD: It was through parliamentary counsel.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Today?

Ms BEDFORD: Yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am not quite sure what the member for Bragg and the member for Schubert find so difficult to understand about the proposition from the member for Florey. It is quite simple really. That is, when a Speaker finds themselves in the position of presiding officer in this place, if they themselves reflect on the fact that they might like to seek re-election as a member of parliament, we have in recent times put in place laws to ensure that all members are placed on an equal footing for electoral purposes when it comes to electoral funding and disclosure, and a Speaker, in whatever capacity, should not have an unfair advantage over another member of parliament.

The member for Schubert I know has been a brief participant in this place, so he probably does not recall that the former member for Croydon was in fact Speaker from 2010 to 2018, not from 2014 to 2018. I realise that as far as the member for Schubert is concerned, we have BC and AD in terms of his parliamentary career, but there were some proceedings and people who pre-existed his time in this house.

It is quite clear that from time to time a Speaker will seek re-election to the House of Assembly. They may not seek to be Speaker in the next session of parliament at all. They might have done some period of time as Speaker and want to go back to their substantive duties as a member of parliament, and perhaps participate in some other office of the parliament. They might choose to be a Chair of Committees, or they might choose to be a member of either side's frontbench or a Chair of a parliamentary committee or whatever.

In that event, I do not think it is unreasonable that the member for Florey has carefully designed a regime where the parliament can benefit from true independence of the behaviour of a Speaker, unfettered from the strictures and the expectations and the factional requirements placed

upon them by a political party, such as we have experienced in the last 3½ years under this government, so that they can exercise their freedom of judgement and the best possible superintendence of the house, and that we make some small accommodation for them in the lead-up to an election so that should they wish to demonstrate to their electorate, to use perhaps the lingo of the Premier, the cut of their jib as to which political party they might show some allegiance to, then the electorate can have the opportunity to have that made clear by that member. Of course, having the funding and disclosure regime and having an equal footing there—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: What's the question?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Did you think I was asking you a question?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I was speaking to a clause. Have you not been through this process before?

The CHAIR: Could you take a seat please, member for Lee. I will just remind members that the member for Lee is quite within his rights to make a contribution on this clause. He may or may not ask a question as a result of that, but certainly a contribution is within standing orders.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, sir. I am grateful for your protection. I do not think it is unreasonable for all of us to acknowledge that the member for Florey has quite carefully come up with this arrangement to ensure that the parliament can experience, as the saying goes, the best of both worlds. The member for Morialta paints a dreadful picture of the last nine months of a parliament, presumably the current context front of mind for him. He talks about the months leading up to an election as being a 'febrile period' for the parliament.

I have to say in all the terms of parliament that I have witnessed, or indeed directly experienced, it has never been fevered as far as I can recall, because I have never seen a political party with such a weak grip on the levers of power and on the numbers of parliament as what I have seen before us. We have never experienced this situation where the leadership of a political party in its current form from the member for Dunstan and the member for Bragg could so badly mismanage their political party that people are running for the exits.

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, you are straying from the clause at hand.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sure. But that leads us to the current environment. Now that we have more evenly balanced representation within this place during the course of the term in which they were meant to provide majority government, we have the opportunity to finally improve the situation.

The member for Bragg and the member for Schubert say, 'Don't worry about what they've got in the House of Commons. That's not good enough for us. We want something different. We want something better. We want partisan superintendence of our place. We don't want independence. We don't want that. Don't worry about the hundreds of years of people laying down their lives for parliamentary conventions and privileges. We're not interested in any of that. We know better.'

Do you know what? We have tried your way and do you know what it has resulted in? It has resulted in all of us not having the opportunity to adequately represent our communities in this place because you silence us and, in fact, do you know what it has meant for you as well? It has meant that your political party has fallen apart at the seams.

We have tried your experiment and your experiment does not work. We have had Labor Speakers who provided fair superintendence of this place. They have allowed you to have the first half an hour of question time so that we can hold the government to account, but what did you give us? Nothing. More time in question time devoted to Dorothy Dixers than to opposition questions.

We have tried it your way. We have tried to extend the same courtesy that other governments in this place have had for generations and for decades. You have trampled your feet all over it. It has not worked. You are the authors of your own demise and now you are suffering the consequences.

So, finally, those of us either on the opposition benches or the crossbench, can finally get a fair go in this place.

Mr KNOLL: The member for Lee is correct: I only came into this chamber in 2014, but I do know how to use Google and I do think that in 2010 the Speaker of the parliament was actually the former member for Giles, Lyn Breuer, and in fact the member for Croydon only became the Speaker on 5 February 2013.

But the rant from the member for Lee belies the fundamental hypocrisy and illogicality of this bill. You cannot have a situation where on 30 June you need an independent Speaker in an election year but on 1 July you no longer need to. The idea that you need to be independent of a registered political party for three years and three months, but on 1 July, no, you can go back and join that political party. It is okay. We trust that you will be independent now. That fundamentally brings lie to the premise behind this bill, because if you needed an independent Speaker you would need it for the full term and, if you do not need an independent Speaker, then you do not need that to happen for the full term.

The idea that we can now try to create—and this is because when you rush legislation and bring it to parliament without due process or let it see the light of day so that we can actually discuss and look at—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr KNOLL: —the unintended consequences of legislation such as this—

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr KNOLL: Unintended consequences which is why you have to have amendments like this that do not make sense.

The CHAIR: Member for Schubert, I hate breaking you mid-stride but I am going to remind opposition members that the member for Lee was able to make a contribution, a heartfelt contribution, over some minutes without any interruption.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: There was one.

The CHAIR: One interjection but nothing like what we have just seen. The member for Schubert is entitled, as you were, member for Lee, to make a contribution. I will just remind people that I have warned a couple of members already, and if they are warned a second time they are on their way to be thrown out, and we have a way to go in this committee.

Mr KNOLL: I do not mind that this bill comes to this house, but everybody should see it for what it is, and that is the fact that we are seeing an undermining of the workings of government by those opposite—and that is okay, but at least be honest about it. At least be honest about it instead of trying to couch it behind flowery language and high-minded rhetoric, and a degree of self-righteousness that really sits poorly in the back of my mouth.

Just be honest about what you are seeking to do here, and that is to trample on convention in this chamber, trample on the history that Speakers since time immemorial have given to this place in a fair, judicious and impartial manner. I think it is a disgusting slur on the member for Heysen, who is perhaps one of the most thoughtful contributors and Speakers to ever sit in that chair.

He is a man who deliberates deeply on every decision he has had to make, who has at times made decisions that may have put him at odds with people on all sides of this chamber, because he sees that he has an oath to that chair that is beyond any party affiliation. At least those opposite can be honest about that.

My question to the member for Florey is: why is it important to be impartial and not a member of a political party on 30 June, say, 2025, but on 1 July 2025 it is okay to be a member of a registered political party and expect that Speaker to be any more or less independent than the day before?

Ms BEDFORD: I think the intent is that it is going to encourage all of us to have our fiscal houses in order from 1 July rather than force anyone to rejoin or become a member of a party.

Mr KNOLL: What the member is saying is, 'I desperately need an independent Speaker who is not a member of a registered political party, and that's why I have to bring this bill to the chamber and have it jammed through on the same day it was presented, because it is that important, but that principle of independence does not supersede the normal functioning of political party operations in the lead-up to an election.'

The member for Florey says that we need independence, but we only need independence for three years and three months. After that the practicality, and the fact that this bill does not work, well we are going to have to fix that by amendment to this bill so that the normal functioning of the way members of parliament get elected is not upset by this ill thought-through legislation. Essentially, the principle and independence, which are so high minded that we have to deal with this today, is not so high minded that getting someone's financial house in order, as the member for Florey says, should not take precedence over that perceived independence nine months out from an election.

That just speaks to the farce this chamber is going through today, and any member of this parliament who votes for this bill is doing so only out of short-term interest. I want to know what the Labor Party is going to do next time they are in government; I want to know what they are going to do. They are going to force their Speaker to resign. The member for Croydon or the member for Giles or the member for Playford, Mr Snelling at the time, all those Speakers could act impartially but now, all of a sudden, we cannot have impartial Speakers.

This chamber has operated on convention for decades; it has operated on convention forever, but slowly, bit by bit, those conventions get eroded. I tried, during my time as Manager of Government Business, to bring those conventions back, but once they are gone they very, very rarely come back. Going to the member for Lee's point earlier, we now have a function of regularly seeking leave to provide explanations for questions, which did not exist before. If that is not something that speaks to the magnanimity and impartiality of the Speaker, then I do not know what does.

What is happening here is that bit by bit the conventions of this parliament are being eroded: the ability of governments to prorogue, the ability to see the Speaker as impartial regardless of their political persuasion. Bit by bit these conventions go until, in the end, all we have is brute force of numbers. That is a dangerous precedent to set, and it is something that really frustrates me in these last few months of my time in this place, to see these conventions go out the window.

What replaces them is a form of petty politics, and it is a reason why the public do not trust us. The Roy Morgan poll that came out in terms of trust in professions earlier this year, in March or April, had us at 7 per cent trust amongst the South Australian public—and debates like this are the reason. Anybody who would be coming in to watch this debate today would go, 'What's this on about? Why are they doing this?' When they try to sit down and functionally understand why it is that we have had to stop dealing with important government business to deal with a private member's bill based on creating a change to the Speaker—

Ms BEDFORD: Point of order, Chair: I am just wondering what the question is.

The CHAIR: As I have already explained—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The CHAIR: The member for Chaffey, unfortunately, is warned for a second time. To the member for Florey, as I have explained to this committee just a few moments ago, every member is entitled to ask a question and/or make a contribution. The member for Schubert is making a contribution. We can hear that out. He may look to couch a question as a result of that, but he has the call.

Mr KNOLL: Anybody who is listening in to this debate today would say, 'In what way does this bill, which has sought to take precedence over many other very important bits of legislation which are sitting on the *Notice Paper*, need to seek precedence? Who is it really benefiting? What is this change designed to do?' The bit that I do not understand is: let's say this passes—all the member for Heysen has to do is resign as a member of a political party.

Members interjecting:

Mr KNOLL: He does not even have to do that, so what are we doing here? Why has this taken precedence? The reason that it has taken precedence is that all of a sudden the naked maths in this place has come to bear and those opposite, especially the member for West Torrens, just want to create a bit of havoc, and that is fine. Be honest about it—that is fine—but do not expect the South Australian public to swallow it. This is why people do not like politicians: because they spend so much time talking about themselves rather than the issues that matter. My question to the member for Florey is: given that the Speaker does not have to do anything as a result of this bill between here and the 2022 election, why is it so important to jam this bill through the house today?

Ms BEDFORD: I would expect the person who becomes or remains Speaker to resign from their political party in an effort to show the people of South Australia we are going to change our behaviour in this place.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I just want to correct a few things that the member for Schubert said, which I think are inaccurate. He says we are trampling on the traditions of this house by not allowing governments to prorogue. The right to prorogue the parliament is not a right of this parliament; it is a right of the Crown. It is a fundamental misunderstanding by a young man who rushes to judgement, again.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. The idea that somehow proroguing the parliament is a right of the house is wrong. It is factually incorrect, just like claiming to have the ability to remove members of a Cemeteries Authority when you do not. It is that type of ill-informed commentary that misinforms this debate.

What is actually happening here is the parliament is expressing its will over the Crown, because we are saying that the Crown should not prorogue the parliament six months before an election. The member for Schubert is completely wrong in his assessment about the traditions of the parliament. When he said we restored the traditions of the parliament by allowing leave, leave had been a process of this parliament since the 1860s.

An honourable member: It's in the standing orders.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is in the standing orders. Who took it away? This government when they got elected. To his credit, the member for Schubert, when he became a manager of government business, when they fired the former one—he was my second manager of government business; I am onto my third now—he decided that we should return those processes back to the house because they are important, and I agreed with him, because the government were wrong in not honouring pairs.

What was the opposition's only thing we had left? Remove leave—that is all we had, because the government broke a pair because they cannot manage themselves. Here we are again because they cannot manage themselves, because the Premier is too busy doing other things to worry about his government. We are here now in a minority government, and the government are bemoaning that they are a minority. The member for Lee is right: you are the authors of your own demise. It is not us; it is you.

So, with all due respect to the member for Schubert, who I do actually have a high regard for, despite him continually focusing back on me, the truth is that defending the rights of the parliament while arguing for a right of the Crown are two very different things. The member for Schubert should know that before rushing to judgement, as he did when he attempted to remove members of a board illegally and then was caught, and the OPI then referred it to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman found him guilty of misconduct—

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for West Torrens—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the first minister in this parliament to be found so.

The CHAIR: —you are straying from the clause. Member for Schubert, this will be your final question.

Mr KNOLL: I suppose the only difference is that when I make a mistake I own up to it and accept it. That is how you learn in this place—by taking responsibility for your own actions. The member for West Torrens is correct: that is right, you do petition the Crown to prorogue parliament,

but are we not in this place right at this moment, where the parliament is seeking to change an act to stop the ability to prorogue parliament, which is parliament expressing its will over the rights of governments and governors to be able to prorogue parliament?

What I love most about the member for West Torrens' contribution is, 'Government, you are the authors of your own demise, but we take no responsibility for our actions in this place.' The Labor Party, who today voted to suspend standing orders, have so far voted for the passage of this bill with their self-righteousness and their high-minded rhetoric and 'We're here trying to stand up for the people, but it's not our fault, we're just voting for it.' That sort of logic is pathetic and it is something the South Australian people will see through.

To try to suggest that somehow they have no responsibility for their actions today beggars belief, that there is any sort of logical, internal consistency the member for West Torrens can put together to keep a straight face when saying that sentence. If you are going to take responsibility because we are a minority government, then take responsibility, but do not say, 'It's not our fault. It's your fault we're voting the way we are.' Take responsibility and be honest about what you are doing here.

I think everybody in this chamber should be honest about what this bill is really seeking to do—about what this bill is really seeking to do—because, if it were anything other than that, then it would be allowed to take normal process, given the fact that it is not going to make any difference between here and the 2022 election as to whether or not the Speaker will have to resign as a member of a political party. But, again, it all comes down to the fact that raw maths, the ability to count and the lack of any sort of responsibility for any decisions they happen to make, that the opposition chooses to make, means we are dealing with this situation here tonight. That is farce, and I think those people who vote yes to this bill will be taking responsibility for this bill.

Ms LUETHEN: I have a question to the mover of the amendment. I would like to clarify whose behaviour you are looking to change by having a Speaker independent for 3½ years and then the last six months they can choose to be in a political party. It has been my experience in this term that often the opposition is yelling at me while I am speaking—most of the time the Leader of the Opposition—so how will this independence of the Speaker for 3½ years of the term stop that yelling at another member in government?

Ms BEDFORD: Well, it will not unless you respect the role of the Speaker, and I put it to you that if the Speaker is independent they have a much better chance of that respect.

The CHAIR: If I can make a contribution here, the respect is for the standing orders and how they are applied. They are quite clear.

Ms LUETHEN: My second question is that every time I take classes here on a school tour, when I talk about how we regulate the behaviour in here I talk about the standing orders and how the standing orders set the rule for debate. One of the things more as commentary I would like to see in the future is more description and adhering people's behaviour to more respectful behaviour and building that into the standing orders. Can you tell me more about why you are not choosing, with your amendments, to go down the path of changing the standing orders and, instead, you are focusing on the political party membership of the Speaker for 3½ years?

Ms BEDFORD: Standing orders committees have existed for as long as I have known—

Mr Picton: She is a member of the Standing Orders Committee.

Ms BEDFORD: Right, and I guess we could say to you that, as someone who has been on that committee, you would see that standing orders are only going to work if they are respected. It is the enforcement of the standing orders that I see is the issue and if the current make-up and role of the Speaker is not allowing for that to happen, it is about trying to find an alternative way to have that happen so that our behaviour is regulated and the business of the house is carried on in a much better atmosphere.

Ms LUETHEN: I have just one more question to further understand your thinking around this amendment. Could you help me a little bit further to understand why the Leader of the Opposition can yell at me so often in government with a government Speaker? I have the utmost respect for the Speakers we have had this term trying to regulate everyone's behaviour. I do not see how that is

going to change, having a Speaker who is not part of a political party for 3½ years of the term, without changes to the standing orders. It does not make sense to me. In making more of a comment, you would think if anything, if what you are saying is because there is a government Speaker there would be more protection here, I would not have the problem with the Leader of the Opposition yelling at me so often. So how do you explain that?

Ms BEDFORD: You would have to ask the Speaker, would you not, who lets the Leader of the Opposition yell at you. In some ways, I would hope this new regime would stop that.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Can the member for Florey advise the house if she has been discussing her candidacy as a Speaker either now, before the election, or after the election with any member of this chamber?

Ms BEDFORD: Yes, I can and I have not.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Can the member for Florey confirm that the member for Kavel is advising you this evening on answering questions in this committee process?

Ms BEDFORD: I already answered that when I said I asked the member for Kavel to help me, and you were in the room when I said this, because I have no legal training.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: So the member for Kavel is assisting you this evening?

Ms BEDFORD: Only if I choose to ask him a question, and I asked him as late as this afternoon if he would assist if there were questions that I could not answer.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I hear that the member for Kavel is assisting the member for Florey in asking this question and it makes me ask myself the question: where are we heading here? I think, where have I seen a 'Bizarro' situation previously—in other words, the reverse of what we are seeing tonight—where we now have the Labor Party acting like the Nick Xenophons of the parliament and we have a bizarre piece of legislation with bizarre amendments. It reminds me of when the former member for Wright, Jennifer Rankine, brought to this place a reform of the real estate act and the way we sell real estate in South Australia, and—

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

The CHAIR: There is a point of order from the member for West Torrens, so the minister will take a seat.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 127: digression, personal reflections on members:

A Member may not

1. digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion,
2. or impute improper motives to any other Member,
3. or make personal reflections on any other Member.

The minister is talking about members being bizarre. He is talking about their character because of the way they are moving motions. It is not within the standing orders for him to behave this way.

The CHAIR: My recollection is that the minister did use the word 'bizarre', but he was talking about a situation—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: 'Bizarro' I said.

The CHAIR: Bizarro. Those of us who read *Superman* comics would know all about the planet Bizarro. The minister was referring to a situation rather than a person. He did mention the previous member for Wright. The previous member for Wright is not here to take offence. Minister, you are on your third question, given that I allowed one for clarification.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is obvious that the member for West Torrens is not a fan of *Seinfeld*, because there is a whole story, a whole episode about Bizarro Jerry. These were the opposite to Jerry, to George and to Kramer.

The CHAIR: My recollection is more from the *Superman* comics.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That is what we are seeing here, sir. We are seeing a bizarre bit of legislation brought into the parliament, and it reminds me of the bizarre landing that the Labor Party came to with Nick Xenophon in 2007 during that debate on the real estate bill, where we, as Liberals, on our side said, 'If somebody wants to declare that they are having a vendor bid and someone is foolish enough to bid against the vendor or they want the property so much they bid against the vendor, and everyone is informed of the situation, let them do it.' The Labor Party's position was, 'No, we are opposed.'

The CHAIR: Minister, you have already had a point of order raised against you, and I ask you to come back to the clause at hand, which is clause 3 as amended.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: This is an important comparison as to the ridiculousness of this bill before the house compared to the outcome of a negotiated bill in the upper house back in 2007. The outcome of that was that Nick Xenophon wanted a headline. He wanted to be the person who fixed the deadlock, and the then Labor Party agreed to three vendor bids, with the fourth one being illegal. So you have a situation where it is legal to have a vendor bid the first time, the second time and the third time and now the fourth time it is illegal. That is what we have here. We have a—

The CHAIR: Thank you. Back to the clause.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: This is how silly that bill was, and this is exactly the same silliness that we are seeing in this bill, where someone is going to be seeking preselection who has been forced to be independent or not a member of a political party. It does not actually force someone to be independent. It just means they cannot be a member of a political party. There is a big difference between them, because I know a lot of Liberals who are not members of the Liberal Party. They would not say that they were independent voters; they would say they were Liberal voters.

So we have this bizarre situation where we are led to believe that somebody who is not a member of a political party has no allegiance to that party. Someone who has been a member of that party for 20, 30 or 40 years all of a sudden switches off their allegiance to that party. They put on their blinkers, they completely ignore colleagues, friends, lifelong friendships they have developed in political parties and they do not play any favourites. Their children still play together, I imagine. I guess that is not banned. Families still get together. The Speaker would get together at barbecues with the members of the government.

The CHAIR: Depending on the COVID regulations at the time.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We are expected to believe that they will in actual fact be impartial and independent, even though they have an intention of running for parliament again under the brand that they were elected under initially, and they expect that preselection in nine months' time. It is a nonsense.

Ms BEDFORD: I just would like to advise the committee, and in particular our immediate past Speaker, that one of the other things I would like to see happen in this place is that people who move private members' bills are able to have advisers, because it is going to be important to have advice if this house is going to operate in any sort of way where members feel they can move private members' bills.

The Attorney and I were both here when the euthanasia bill went through and we had four or five people running around trying to do the right thing. That is another thing we can do for the house. I also remind you all that Speakers Jenkins and Smith have managed to do this sort of thing, be independent in the chair, manage to get preselection and manage to be re-elected. So I do not think what you are saying applies because I think what I am proposing here is eminently achievable.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Clause 4 as printed sets out to insert 34A. You have titled it 'Removal of Speaker'. My question is in relation to this clause which is to require that a person who is the subject of a motion of a majority of the house who is Speaker to immediately vacate the chair, of course, if they are voted to remove. My question relates to the current Speaker, who is a member of a political party. Under the clause that we have just passed in this bill, he is entitled to be a member

of a political party now because we are in this last nine months after 1 July. He could remain then as any other member, of course, could be affiliated with a political party, and be there. Is it the intention of the mover that she proposes that the current Speaker should be removed from office?

Ms BEDFORD: No, that is a matter for parliament.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can the member explain to me why it is necessary to provide in this bill a removal of Speaker provision when in fact the parliament already has the power to both elect and challenge an existing Speaker and, of course, vote to remove them? Why is this necessary?

Ms BEDFORD: Because it would adopt the appointment mechanism as the removal mechanism. It is a ballot.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Just to be clear then, you are saying that the vote of this parliament to both elect or remove a person in the Speakership is not a ballot, or are you saying that it should have some kind of terms around it as to it being a secret ballot or something of that nature?

Ms BEDFORD: It is just the same mechanism for the appointment as it is for the removal.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: What I am trying to understand is this parliament already has the power to appoint and remove its Speaker and in fact it regularly does do just that, especially after an election. It can, of course, move a vote of no confidence in the Speaker. It can move for a further nominee to be made to that position and can vote to do that. We could do that right now. If it is no intention of the mover to actually do that, why is it necessary to have new section 34A at all?

Ms BEDFORD: It is just an attempt to codify the process.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Is that the information that is being provided?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: I think the Attorney has had four questions so far.

The CHAIR: She has but I have deemed, once again, that she was seeking clarification. Final question, Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: What is the proposed ballot arrangement that is in subsection (3)?

Ms BEDFORD: The same as the appointment mechanism.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Which is?

Ms BEDFORD: Which is if necessary, as we all endured the last time we had a ballot for the Speaker, people fill in little bits of paper and stick them in a box.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Will the member for Florey rule herself out for being a candidate if there is a ballot for Speaker before the election?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: that sounds extremely hypothetical and it should be ruled out of order for being hypothetical.

The CHAIR: I am going to allow the question.

Ms BEDFORD: It is hypothetical, but who knows? I may be the only person nominated at that time and I would have to think about a nomination if that happened.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Has the member for Florey had any discussion about nominating for the Speaker's role with any member of this chamber?

Ms BEDFORD: No. You asked me that earlier and I said no. It is still no.

The CHAIR: The minister is asking hypothetical questions, which he is quite entitled to do because this is not question time, but if I can just make a comment in relation to that: we already have a Speaker. It is just an observation.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1.

Ms BEDFORD: I move:

Page 3, lines 25 to 30—Delete the Schedule and substitute:

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

4—Transitional provision

For the avoidance of doubt, section 6(1)(c) of the *Constitution Act 1934* (as amended by this Act) applies (on and after the commencement of this Act) for the remainder of the relevant election period that commenced on 1 July 2021.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to speak to the amendment?

Ms BEDFORD: I think it is obvious, sir. As it says:

For the avoidance of doubt, section 6(1)(c) of the *Constitution Act 1934* (as amended by this Act) applies (on and after the commencement of this Act) for the remainder of the relevant election period—

and, again, that magical date, 1 July.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My question, member for Florey, is: in introducing this proposed schedule 1, I am now looking at page 41 on my copy of the Constitution Act. At the end of the list of legislative historical amendments there is the title 'Transitional etc provisions associated with Act or amendments'. Do I understand that this amendment is to insert after the words 'Constitution (Parliamentary Terms) Amendment Act 2001' this new clause 4, which is to be called a transitional provision?

Ms BEDFORD: It is a new schedule, is it not? If you read it, I am deleting the schedule and substituting a new schedule 1.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If you look at the schedule—Transitional provisions on pages 41 and 42 of the act set out a number of different transitional provisions. You are not abolishing all of them because there is no provision for that; you are simply deleting your 'Transitional provision 1—Speaker continues to hold office until next sitting day' and substituting this new transitional provision. I am just trying to work out where it is going to go into the act.

Ms BEDFORD: My understanding from parliamentary counsel is that it is a standard provision.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just trying to work out where it is going in because at the moment there are a whole lot of transitional provisions in the act and you are removing the proposed schedule 1 from your bill and in your amendment you are putting in a new transitional provision. I am just trying to ascertain where it goes in the schedule to the current act.

Ms BEDFORD: Exactly where it says.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is the point; that is why I am asking you.

The CHAIR: My reading of this, member for Florey, is that this is a reasonable question. From my perspective, I need to know where it is going to fit into the act.

Ms BEDFORD: Does it not say 'Delete the Schedule and substitute: Schedule 1'?

The CHAIR: In relation to drafting of bills, there is a particular place in the bill where a schedule needs to appear. My reading of it is that it is not exactly clear.

Ms BEDFORD: Parliamentary counsel has prepared this for me. If they are wrong, I am imagining they are still listening—would they not be listening for a private member's bill? It says, schedule 1, page 3, lines 25 to 30, so you have the bill there, Attorney, and this says, 'Delete the schedule and substitute.'

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If you look at your bill—it is not completely terminal, if it is a complete muck-up, I suppose it is something that can be dealt with in another place. My point is that you have in your bill a transitional clause, which is a quite sensible thing to have, I think, and you are now moving an amendment to get rid of that transitional provision and put in a new one. I am asking where that new one is going to go in the act; that is not clear. If it is, I would like you to indicate to me where it is going in the act.

Ms BEDFORD: My advice is it does not go into the act. It is just a transitional provision that sits in the amendment bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Alright. If it sits in the amendment bill, is it going to be included? The reason I was alerted to this is because it has gone from clause 1 to clause 4 as a transitional provision and it seems as though it needs to sit—and you can perhaps get some advice on this at another time—in relation to the transitional provisions in the act, and there is a number of them relating to different acts. It seems as though this one is relevant to the Constitution (Parliamentary Terms) Amendment Act 2001 and is a transitional provision that you are putting in for it.

I would just like some clarification on that. You may be able to provide that information between the houses, because unless we sort that out, if there is a suggestion that this was to replace the whole of that schedule, it may remove a whole lot of other validation and transitional provisions for the other acts in that transitional section of the act. That, I think, could be catastrophic.

However, my next question is this: in relation to the current position as Speaker, on the basis that this bill passes, does the mover of the bill understand that it is quite legitimate under the terms of this bill for the current Speaker to continue as a member of a political party, given that it is now October?

Ms BEDFORD: It would be a matter for parliament.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am saying it is quite lawful under the terms of your new bill, because it is after 1 July, that he is actually able to be a member of a political party.

Ms BEDFORD: I am not in the position to give you legal advice. You will always form your own view.

The CHAIR: Before I call the minister, just in regard to the previous line of questioning as to where the schedule might fit, I think we have to assume, obviously, that parliamentary counsel know what they are doing and we can clarify it between the houses.

Ms BEDFORD: I am getting advice from parliamentary counsel and it is perfectly normal not to put it in the act. It is done all the time, is my advice. I know the Attorney will be able to turn her mind to it between this and the other place.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (22:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (22:20): I rise to relate a few matters that I think will need to be considered in relation to this legislation, and they may be matters that need some assistance in the other place because obviously Constitution Act amendments require both houses of parliament and an absolute majority.

What I think is very clear through the debate on this matter is that, whilst there may be good intentions of the member for Florey to establish a regime of Speakerships in this house and perhaps even potentially in the other place of the President on the basis that there be some independence from undue influence of political allegiances—and I understand that argument—I think it is hurried and I think that, unfortunately, we may not be able to achieve something that is workable as a result of that; however, I understand it.

Unfortunately, what I find completely absurd is that whatever meritorious aspect the member has in relation to independence is utterly undermined as a result of her attempt to give some fairness to Speakers who want to be candidates at the next election by allowing them to rejoin a political party after 1 July in the year preceding the fourth anniversary of an election year. That, to me, is just completely inconsistent.

I still cannot get my head around how a Speaker, if it demands of their opportunity to be free of the encumbrance of any duress of the political influence they would be under by being a member of the party for the first three years and three months of a parliamentary term, can suddenly walk and chew gum, as the member for Florey says, in the last nine months when they are a member of a political party. Quite frankly, if they have some desire to be partisan in the lead-up to an election, it would be the classic circumstance where they are likely to be influenced. I cannot understand that argument or the merit behind moving to make some provision this way.

As best as I understand it, it does not even occur in what has been described as the Westminster system, which is not this system. They have one in which they have a level of independence, but they certainly do not say that in the nine months before an election suddenly you can go and rejoin political parties and have those alliances. It seems to make a farce of the whole thing.

The other question is: why now? I think that is obvious. I think the member has been quite frank about that. She sees the opportunity. She says it has been a long-held view. She was happy to sit as a Deputy Speaker herself in the political party room with the Australian Labor Party while she was there. In the time I have been here, I have never seen her present a bill of this nature, but it may be a longstanding desire on her part that she has brought it here. She has seen the opportunity with the composition of the voting circumstances of the house and she has taken it. Again, I do not make criticism of that.

What I find bizarre is that it is clothed in this idea that it is necessary for an orderly parliament. If she has been so worried about this, it seems to me rather unusual that it has not been raised in the 24 years she has been here. Let me look at what is really happening here. What is really happening here is there is an opportunistic circumstance to change the Speaker of this house, notwithstanding the extraordinary service of the current Speaker to undertake that role.

The debate contributions in this time have been repeatedly of the accolades for former Labor Speakers and their capacity to undertake independent and fair assessments while they have been a member of the Australian Labor Party, so the whole thing seems to be completely inconsistent with that argument. I do not know. I was a victim of Speaker Atkinson, being thrown out of parliament more than most, I think, in the house, but nevertheless that is their view. It seems to completely undermine the basis of this.

What is really going to happen here? What we are clearly moving to is to use this opportunity—those who want to cause disruption to the parliament I suggest—to remove the Speaker, notwithstanding his, I think, exceptional record. So who should replace, of the Independents here? We have six of them. We have six people who are Independents. We have the member for Frome, who is probably the only one who has been an Independent for all the time he has been here in the parliament. He sat in a Labor government as a minister in that government, but he has sat in here as an Independent.

We have the members for Narungga, Mount Gambier and Waite, all of whom are Independents of their own volition. They have been facing certain charges and matters, but they have actually chosen to save the reputation of their party—that is, the Liberal Party of Australia, SA division—from any reputational damage by them resigning. That is what has actually happened there.

Then, of course, we have the two remaining ones. We have the member for Florey. She was a longstanding member, I think a very loyal member, of the Australian Labor Party for many years, until she was cast aside by the pre-selection of the Hon. Jack Snelling for her seat, what was to be her area. She ran as an Independent and, yes, she has taught the Labor Party a lesson as an Independent and she has remained as an Independent.

In the time since she has been an Independent, I cannot think of any significant bill that she has not supported the opposition on. There have been others that she has supported the government on, but when it has come to significant bills she has stuck to her core belief, her Labor belief, which I do not criticise, that is her position, and she has supported the opposition. Then we have the member for Kavel, who has recently determined that he has some future in being an Independent.

Who is the odds-on favourite? The odds-on favourite at the moment is probably the member for Kavel, as to the deals that have been struck. Second in line I would suggest, about 2 to1, would be the member for Florey. If she thinks she has been offered it, she may be sorely undermined. About 10 to1 is the member for Waite and the three real rank outsiders, about 100:1, are Narungga, Mount Gambier and Frome.

Mr PICTON: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order, Attorney. Member for Kaurana.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: third reading debates have to be quite strict to discussing the legislation at hand and a discussion of potential Speaker candidates—as you have noted, there is no vacancy—seems to be well off the topic.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Attorney will speak to the bill in the third reading speech. You have the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We will see over the next few days who is right about what is really happening here and I think we will find it will be a bit like groundhog day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Florey has moved that the bill be now read a third time. I refer back to an item that I referred to earlier, and my advice is that, as this is a bill to amend the Constitution Act and provides for an alteration of the constitution of the Legislative Council and/or the House of Assembly, its third reading is required to be carried by an absolute majority, and in accordance with standing order 242 we need to ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority present of the whole number of members of the house, I now put the question that the bill be now read a third time.

The house divided on the third reading:

Ayes 24

Noes 22

Majority 2

AYES

Bedford, F.E. (teller)
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.
Cregan, D.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Duluk, S.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

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

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

*Parliamentary Procedure***STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

Mr BROWN (Playford) (22:37): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority of members present, I accept the motion.

Mr BROWN: Sir, I will brief. I need to suspend sessional and standing orders so as to enable me to move a new sessional order to give light to the new spirit of independence in this house as expressed here today.

The SPEAKER: It has been moved. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 22
Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried.

*Motions***SESSIONAL ORDERS**

Mr BROWN (Playford) (22:43): I move that the house adopts the following sessional order:

When the house stands adjourned, the Speaker may require the house meet at an alternative time than that originally fixed:

1. The Speaker, if satisfied that the public interest requires it, may give notice that the house will meet at an alternative time;
2. The house meets at the time stated in the notice;
3. The business to be transacted when the house meets at the alternative time includes the business set down on the *Notice Paper* for the day to which the house had originally adjourned;

4. The dates set down for the remainder of the business on the *Notice Paper* may be altered by a motion moved without notice on the day on which the house resumes after the adjournment.

I want to indicate that this sessional order is very similar to standing order 57 except that, again, in the spirit of independence that this house has now established for itself, it no longer requires the minister to advise the Speaker that they request that the house sit. It then frees the Speaker to use their own judgement to make the house sit at an alternative time.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (22:44): It is no surprise, I am sure, to those opposite that the government does not support this, and for several reasons, including the fact that those opposite should be completely ashamed of themselves—all of those opposite should be completely ashamed of themselves for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Those opposite should be completely ashamed of themselves for trying to jam something like this through, saying—and I think I will get this right—the whip from the opposition said 'in the house's newly found independence'. Mr Speaker, complete disrespect for the process of parliament, complete disrespect for the fact that—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Complete disrespect for the fact that there are two houses of this parliament, there is a Governor who will make some decisions, too, with regard to legislation if it passes both houses of parliament but, more importantly, the idea that the opposition would try to jam this through in this way is completely disgraceful.

I did actually hear members opposite during the debate on the last bill that we discussed in this chamber talking about how reverent they were with regard to convention, talking about how they thought it was very important that we conform with convention, that they actually respected that. But, of course, those words have just evaporated in a very short period of time because they want to throw all of that convention out of the window immediately.

For a wide range of reasons we oppose this bill. It is pure, base politicking without the best interests of South Australians in mind, just the best interests of those opposite. It is completely unacceptable and I know that the public will feel exactly the same way.

Mr BROWN (Playford) (22:47): I will not take up much of the house's time except to say that this is an opportunity for this house to declare that it believes that you, Mr Speaker, should be given the independence to make these decisions without having to be under the yoke of this government.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert! The question before the house is that the motion to adopt the sessional order be agreed to. The Speaker counts the house ahead of consideration of the question for the adoption of a sessional order. There being an absolute majority of members present, I will put the question.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (22:48): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority of the whole number of members present, I accept the motion.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, it is important that I now move a motion because I wish to move for you to be removed from the office of Speaker, and I ask that we suspend standing orders to allow me to move that forthwith.

The SPEAKER: Are there any other speakers on the motion to suspend?

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (22:49): It is now extremely clear, with the sequence of events that has happened over the course of today, what today was really about. In seeking to move the suspension here, what it lays bare is that the bill we were dealing with before was trying to provide a fig leaf, but it seems that fig leaf has now been removed.

The motion by the member for West Torrens for the suspension of standing orders, and the manner in which they have sought to do that, belies the fact that without any justification, without any basis, it seeks to turn this house's attention away from government business, from dealing with important matters that are actually going to help South Australians. In this newfound balance of power in this chamber, it is more about divvying up the spoils for those who feel they deserve them most in a time and a manner that is unbecoming.

South Australians will see through this suspension and they will see through what comes next. They will see it more as politicians bickering and those opposite using naked power to grab what they want to line their own pockets, as distinct from doing what is in the best interests of South Australians.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

Mr KNOLL: There is no justification for there to be a suspension of standing orders in this way. As South Australians read the newspapers and listen to the radio or watch TV tomorrow, they will understand completely what has taken place here, why it has taken place and who is going to be richer as a result of what is taking place tonight.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (22:51): It was a poor selection of speaker for the government, for that member to be lecturing us, anyone in this parliament, about lining our pockets, given the amount of money he has paid back that he claimed inappropriately and given that he was the first minister in this house to be found guilty of misconduct or poor choice.

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

Mr KNOLL: Point of order: I ask the member to withdraw and apologise for that last comment in relation to inappropriately claiming money.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member having taken offence, as I understand it, pursuant to standing order 125, I ask the member for West Torrens to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir. I will not. To make it easier, sir, I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has withdrawn and apologised. Has the member for West Torrens completed his contribution?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have, sir.

The SPEAKER: In that case, having counted the house, and there being an absolute majority of members present, the motion of the member for West Torrens is that standing orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move a motion for the removal of the Speaker; is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24

Noes 22

Majority2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried.

*Motions***SPEAKER**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (22:58): I move:

That the Speaker be removed from the office of the Speaker.

When you were first elected to the office of Speaker, it was under very controversial circumstances: the former Speaker was elevated to the ministry and vacancies created by a scandal that had engulfed the government. There have been many scandals that have engulfed the government. They are difficult to remember. I had to look it up to remember exactly which scandal it was.

Mr Speaker, your first act as Speaker was to castigate the opposition leader for daring to tell his members of his political party that they would co-operate in full with any independent investigation into ICAC, claiming breaches of privilege, claiming that the Leader of the Opposition had acted inappropriately. I was expelled almost immediately for interjections that you found were disorderly while you were on your feet making your opening statement. You then, in record time, faced the first no-confidence motion of your Speakership, immediately afterwards in lieu of question time, where the opposition argued that you had shown a bias almost immediately.

Since that time you have thrown out of question time 118 Labor members—on 118 occasions you have thrown out a Labor member. To contrast that, government members on four occasions have been thrown out—four occasions. That is not an impartial Speakership.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a shame. The removal of the Speaker is not something any member does lightly and, despite what was said in the arguments leading up to the suspension of standing orders, the opposition does this because the house has just passed I think a momentous constitutional amendment, that is, that we demand as a house, the crossbench and the opposition, independent adjudication of the house, impartial adjudication of the house, through an unbiased political prism.

Mr Speaker, you are a loyal Liberal. You are Liberal Party royalty. You are from a long line of Liberal MPs. You are probably going to be here for a long time, and I suspect you will have a long and fruitful career within the Liberal Party. They gave you the wrong job. You should not have been

made Speaker; you should have been made a minister. You are not designed or built to be impartial. You are loyal to your team, and you want to see them succeed, and the evidence is borne out by the number of times you have expelled Labor members, often when they are the ones asking questions of ministers who are facing serious accusations, like the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, like the former Minister for Planning, like the current Attorney-General and like the Premier.

Whenever these ministers are under serious scrutiny from the opposition about accusations that should outrage the public and this house, often the way to silence that critique, that scrutiny, is just to expel the member, because the House of Assembly, when people control the numbers, behaves like a dictatorship.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Here it is again.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Whenever scrutiny is put towards the government, they hurl insults—how dare we! The Attorney-General is today the subject of a select committee and she still throws insults at us rather than showing any humility at all about what is occurring here today.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Do you even know what the word is?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do I even know what the word is? I can tell you what the word is: the word is when you lose member after member after member through scandal, through fraud, through other means. I would look in a mirror rather than looking at me about why that has all occurred. This vote, this act, is about making sure that this house is governed by an independent member of parliament, and that that independent member of parliament puts the institution first, not the government.

The executive are not the parliament. Ministers are not the parliament—you are servants of the parliament. The parliament is supreme, and you are finding that out today in spades, that this parliament will no longer tolerate partisan politics, partisan political prisms of a Speaker ever again. We will now have, from this time forth, an independent Speaker, not a member of the two major governing parties, and I think that is a good thing and I am sure, Mr Speaker, that if this vote is successful and there are other activities that occur in other parts there may well be a vacancy very, very soon.

Mr Speaker, while you have been a loyal servant of the Liberal Party, that is not what this parliament needs. This parliament needs a loyal servant of the parliament, a loyal servant of the institution, someone who will call up members equally.

I point out to members that when an interjection occurs it is disorderly, but it is interesting that, when that interjection is called out without a point of order, that is the intervention of a Speaker into the debate. When points of order are brought up about members debating questions sometimes the Speaker rules in our favour; sometimes he does not. But, if we respond to interjections or if we use the only thing we have left to make a point, which is interjection and ridicule, we are thrown out. That serves no-one. The parliament, if it is adjudicated fairly, impartially and independently, will function better.

As we go towards an election, and probably one of the most important elections of our generation, given the once-in-100-year pandemic we are facing, what could be more important than to let there be a real contest of ideas on the floor of the House of Assembly? What could be more important than the scrutiny of a government and the decisions they are making?

Tomorrow's *Advertiser* will not be splashing or headlining the turmoil in the government. It will be talking about data being kept inappropriately after this house was promised it was being disposed of. Obviously, the opposition will have questions about that data being kept inappropriately by the government after this house was assured time after time that it was being destroyed, and who was it who blew the whistle on that data being kept inappropriately? An independent officer of this parliament: the Auditor-General.

We want another independent officer of this parliament to adjudicate our interrogation of that potential crime and who benefited from that. Was it inadvertent or was it deliberate? We want

answers to these questions because South Australians have voluntarily given up many liberties in the name of protecting our state and keeping us all safe, but we have been assured that our privacy has always been protected and now we find that it has not.

So, Mr Speaker, we believe you can no longer continue in this role. We believe you must leave the chair. We believe that you belong with your comrades and colleagues on the government benches as a member participating as a Liberal because you can no longer do that given what the house has passed. It is clear to me, it is clear to the house, that we are able to pass a constitutional amendment for an independent Speaker. It is only appropriate now, sir, that you vacate the chair and that this house moves to elect a new Speaker who will bring a new era of independence that will begin today going forward in perpetuity.

From now on, the Speakership will not be a prize of either political party, but it will be in the custodianship of independent members who no longer serve their political masters but serve only the parliament. It is a noble ideal, and I am glad that the crossbench and the opposition are the ones pushing this. The mother parliament, the House of Commons, has operated exceptionally well, from the Major government to the Blair government, right through to the current Johnson government. The Speakers do not serve the executive but serve the institution, and did it not serve them well?

Most recently, when Boris Johnson prorogued the parliament illegally—it was found by the UK High Court to have acted inappropriately to stymie debate—who led that charge? The independent Speaker of the House of Commons. That is why we need an independent Speaker: to ensure that we have someone watching over the excesses of the executive, to make sure that the executive is held to account, that we do inquire into them when we think that they have done inappropriate things and that they are held here to answer questions.

That hour of question time is the most important hour this parliament spends, when the most powerful people in the state have to come to this place and answer questions—and answer questions truthfully and honestly. If they do not, they face the punishment of this house, and it should be adjudicated by someone independent.

You cannot throw out ALP members 118 times and government members four times and say you are independent. The numbers just do not add up. It just proves that we have a system that is broken. You were not the first one to be partisan, sir, you are just in a long line of them, Labor and Liberal. It does not mean you were not a good Speaker, but now what we want is something different. We want something new. We want something that will improve the parliament for all South Australians.

With those words, I commend the motion to the house. I hope this is passed unanimously, but I suspect it will not be, out of political loyalty. After the conclusion of this, I hope that we elect an independent member to govern this parliament between now and the dissolution of the parliament before the 2022 election.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (23:10): It is quite extraordinary that the member opposite, on behalf of the opposition, the combined Independent and Labor opposition, has said that none of this means you are a bad Speaker and yet apparently you have to go. We completely disagree with that. You have been a fine servant of this parliament, Mr Speaker. You have adorned this parliament with your participation, with your oversight, with your superintendence, the word that was used earlier on this evening. I would rate your performance compared with previous Speakers exceptionally well, so for the member opposite to say—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: He was not. He does not.

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: For the member opposite to say that this does not mean you have been a bad Speaker but you have to go is ridiculous. For the member opposite to say that this is all about respect for the chamber but in this way, before this bill has even left this chamber, they want to act upon it as if it is a fait accompli shows absolutely zero respect for parliament.

Having jammed something through of their own will and now saying that that means because what they have in this chamber an effort to change the Constitution Act because they have it right here and now, that is good enough for them. They do not care about the upper house. They do not care about the government. They do not care about the process of parliament. They do not have the respect for parliament that they are claiming. It is absolutely ridiculous.

This business of trying to add up the numbers is like players on a field complaining because they cheat all the time and then the umpire calls them out on it over and over again, and then just because they have more players on the field they want to change the umpire, only because they cheated, because they were called out because they broke the rules. Their reflection upon themselves, highlighting the number of times that they infringed and that they were pulled up on infringing, is an indictment upon themselves, Mr Speaker, not upon you.

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

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: You have been a truly outstanding Speaker. We do not support this motion.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (23:13): So finally we get to what today was all about. That is what it is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: —all about. The high-minded rhetoric of the member for West Torrens belies underlyingly what is just naked power. It just needs to be called out for what it is. For a man to think that this vote tonight is going to do anything to change the conventions of parliament is ridiculous. In fact, the butchering of conventions to get us to this vote shows that this is not about the good working order of this parliament; it is about numbers, and we should just be honest about that fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: So the only way that this parliament works is through convention.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas: Stable government makes a difference.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

Mr KNOLL: What I mean by that is that the absence of convention—for instance, the continual interjection to try to interrupt a speaker speaking—ruins a convention to help the orderly processes of this house continue. In fact, at so many opportunities throughout the day we work on parliamentary convention. At so many points throughout the day we work on parliamentary convention so that we can get through the orderly business of the house.

To suspend standing orders at the start of the day to introduce a private member's bill, to switch government time into private members' time, to not use the normal process that those opposite rail against—and especially did with regard to those earlier COVID bills in relation to wanting to have briefings and all sorts of understanding and background and as much information as possible before making decisions on emergency bills.

Meanwhile, that was in regard to a pandemic, rather than this confected outrage and situation we find ourselves with today. To move to private members' time, to then suspend standing orders a further three or four times throughout the day, to move a sessional order—which interestingly expires once this parliament goes so if, heaven forbid, Labor get onto the treasury bench next time, this rule will not apply to them—it is only now for this situation because they believe that there is some short-term political advantage but they do not have to deal with the long-term consequences. The number

of conventions today that have been butchered show that those opposite do not have what it takes to be grown-ups when it comes to running this place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: They do not have what it takes because if it was anything other than that they would put a notice on the *Notice Paper*. It is only 24 hours.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

Mr KNOLL: It is only 24 hours and they could have done things in the right way with regard to this no-confidence motion, with regard to debating sessional order changes which could have been done by giving notice today for tomorrow morning. It is just the height of hypocrisy. What I would also say to those opposite is that you are the company you keep, and when the member for Croydon first came to this place I thought that he was going to try to be better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: You could see in him that there was some sort of innate righteousness. I thought, 'Here is a man that I would love to see use what is one of the toughest jobs in politics, being the opposition leader, to try to raise the standard of debate.' It is the opposition that needs to abide by the conventions in order for this to work. It is in opposition, when opposition show restraint, that conventions work. Oppositions have the opportunity to call quorum at all times during the day to try to disrupt the parliament, to move that speakers no longer be heard, to withdraw leave—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: —and any other different ways that they could disrupt parliament using the rules fair and square, but they do not and should not to keep the good orderly running of this house. The member for Croydon has failed and given in to the crass base politics of the member for West Torrens. This is a man whose smiles throughout the course of the day showed that this is the pinnacle of his existence; these games in this parliament are the pinnacle of his existence. Did any of it help the people of South Australia? No. Did any of it help to deal with the COVID pandemic that is going on at the moment? No. Did any of it help to improve the lot of South Australians and improve jobs in our economy? No.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham! Order, the leader!

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

Mr KNOLL: What it did was give him the opportunity to play the childish games in this chamber that he enjoys playing. It is done with the tacit and explicit approval of the opposition leader and he should reflect very much on the company that he keeps.

Every time instances like this come up, these conventions get butchered. It always happens one at a time and it is incremental. 'We're not changing the standing orders much. We are just changing it so that you, Mr Speaker, can make the decision about when parliament sits, as distinct from the government.' 'Oh no, we just need to change it so that the Speaker doesn't have to be a member of a political party. That's only a minor change.' But these conventions get ruined one decision at a time and they do not come back. What we will have at the end of this is a parliament that either rules by brute force or is so unruly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

Mr KNOLL: —that it is difficult to get the job done. Ultimately, we are here at the express will of the people as they elected us, and they did elect a majority Liberal government at the last election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member Hurtle Vale!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

Mr KNOLL: They elected a majority Liberal government for four years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will cease interjecting.

Mr KNOLL: But it seems that there are some in this place who feel that their opinion is worth more than the considered opinion of every single South Australian, and that is sad. Again, that is a butchering of another convention: the idea that governments get elected and they should be allowed to govern. These conventions get butchered one at a time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

Mr KNOLL: —and they do not return. I would also like to say that we can sit here pretty in the knowledge that our democracy is robust, and it certainly is. But democracy itself is not infallible. In fact, younger generations more and more do not believe in democracy as the best form of government and the reason they do not is because of what we are doing here today. We have a higher purpose and a higher calling to actually defend democracy—

Mr Szakacs: Shut them out. Shut first-time voters out.

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham!

Mr KNOLL: —because what happens is that young people, not as engaged in politics, see the petty behaviour that goes on in the chamber like we have seen today and they say, 'Well, if this is the product of democracy, then I want to think of something else. If this is what happens and this is the product of how we vote, then I want to see what the alternative systems are.' That is a massive problem.

We can all say, 'It's okay. We're only making a small, incremental change today. This does not matter one whit. We will get past today, we will have a new Speaker, everything will go on and everything will just be fine.' But only 7 per cent of people in this country trust their state politicians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is warned. The member for Cheltenham will cease interjecting.

Mr KNOLL: We do rate higher than used-car salesmen, but I think that is the only profession. That is an absolute travesty and what we are seeking to do here today, what the opposition is seeking to do here today, is emblematic of that. Democracy is fragile. We can see in any number of places across the world where democracy is being subjugated. It all comes one step at a time. It is just a little change in order for Vladimir Putin to be able to get re-elected. We can all say we are a million miles away from that, but these conventions are taken away one at a time until they are not there anymore.

As we undertake this vote tonight, I think we should be very clear about what this is—and that is the fact that somebody wants to sit in that chair and earn more money.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hurtle Vale!

Mr KNOLL: That is fine, but let's call it out for what it is. Let's call it out exactly for what it is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles!

Mr KNOLL: As somebody who has existed through the last parliament and this parliament, anyone trying to suggest that in the last parliament there was not an imbalance between opposition members and government members being thrown out would need to have such a revisionist view of history that they would need to put on some glasses. It could also be that oppositions are the ones who interject more, but of course in this chamber we no longer take responsibility for our actions. The opposition seems not to vote on behalf of their own free will; it is obviously just the government's fault the way that they vote.

Mr Speaker, I have seen in you somebody who has considerable legal experience at the highest level within South Australia and somebody who has applied that legal experience in a thoughtful and considered way without fear or favour. The reason I say without fear or favour is that it would have been easy, on first coming into the chair, to let the first few slide while you were new in the chair and to not rock the boat. But you were keen to set a standard from day one that this is what we expect, this is what I expect, the behaviour that I will or will not put up with. That is acting without fear or favour.

When somebody does not like the decision you make, they straightaway call into question your motives instead of reflecting on their own behaviour that led to the decision in the first place. Of course, we have had no debate of that tonight. It is simply, 'You told me off, therefore you are the one who is wrong, not me, because I could not possibly have done anything wrong,' and that is a farce. That is an absolute farce.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: So, Mr Speaker, as we undertake this vote tonight, you should know that you have done an exemplary job in the chair as somebody who has stood up for the traditions and conventions of this parliament, as somebody who has been extremely thoughtful, especially dealing with the difficulties in question time and has been able to find a cogent balance and understanding of what due process is.

It all comes back to the good, proper and easy working of this house. The decisions you make allow us to undertake the business of this house in an orderly fashion. As this vote is undertaken tonight—and as has happened with every other vote today—I think we can all count, but I think we should all understand that it is only because we can count that this decision is being made, as distinct from anything that you have done while you have sat in that chair.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (23:26): After 3½ years, this government and the political party from which it is drawn is finally being held to account, and don't they hate it? Don't they squirm at the increased amount of scrutiny, accountability and obligation they suddenly find themselves in to the people of South Australia?

The defence we have from the member for Schubert is: you should not be seeking to exert any power over how the parliament has been run over the last 3½ years, how we have conducted ourselves in government over the last 3½ years and how the chamber has been superintended over the last 3½ years, because of convention. That is a weak and bogus argument because what we have had over the last 3½ years, pretty much from day dot, is a scandal-plagued government.

At each juncture, when the opposition has sought to hold this government to account for scandal after scandal after scandal, for the ignorance displayed of those scandals, for the sweeping under the rug—both by the executive government and by the presiding members—the Liberal Party has used its numbers in this place to shut debate down, to curtail any questioning and to move on as quickly as possible.

I cannot remember a 3½-year period of this parliament which has seen such a frequency, let alone an extremity, of scandal that we have had from this government. We have had a country members' accommodation allowance scandal which has claimed scalp after scalp after scalp and,

as the member for West Torrens has said, in part is the reason why you, sir, as the member for Heysen, find yourself in the Speaker's chair rather than anywhere else in this parliament.

In fact, it was the member for Schubert, one of those members who out of what I think he said was just 'merely an abundance of caution' had to pay back tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayer-funded allowances to the parliament—something the Premier sought to dismiss as a minor administrative error only. That is not how the state's integrity commission thinks of these sort of matters. When we have sought to question that matter, or the unprecedented bringing to the surface of allegations of MP and staff behaviour in the parliament over recent years, we have had presiding members who have not handled those investigations well.

We had the member for Hartley procure some private gumshoe to do some investigation, under what authority we still do not know, and to what end we still do not know. We had a government of course that refuted the opportunity to have the equal opportunity commissioner launch an investigation into behavioural standards in the parliament until of course it became obvious that they could not resist it any longer and so finally in November, some 10 months after the call was first made, the government relented.

What has happened out of those allegations? We still have two uninvestigated and untested allegations, presumably about the behaviour of members of parliament within the parliament precinct. I am not referring to any of those matters that have been ventilated elsewhere. We have serious allegations raised by staff in this place of sexual assault and sexual harassment that still go uninvestigated and that still go without any further action. To me, I find it a distinct embarrassment that I would be part of a workplace that refuses to take that sort of action.

But what happens in question time when the opposition and even members of the crossbench seek to hold executive government to account? We raise legitimate questions—fair questions—and we have the member for Stuart and the member for Morialta and even, regrettably, the member for Unley sometimes stand up and seek to prevent the opposition or constrain the opposition in the questions that they ask seeking to raise minor technicalities in some sort of generous reinterpretation of the standing orders, which, almost without exception, sir, you uphold in favour of the government.

Then when a question goes to be answered by a minister, we have these long rambling debating answers that stray as far away from the topic of the question as possible, and if the opposition or a member of the crossbench should raise exception to that, raising a breach of standing order 98, almost without exception those points of order are not upheld, so we have a massive imbalance in how the chamber is treated during, as the member for West Torrens said, the most important hour of the parliamentary day, where the government does its best to avoid scrutiny and the opposition is restrained from applying scrutiny and pressure to the government.

I cannot tell you how debilitating that is, not to us as MPs so much but for the whole purpose of the parliament. We exist here to ensure, particularly in question time, that responsible government is being exercised and that is being thwarted not just by those rulings that you have undertaken but by your immediate predecessor, the member for Hartley.

We even did a reconciliation of how much of the hour of question time was devoted to opposition questions versus how much time was devoted to Dorothy Dixers from the government in the first two years of the member for Hartley's stewardship of this chamber and two years in a row more time was allocated in question time to Dorothy Dixers than was allowed from opposition questions. That is outrageous—absolutely outrageous—particularly as, after finally tripping over into government after 16 years of manifest incompetence in parliament, this government was afforded, almost without exception, for the last term of government between 2014 to 2018, to have a free run of question time.

I can remember when members of the opposition frontbench back then would ask at least half an hour of questions unbroken of a minister to apply a real blowtorch—real pressure—and hold government to account. We do not get anything like that whatsoever and that is the difference in standards. I remember the questions to the former ministers for child protection, the former member for Enfield and the current member for Port Adelaide. It was half an hour of scrutiny. What does the member for Adelaide get? Zilch, and in fact when we do ask questions of the member for Adelaide—

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will resume his seat.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —she seeks to shut down the questions. The Minister for Child Protection rises on a point of order.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: In opposition, I stood up many times and was completely ignored by the previous Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! It is very difficult for me to hear the Minister for Child Protection rising on a point of order, where there is this level of interjection in the house. I did manage to hear the minister, I think. In the circumstances, there is no point of order. The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Then we come to the member for Stuart, the third Leader of Government Business we have had in just over three years. He says what the opposition and the crossbench are now attempting to do is akin to a football team of cheats on a field having been pinged for cheating the rules and, having been told off by the umpire, wanting to change the umpire.

That is an outrageous slur, given what the facts and statistics of the superintendence of question time show. But if the member for Stuart wants to use a sporting analogy, perhaps he could consider his football team and the salary cap breaches and the misdemeanours of play behaviour at the end of season functions. We have even had players walk out on the team mid-season, member for Stuart, if that is the sporting analogy you are looking for.

Now in this place, amongst the 47 of us there has been a levelling of opportunity in this place. There is now the opportunity to hold the government and indeed the Speaker to account for their behaviour for the last 3½ years. Well, how you all squirm—and rightly so. The scandals that have gone uninvestigated by this parliament because the opposition and the crossbench have been shut down should raise genuine concern, if not fear, amongst the public of South Australia.

We still have not got to the bottom of how the Liberal Party of South Australia has been misusing data taken from members of the public's use of government websites. We still have not had an answer from the Premier about a cyber attack which occurred apparently a year ago, in November 2020, and whether any South Australian's personal data was compromised, whether any data from any South Australian's driver's licence has been accessed by hackers.

This is laughed off by the member for Bragg as being inconsequential, but these are the concerns that people have. We are in a different, challenging, uncertain world now—with not just COVID but all these other extraneous pressures placed on people. They expect our parliamentarians to be able to stand up in here and raise the issues that are of concern to them, rather than having them shut down, either by ministers refusing to answer, or not taking them seriously, or being protected by a Speaker seeking to do his political party's bidding.

It gives me absolutely no pleasure to be participating in this debate, let alone supporting this motion, but we are without any other option because we have had two goes at this from the Liberal Party and it is not working for the parliament and, if it is not working for the parliament, it is not working for the community. We have to continue going back to our communities and try to explain why we cannot give them answers about the things they are concerned about that are happening in the government. Well, that is unsatisfactory.

The reason we are doing this is that hopefully we will be better armed to give our communities the representation and the voice they deserve in this place so that we can hold the government to account, not just for all the scandals that we have encountered over the last three years but the ones that have continued to be uninvestigated. We will be doing that and, whoever we will be dealing with as the new Speaker, we look forward to having a better superintended place up until the next state election.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (23:39): I will make a brief contribution—a number of brief sentences—to this debate, which I would not ordinarily do but feel compelled to do on this occasion. Members of this place will be well aware that my arrival at the crossbench was a rather reluctant arrival here. I would much rather still be sitting in my normal chair on the other side of parliament.

The circumstances behind that arrival have been well canvassed in the public and as well tonight; they have featured a number of times in the commentary tonight. Regardless, I was a rather reluctant arrival on the crossbench.

When I did get here, though, one of the attractions that was presented to me as something that might be of benefit for the rest of my time here in parliament was that I might have 'the ability to get stuff done'. I might be able to achieve something for my electorate as an Independent sitting on the crossbench.

Well, it causes me great distress that we have spent over 12 hours of the precious few hours we have left here in this parliament this term wasting time, in my view. There is not a single voter in Narungga who is better off after today as a result of almost 12 hours of debate, and that causes me great distress. As someone who nominated with the best of intentions to try to deliver outcomes for the voters in Narungga, I am greatly saddened that we have wasted an entire day of parliament—

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson!

Mr ELLIS: —debating what is an inside political game, a game within a game, basically, a political game to satisfy a few within the chamber. That caused me great distress, and I feel compelled to put that on the record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for West Torrens wish to seek the call? The member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (23:40): I would like to thank members for their contributions to this I think historic debate. Going forward, I think we are now going to have a new era of independence and independent adjudication of the parliament, which will serve all South Australians greatly. It will improve the quality of debate, the quality of scrutiny, which will only improve the quality of the government and the quality of the opposition and indeed give better outcomes for the people of South Australia.

It is more than a game. This is important. Scrutiny matters in democracies. That is why this parliament is U-shaped. It is an adversarial system. This is how the framers decided that we should conduct ourselves, and this is in the best tradition of our Westminster democracy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the house is that the Speaker be removed from the office of the Speaker. It is a motion that is within the power of the house pursuant to section 34 of the Constitution Act.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24

Noes 22

Majority 2

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Cregan, D.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Duluk, S.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)

NOES

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

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

Marshall, S.S.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Power, C.
 Tarzia, V.A.
 Whetstone, T.J.

Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, before I vacate the chair I just wish to indicate to the house that I have been honoured to have been elected as Speaker of the house. I give the house my assurance that I have endeavoured to do my very best in this role. I have enjoyed every moment of it and I thank the house very sincerely for the privilege.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

*Members***SPEAKER, ELECTION**

The CLERK: I advise the house of the vacancy in the office of Speaker. I remind the house that it is now necessary to proceed to the election of a Speaker. I call for nominations for Speaker.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (23:48): I nominate the member for Kavel as the Speaker of the house.

The CLERK: Member for Kavel, do you accept the nomination?

Mr CREGAN: Sir, I have given it deep consideration. I do.

The CLERK: Are there any further nominations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (23:48): I nominate the member for Flinders.

The CLERK: Member for Flinders, do you accept the nomination?

Mr TRELOAR: I do, sir.

The CLERK: Are there any further nominations? As there are two nominations, both members proposed may address the house, as may the movers and seconders and any other members.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (23:50): I certainly was not planning on speaking tonight, but I really want to put on record a few thoughts and, in particular, not let this moment pass given that I am so deeply disturbed by it. I am quite devastated. I look at the member for Kavel and, eye to eye, I do not know how you can do this: how on one week you can sit on this side and on the other side do this.

To the member for West Torrens, you must know better than anybody the number of times someone from your party was in the role of the Speaker and yet, the opposition—our party—was kicked out. I think the idea that you proposed in which your party or members of the Labor Party have been kicked out for some ridiculously high number in some unjust way is just absolutely ridiculous. Perhaps it is because your members did not meet the high standards of the standing orders.

Before we all cast our vote, there is one thing that I am absolutely certain of and that is that there are so many things that happen in our lives that we cannot control, but we can control who we are in this life and how we move through this life, and we can decide to do that with integrity. I think that what is happening does not come from a place of integrity: it comes from a place of ego, and you must take a moment to reflect on that.

I am absolutely devastated and I am really disappointed. I came into this place thinking it would be a place where we would all strive to be the best versions of ourselves for the benefit of South Australians, for the benefit of the community which we represent, and what I have seen happen over the course of today falls well and truly short.

We are human and we will not always achieve and succeed in our endeavours to be the best versions of ourselves, but we have this moment, and I certainly implore everybody in this chamber to think about what does being the best version of themselves and moving through this life mean. All we have at the end of the day is moving through this life with integrity and deciding who and how we are going to be, not what role we are going to perform, not how we are going to serve our party, not how we are going to be a slave to our ego but, rather, who and how we are going to be in this life for ourselves and for something much greater than ourselves. So perhaps we can all take a moment to reflect on that and cast our votes accordingly.

The CLERK: There being two members who have accepted nominations, there must be a ballot pursuant to standing order 8. Members are required to write the name of their chosen candidate on the ballot slips being distributed. Once completed, slips can be put into the ballot box as collected by the attendants.

The house then proceeded to a ballot.

The CLERK: There being 23 votes for the member for Kavel, 21 votes for the member for Flinders and three informal votes, the member for Kavel having received an absolute majority of validly cast votes I declare the member for Kavel to be elected as Speaker of the house. Will the mover and seconder escort the member for Kavel to the chair?

Mr Cregan was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder of the motion.

The SPEAKER (Mr Cregan) (00:03): Parliament has asked for a Speaker who does not serve the executive but instead the parliament. It has done so not making a specific criticism of the skills or expertise of the previous Speaker; instead, parliament has said that the previous Speaker has been a tremendous advocate for his cause and for his party. I know that the previous Speaker will understand that when a corpus or body wishes to send a new representative or have a new officer presiding over them, that decision can be made for a number of vital and important reasons.

It is my sincere belief that the Westminster tradition of having an impartial speaker is a vital improvement to democracy in South Australia, that this is a historic moment and that we may seize that moment at a time when emergency powers are being exercised to bring to bear, if it is the will of parliament, more scrutiny on the executive.

I will well and truly serve this parliament. It is my hope that I will bring honour to the proceedings here. I take this role, as I say, without any criticism of the former Speaker but simply because a call has been made by parliament tonight to send a Speaker to preside who is not serving the interests of the executive. I have great respect for the government. I have great respect for the opposition. I hope that I can discharge my functions clearly and with great respect for all members present, and I will take into account advice given to me by both sides in hoping to see through my role. Thank you.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (00:05): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the house to sit beyond midnight.

The SPEAKER: I understand that the motion needs to be passed by an absolute majority, so I will count members present. I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: In view of the lateness of the hour, I propose with respect to the house and to members that we move to adjourn and that we take care of additional business at the sitting of the house tomorrow. I am informed by the Clerk that the minister would ordinarily advise the house about the presentation of the Speaker to the Governor.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (00:07): I move, without notice:

That the standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to allow the sitting of the house to continue until the time for presenting the Speaker to Her Excellency the Governor.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required. I have counted members and an absolute majority is present. Is the motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

Bills

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (CPIPC RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (FURTHER ADOPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 7, page 5, after line 16—Insert:

- (1a) A person must not be appointed as a member of the Multicultural Commission unless the person is an Australian citizen or a permanent resident of Australia.

No. 2. Clause 7, page 5, lines 29 and 30—

Clause 7(4)—Delete 'Commission, at least half (rounded down to the nearest whole number) must be women.' and substitute:

Commission—

- (a) at least half (rounded down to the nearest whole number) must be women; and
(b) at least 1 must be a resident in regional South Australia at the time of their appointment; and
(c) at least 1 must be less than 25 years of age at the time of their appointment.

No. 3. Clause 9, page 6, line 28 [clause 9(2)]—Delete '4' and substitute '6'

No. 4. Clause 11, page 7, after line 39—Insert—

- (ga) to raise awareness of the harm that racism and other forms of discriminatory behaviour can do to multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia;
(gb) to advise and consult with the Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity and other appropriate persons and bodies on matters relating to discrimination and racial vilification, and to refer such matters to be dealt with by such persons or bodies in circumstances where the Multicultural Commission considers it appropriate to do so.

At 00:11 the house adjourned until Wednesday 13 October 2021 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***ELECTRONIC MONITORING**

566 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). How many electronic monitoring devices does the Department for Correctional Services currently operate, as at 30 July 2021?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

999.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

567 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). How many FTEs are allocated to supervision and management of electronic monitoring?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

Electronic monitoring is overseen by Community Corrections. Community Corrections staff have broad case loads, of which a portion may be offenders subject to electronic monitoring. Therefore, an exact FTE is unable to be calculated.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

568 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Are all electronic monitoring devices of the same type? If all electronic monitoring devices are not of the same type, what is the breakdown of the numbers of different devices?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

Yes.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

569 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). What are the different levels or tiers of electronic monitoring?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

Control, change, assist and monitor.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

570 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). What are the triggers or conditions for each different level or tier of electronic monitoring?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

The department's enhanced Community Corrections service standards for each tier of supervision are built around an offender's order conditions as well as individual criminogenic needs, dynamic risk and protective factors.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

571 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). What is the average annual cost—in total and per person being electronic monitored—of each level or tier of monitoring?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

For the 2020-21 financial year the total cost was approximately \$11.3 million, equating to approximately \$11,300 per unit.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

572 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). For those whose electronic monitoring is linked to a finding of guilt, what is the breakdown of the offence categories?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) has advised:

This data is not available.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

573 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). For those whose electronic monitoring is linked to bail, what is the breakdown of the alleged offence categories?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

This data is not available.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

574 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). For those whose electronic monitoring is linked neither to a finding of guilt nor bail, what is the breakdown of reasons for electronic monitoring?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) has advised that:

All offenders supervised by DCS have either been found guilty by the court or are subject to bail proceedings.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

575 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). How many alleged breaches of electronic monitoring conditions were detected in each of the last three financial years?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) has advised:

The DCS IT system does not provide this granularity of data. Breaches may range from returning late from an approved essential reason to leave the residence to attempting to tamper with an electronic monitoring device.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

576 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). How many alleged breaches of electronic monitoring were responded to and not responded to in each of the last three financial years?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) has advised:

The DCS IT system does not provide this granularity of data. Breaches may range from returning late from an approved essential reason to leave the residence to attempting to tamper with an electronic monitoring device.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

577 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). How many breaches of electronic monitoring conditions were substantiated in each of the last three financial years?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services (DCS) has advised:

The DCS IT system does not provide this granularity of data. Breaches may range from returning late from an approved essential reason to leave the residence to attempting to tamper with an electronic monitoring device.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

578 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). What is the breakdown of penalties or sanctions, including being placed into secure custody, that arose from substantiated breaches of electronic monitoring conditions?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): Penalties and sanctions for breach of conditions are not determined by the Department for Correctional Services.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

579 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). For each of the last three financial years, what were the number and duration of system outages that affected electronic monitoring?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

- 2020-21—two outages (67 minutes and 103 minutes) and two partial outages (120 minutes and 20 minutes)
- 2019-20—two outages (70 minutes and 310 minutes) and one partial outage (86 minutes).
- 2018-19—zero outages

During a partial outage, the system remains operational, with some interruption.

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

580 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). For each of the last three financial years, how many electronic monitoring device failures were detected?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
The Department for Correctional Services has advised:

Electronic monitoring comprises multiple devices.

System outages over the last three financial years are outlined in question 579.

DUGGAN REVIEW

581 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). With regard to the independent review into police work:

(a) What were the recommendations of the independent review into police work conducted by retired Supreme Court Judge Kevin Duggan QC?

(b) When did Mr Duggan report to government?

(c) Will you make the results of the Duggan review public?

(d) Has the government acted on any of the recommendations of the Duggan review? Which ones, and what action has been taken?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
Answers to these questions are available in the publicly available document at www.premier.sa.gov.au/news/media-releases/news/delivering-on-the-duggan-review.

DRUG DETECTION DOGS

582 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Which schools have made requests for the presence of police passive alert drug detection dogs, under the new protocols agreed by Department for Education and SAPOL?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

This is a matter for the Department for Education.

REGIONAL POLICING REVIEW

583 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). When will the regional policing review be complete?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

The completion date is unknown.

REGIONAL POLICING REVIEW

584 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Will the regional policing review's recommendations be implemented in full?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

The regional policing review is yet to be completed.

REGIONAL POLICING REVIEW

585 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Can the minister guarantee that the regional policing review will not result in fewer CIB members or detectives in the regions, as opposed to the metropolitan districts?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

There is no draft recommendation within the regional policing model to reduce the number of CIB members or detectives in any regional area.

REGIONAL POLICING REVIEW

586 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Can the minister guarantee that, following the regional policing review, regional areas will receive the same level of service from police patrols, regional police stations or CIB as they do currently?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

The principle of the regional policing review has been to ensure frontline policing services are maintained in regional areas.

KALANGADOO POLICE STATION

587 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). When will the Kalangadoo Police Station reopen as promised by the member for Schubert before the last election?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

The position at the Kalangadoo Police Station will remain vacant until a decision is made regarding its future.

REGIONAL POLICING REVIEW

588 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Can the minister guarantee that the police stations at Port McDonnell, Lucindale and Beachport will not be closed as part of the implementation of the regional policing review?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

There are no draft recommendations for the closure of any police station.

KALANGADOO POLICE STATION

589 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Has the minister or the previous minister received and/or exchanged correspondence with the member for MacKillop regarding the reopening of Kalangadoo Police Station since September 2019? If so, will he provide this correspondence to the house?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
Yes. No.

CIB SERVICE

590 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Has the minister received and/or exchanged correspondence with the member for MacKillop regarding consolidation of CIB services in the South-East since September 2019? If so, will he provide this correspondence to the house?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
No.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

591 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). When will the Hindley Street Police Station cease operating on its current site at 26 Hindley Street? Is that the date that the lease was always due to expire?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

First quarter of 2022, subject to COVID-19 or other unexpected delays. The original lease has been extended.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

592 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Why did the government originally decide not to renew the Hindley Street Police Station lease beyond November 2020?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police (SAPOL) has advised:

The decision was made by SAPOL following a review of SAPOL's public safety requirements.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

593 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). When exactly was the decision made not to renew the Hindley Street Police Station lease?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
September 2020.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

594 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Is the Hindley Street Police Station lease process managed by SAPOL or another agency?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
The lease process is managed by South Australia Police.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

595 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). When was the government's original intention not to renew the Hindley Street Police Station lease on the current site conveyed to the owner? Was SAPOL negotiating to lease a new site at this time?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police (SAPOL) has advised:

The owner of the existing Hindley Street Police Station was advised as per the terms of the lease. Information regarding SAPOL's negotiation of new lease terms is commercial-in-confidence.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

596 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). When was a new site for Hindley Street Police Station identified?

- (a) When does that lease take effect?
- (b) When will that site be ready and fully operational as a police station?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

The new site was identified as a potential alternative in May 2020.

- (a) To be determined.
- (b) In the first quarter of 2022, subject to COVID-19 and other unexpected delays.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

597 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). When did SAPOL begin negotiations to extend the current Hindley Street Police Station lease beyond November 2020?

- (a) What was the plan before that point?
- (b) What was the minister's expectation about how police services were to be provided between November and May 2021?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

Late August 2020.

- (a) To align the occupancy of the current station to the relocation time frame for completion of a new station.
- (b) Business as usual.

ROMA MITCHELL HOUSE

598 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Will the patrol base at Roma Mitchell building have the same level of security and safety as the current site?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

Roma Mitchell building is not intended to be used as a Hindley Street patrol base at this time.

ROMA MITCHELL HOUSE

599 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). Will firearms be stored, loaded and unloaded at the Roma Mitchell building patrol base? What precautions have been made, as they would at a new police station, to ensure safety for police there and for other tenants of that building?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):
South Australia Police has advised:

Roma Mitchell building is not intended to be used as a Hindley Street patrol base at this time.

BUSHFIRE SEASON REVIEW

600 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (25 August 2021). On what date will each of the following actions, arising from the independent review of South Australia's 2019-20 bushfire season, led by former Australian Federal Police Commissioner Mick Keelty, be complete:

- (a) Provide thermal imaging cameras for each of the 55 CFS groups?
- (b) Undertake disaster risk reduction strategies focusing on protection of critical infrastructure under the \$16.7m joint commonwealth/state disaster resilience and risk reduction package?
- (c) Create a monitoring system to capture real-time data from a range of systems onto a common picture to assist the state emergency centre with decision-making during emergencies?
- (d) Develop a lightning tracking system to assist with early detection and rapid response to lightning ignitions?
- (e) Additional BOM resources to support state emergency centre decision-makers?
- (f) Increased investment in emergency alert, for improved emergency warnings?
- (g) Australian Fire Danger Rating System—towards the latest fire science to better inform the community during extreme fire weather?
- (h) Provide additional public education on high-risk activities during periods of high fire danger?
- (i) Implement the agreed outcomes of the 2019 Operation Nomad review?
- (j) Enhance Alert SA to improve bushfire warnings, grass and bushfires to watch zones?
- (k) Design space for the ABC emergency broadcaster into the new state control centre?
- (l) Undertake a major overhaul of education programs to refocus messaging that will improve understanding of key information such as the role of places of last resort, hazard reduction application processes, fuel reduction strategies and the importance of bushfire plans?
- (m) Clarify SAFECOM's enabling functions and commence consultation on a department model for SAFECOM?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):

The South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission (SAFECOM) have advised:

- (a) 11 November 2020.
- (b) January-June 2022.
- (c) 29 April 2021.
- (d) 28 January 2021.
- (e) August 2021.
- (f) 27 October 2020.
- (g) July 2022.
- (h) 8 December 2020.
- (i) 28 January 2021.
- (j) 27 October 2020.
- (k) 27 October 2020.
- (l) Multiple suite of actions:
 - Educate community to clarify expectations on limitations of hazard reduction—25 November 2020.
 - Reinforce messaging for individuals to prepare their homes and have a bushfire plan—25 November 2020.
 - Improve understanding of the role of places of last resort—25 November 2020.
 - Continue to clarify and educate the community on language between emergency and evacuation – progressing.
 - Improve CFS website to better distinguish between the warning message polygon and the fire boundary—14 May 2021.
- (m) 29 January 2021.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

601 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What percentage of category 3 SA ambulance call-outs were reached within 60 minutes over each of the past two financial years?

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

SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) does not triage triple zero (000) calls based on categories, rather they are triaged based on priorities.

SAAS tracks priority 3 calls internally as percentages responded to within 30 minutes and does not routinely use 60 minutes as a benchmark for this.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

602 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What was the average wait time for category 3 ambulance call-out over each of the two financial years?

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

SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) does not triage triple zero (000) calls based on categories, rather they are triaged based on priorities.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

603 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the total spend to date on legal fees in representing SAAS and the Department for Health and Wellbeing in the SA Employment Tribunal on matters including ramping, late cribs, on call and overtime brought by the Ambulance Employees Association?

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

\$691,000.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL CAR PARK

604 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What was the total revenue for hospital car parking at TQEH for each individual month over the past two financial years?

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

Total revenue for hospital car parking at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital for each individual month over the past two financial years is:

	2019-20	2020-21
July	112,699	34,381
August	90,291	43,738
September	90,855	46,368
October	103,760	42,338
November	93,392	25,623
December	108,517	23,593
January	150,793	18,988
February	174,426	25,176
March	179,310	68,611
April	112,784	71,705
May	7,506	80,339
June	34,273	73,857
Total	1,258,608	554,717

REGIONAL HOSPITALS

605 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the total spend to date on legal fees in representing SAAS and which regional hospitals have medical coverage solely from locum doctors?

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

Millicent and District Hospital and Health Service has had medical coverage provided solely by locums for the last five years. This is a planned approach, as there is a long-term contract in place with one locum provider, which was won by a tender process.

Balaklava Soldiers' Memorial District Hospital, Booleroo Centre District Hospital and Health Services, Peterborough Soldiers' Memorial Hospital, Port Lincoln Health Service, Port Augusta Hospital and Coober Pedy Hospital currently have medical coverage solely from locum doctors.

REGIONAL HOSPITALS

606 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). In the past three years which regional hospitals have moved to only having locum doctors providing coverage at the hospital?

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

Balaklava Soldiers' Memorial District Hospital, Booleroo Centre District Hospital and Health Services, and Peterborough Soldiers' Memorial Hospital, Port Lincoln Health Service and Port Augusta Hospital have moved to a reliance on locum doctors providing medical coverage over the past three years.

HEALTH BUDGET

607 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the budget savings task for the health portfolio for this financial year, and for each year of the forward estimates?

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

SA Health has been allocated a cumulative savings target as at the 2021-22 state budget for 2021-22 and across the forward estimates of:

- 2021-22: \$80 million.
- 2022-23: \$160 million.
- 2023-24: \$240 million.
- 2024-25: \$320 million.

BOWEL CANCER TESTING

608 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the total overdue wait list for colonoscopies following bowel cancer screening tests, on the latest available data?

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

As at 15 August 2021, a total of 678 patients on a South Australian public hospital colonoscopy waiting list were overdue for an initial screening colonoscopy.

BOWEL CANCER TESTING

609 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the URL for the updated data on the waitlist for colonoscopies following a bowel cancer screening test?

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

The latest available data on gastroenterology wait times is available in the Specialist Outpatient Waiting Time Report. This can be found on the SA Health website: <https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+internet/about+us/our+performance/specialist+outpatient+waiting+time+report/specialist+outpatient+waiting+time+report>.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

610 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). How many patients in the past year waited over a year for elective surgery operations?

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

In the 2020-21 financial year, there were 4,392 patients who waited over a year for their elective surgery operations.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

611 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). Can you provide the breakdown by LHN of all outsourced elective surgery, number of surgeries, and cost of outsourced surgery in total?

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

The total number of outsourced elective surgery under the SA Health Patient Services Panel for the period 1 July 2019 to 31 July 2021 is:

Local Health Network	Total Price \$ (Ex GST)	Number of procedures
Central Adelaide	20,119,126	2,205
Northern Adelaide	13,468,192	2,789
Southern Adelaide	3,099,137	871
Women's and Children's	857,485	229
TOTAL	37,543,940	6,094

ELECTIVE SURGERY

612 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). Can you provide the list by private hospital of the outsourced elective surgery operations and total expenditure by each private hospital?

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

As at 24 August 2021, the total expenditure for outsourced elective surgery operations by private hospitals under the Patient Services Panel for the period 1 July 2019 to 31 July 2021 is:

Hospital Provider	Total Price \$ (Ex GST)	Number of Procedures
Adelaide Community Healthcare Alliance Inc. (ACHA)	11,528,373	1,830
Adelaide Day Surgery	635,374	145
Calvary Health Care Adelaide Limited	12,030,462	2,018
Glenelg Community Hospital	1,067,510	532
Healthscope Parkwyn Griffith	13,959	3
North Eastern Community Hospital	1,042,290	307
Northern Endoscopy Centre	61,702	65
Ramsay Health Care SA	885,979	52
Seaford Day Surgery	25,295	15
Sportsmed Hospital	286,030	45
St Andrews Hospital Incorporated	7,717,804	496
Tennyson Centre Day Hospital	939,288	469
Western Hospital	1,309,873	117
TOTAL	37,543,940	6,094

HEALTH BUDGET

613 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). For each of the past two financial years, what has been the total cost of payments made to MSS, Spotless and ISS?

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

The following table summarises the total cost of payments to MSS, Spotless and ISS:

	2019-20	2020-21
MSS	\$32,492,930	\$68,625,972
Spotless (Downer)*	\$22,860,269	\$9,740,398
ISS Healthcare Services	\$53,475,647	\$57,296,369

*The cost of Spotless services to the Royal Adelaide Hospital is incorporated into the public private partnership quarterly service payment. The table does not include the RAH PPP.

OUTPATIENT APPOINTMENTS

615 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). How many people are currently on public waiting lists for an outpatient appointment, broken down by hospital?

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

This data is published regularly.

MY HOME HOSPITAL

616 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What has been the total expenditure on My Home Hospital to date broken down by private provider, and how many patients have been treated to date?

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

Wellbeing SA contracts one provider to deliver the My Home Hospital service, a joint venture between Calvary and Medibank (Calvary MHIH JV Pty Ltd).

Between 13 January 2021 (the first patient admission) and 26 August 2021, My Home Hospital has provided hospital-level treatment to 922 patients in the safety and privacy of their own home.

As at 31 July 2021, the most recent billing period, My Home Hospital had treated 690 patients for which the Calvary-Medibank JV has invoiced Wellbeing SA a total of \$3,169,069.

PRIORITY CARE CENTRES

617 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the total cost of the entire priority care centre program since it was started (including the cost of all sites, payments and seconded nurses and staff from LHNs)?

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

Priority care centres contract and nursing costs from pilot phase, which commenced August 2019, to 30 June 2021 total \$7,747,547.

PRIORITY CARE CENTRES

618 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). In the past financial year, how many patients have been seen in total in priority care centres?

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

In the 2020-21 financial year a total of 13,454 patients were seen at a priority care centre.

GP LIAISON OFFICERS

619 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). How many GP liaison officers are employed in each metro LHN in the past financial year, and what was the total cost of the GP liaison program?

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

As at 24 August 2021, there were three GP liaison officers, individually employed through the Adelaide Primary Health Network. The GP liaison officers work at the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

The GP liaison officers are funded through the Adelaide Primary Health Network by the commonwealth government.

NURSING GRADUATES

620 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). How many nursing graduates applied for graduate positions across the health portfolio last financial year?

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

The total number of nursing graduates that applied for graduate positions across the health portfolio in the 2020-21 financial year was 1,379.

NURSING GRADUATES

621 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). How many nursing graduates were accepted into graduate positions across the Health portfolio last financial year?

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

The total number of nursing graduates accepted into graduate positions across the health portfolio in the 2020-21 financial year was 596.

PORT AUGUSTA AMBULANCE STATION

622 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the total FTE for staffing the Port Augusta ambulance station, both now and following the upgrade completion?

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

The Port Augusta SA Ambulance Service station currently has 16 FTE, with the intent to increase to 24 FTE to remove the on-call roster.

WOODLEIGH HOUSE

623 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What was the total operational cost last financial year for Woodleigh House?

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

For the 2020-21 financial year the total operational cost for Woodleigh House was \$6,953,000.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH UNIT

624 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What was the total operational cost last financial year for the older persons mental health unit at Lyell McEwin Hospital?

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

For the 2020-21 financial year the total operational cost for the older persons mental health unit at Lyell McEwin Hospital was in excess of \$20,000,000.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

625 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the average waiting time between an initial call to DASSA seeking drug and alcohol counselling, and provision of initial counselling?

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

The average waiting time at Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia in the April to June 2021 quarter, from when a new client makes an outpatient appointment for alcohol or other drug counselling to when that appointment occurs was seven days in the metropolitan region, and an average of ten days in regional South Australia.

All people requesting a counselling appointment are prioritised according to their need and presenting risk factors, the highest priority patients for medication assisted treatment can generally be seen the same day.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

626 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the total budget and FTE for DASSA this financial year, and actual spend and FTE for last financial year?

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

The total budget for Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia for the 2021-22 financial year is \$53.095 million and the FTE is 198.

Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia's actual spend last financial year 2020-21 was \$38.4 million and the FTE was 181.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

627 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). How many drug and alcohol rehabilitation beds are publicly run across the state and what is the total cost of all drug and alcohol rehabilitation beds?

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

Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia currently funds and operates 34 beds dedicated to alcohol and other drug rehabilitation incorporating:

- 24 beds at the Woolshed Residential Rehabilitation Service located at Ashbourne in the Adelaide Hills; and,
- 10 step-down beds at halfway houses located in Adelaide aligned to the Woolshed Service.

The actual cost of these publicly run beds in 2020-21 was \$1.165 million.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

628 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). How many people are currently on a waiting list for a drug and alcohol rehabilitation bed?

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

In relation to SA Health operated residential rehabilitation services, as at 30 August 2021, the Woolshed therapeutic community operated by Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia had 13 people on the waiting list.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES

629 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (24 August 2021). What is the breakdown of DASSA's contracts for the past financial year over \$100,000, including total cost and term of the contract, service provided, and name of the provider?

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

Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia had eleven contracts in place over \$100,000 in the 2020-21 financial year, detailed in the below table:

Service provider	Cost (2020-21)	Cost -full period of contract (incl. variations/extensions)	Term of contract	Service provided
South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute	\$741,649 (GST Excl) \$815,814 (GST Incl)	\$ 6,110,601(GST Excl) \$6,721,662 (GST Incl)	1 July 2013 – 30 June 2022 (9 years)	Provision of tobacco
Cancer Council Victoria	\$200,000 (GST Excl) \$220,000 (GST Incl) (Contract commenced 1 January 2021)	\$1,230,250 (GST Excl) \$1,353,275 (GST Incl)	1 January 2021 – 31 December 2023 (3 years)	Provision of Quitline telephone-based smoking cessation counselling service.
Cancer Council SA	\$367,719 (GST Excl) \$404,491 (GST Incl) (Contract expired 31 December 2021)	\$4,585,219 (GST Excl) \$5,043,741 (GST Incl)	1 July 2014 – 31 December 2020 (5.5 years)	Provision of Quitline telephone-based
Cancer Council SA	\$106,648 (GST Excl) \$117,313 (GST Incl)	\$450,061 (GST Excl) \$495,067 (GST Incl)	1 October 2016 – 30 September 2021 (5 years)	Evaluation services for the Tackling Smoking tobacco cessation programs, provided as part of the South Australian Government's Closing the Gap initiative.
Nunkuwarnin Yunti	\$189,625 (GST Excl) \$208,588 (GST Incl)	\$1,075,260 (GST Excl) \$1,182,787 (GST Incl)	1 October 2016 – 30 June 2021 (4.75 years)	Tackling Smoking tobacco cessation service provided as part of the South Australian Government's Closing the Gap initiative.

Service provider	Cost (2020-21)	Cost -full period of contract (incl. variations/extensions)	Term of contract	Service provided
Port Lincoln Aboriginal Health Service	\$261,893 (GST Excl) \$288,083 (GST Incl)	\$1,290,303 (GST Excl) \$1,419,334 (GST Incl)	1 October 2016 – 30 June 2021 (4.75 years)	Tackling Smoking tobacco cessation service provided as part of the South Australian Government's Closing the Gap initiative.
Aboriginal Health Council of SA	\$209,279 (GST Excl) \$230,207 (GST Incl)	\$946,678 (GST Excl) \$1,041,346 (GST Incl)	1 July 2016 – 30 June 2021 (5 years)	Tackling Smoking tobacco cessation service provided as part of the South Australian Government's Closing the Gap initiative.
Hepatitis SA	\$535,305 (GST Excl) \$588,836 (GST Incl)	\$3,502,322 (GST Excl) \$3,852,554 (GST Incl)	1 July 2014—30 June 2021 (7 years)	Clean Needle Program Primary Sites Project, PLUS Clean Needle
Hepatitis SA	\$136,189 (GST Excl) \$149,808 (GST Incl)	\$468,735 (GST Excl) \$515,609 (GST Incl)	1 July 2017—30 June 2021 (4 years)	Clean Needle Program Transitional Sessional Peer Education Support Project
Community and Access Services SA (Vietnamese Community in Australia – SA Chapter)	\$129,789 (GST Excl) \$142,768 (GST Incl)	\$730,207 (GST Excl) \$803,228 (GST Incl)	1 July 2015—30 June 2021 (6 years)	Vietnamese Community Project Clean Needle Program
Pharmacy Guild of Australia (SA Branch)	\$91,105 (GST Excl) \$100,216 (GST Incl)	\$517,021 (GST Excl) \$568,723 (GST Incl)	1 July 2015—30 June 2021 (6 years)	Clean Needle Program Pharmacy Scheme

TOURISM OPERATORS

630 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is SA's total number of tourism operators?

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

According to the latest data from Tourism Research Australia, in the 2019-20 financial year, there were a total of 18,572 tourism businesses in South Australia.'

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

631 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What number of eligible tourism operators were offered to sign up for round 3 of the Great State Voucher scheme?

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

Around 500 tourism businesses which offer hosted tours and experiences received a direct email inviting them to submit an expression of interest for the program.

The program was also advertised publicly to the wider tourism industry through the South Australian Tourism Commission's email and social media channels.

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

632 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is the breakdown of \$50, \$100 and \$200 vouchers in round 3 of the Great State Voucher scheme?

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

The following numbers of vouchers were allocated:

45,000 vouchers were allocated to South Australians with the breakdown as follows:

- \$50 travel vouchers: 10,000

- \$100 travel vouchers: 33,000
- \$200 travel vouchers: 2,000

5,000 vouchers were allocated to residents of Victoria and New South Wales with the breakdown as follows:

- \$50 travel vouchers: 500
- \$100 travel vouchers: 3,000
- \$200 travel vouchers: 1,500

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

633 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many vouchers were redeemed in round 3 of the Great State Voucher scheme and what was the breakdown of the redemption rate?

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

The overall redemption rate was 48 per cent. The redemption breakdown is as follows:

- \$50 vouchers: 44 per cent
- \$100 vouchers: 53 per cent
- \$200 vouchers for overnight hosted experiences: 4 per cent

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

634 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many providers signed up for round 4 of the Great State Voucher scheme?

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

240 operators participated in round 4 of the Great State Voucher scheme.

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

635 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What was the breakdown of vouchers allocated for round 4 of the Great State Voucher scheme?

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

50,700 vouchers were allocated to South Australians with the breakdown as follows:

- \$50 vouchers: 9,200
- \$100 vouchers: 41,500

6,800 vouchers were allocated to interstate residents with the breakdown as follows:

- \$50 vouchers: 800
- \$100 vouchers: 6,000

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

636 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many vouchers have been redeemed for round 4 of the Great State Voucher scheme and what was the breakdown of the redemption rate?

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

The total number of vouchers redeemed at the end of the booking period for round 4 of the Great State Voucher program was 34,035.

The breakdown for these was as follows:

- \$100 vouchers for CBD and North Adelaide: 30,214
- \$50 vouchers for regions and suburban Adelaide: 3,821

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

637 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many further rounds of the Great State Voucher scheme does the government intend to administer?

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

The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) announced rounds 5 and 6 of the Great State Voucher program on 15 August.

Round 5 will be launched on 13 September and will focus on hosted and guided activities and tours. The travel period will run from 17 September to 28 November 2021.

Round 6 will launch on 23 September and offer accommodation vouchers for CBD/North Adelaide. The travel period will run from 23 September to 10 December 2021.

As in previous rounds, the SATC will review the impact of rounds 5 and 6 before confirming any possible future rounds.

GREAT STATE VOUCHER SCHEME

638 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Does the publicly announced economic impact figured from the Great State Voucher scheme include the amount contributed by the travel vouchers? If yes, what is the breakdown between government and public contributions up until round 4 of the scheme?

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

The impact figure includes the value of the voucher. More than \$60 million of tourism expenditure has so far been generated by the vouchers. A total of \$10.7 million was paid for by the South Australian Tourism Commission to operators, with the remainder generated by the public.

LEISURE EVENTS BID FUND

639 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many projects have been funded by the Leisure Events Bid Fund in the 2020-21 period?

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

18 projects have been funded by the Leisure Events Bid Fund in 2020-21.

LEISURE EVENTS BID FUND

640 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many projects funded by the Leisure Events Bid Fund in the 2020-21 period have never been held in South Australia before?

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

In 2020-21, there were 10 projects that had not been held in South Australia before.

It is important to note that events such as NRL State of Origin, which is secured for a second time some years down the track, are the result of new negotiations and are secured based on the economic, marketing and social benefits they deliver for South Australia.

LEISURE EVENTS BID FUND

641 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is the breakdown of funding that has been allocated to each project funded by the Leisure Events Bid Fund in the 2020-21 period and the planned allocation for the 2021-22 period?

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

The details of sponsorship payments for events are subject to contractual confidentiality restrictions, and therefore cannot be disclosed.

Further, the information has commercial value to the South Australian Tourism Commission and third parties, and disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to diminish or destroy its commercial value.

Disclosing this information would also prejudice the future supply of such information as it would reveal third parties' highly sensitive commercial and financial information. This would place third parties at a significant disadvantage in a competitive event sector and in turn, weaken the state's competitiveness in securing new events.

LEISURE EVENTS BID FUND

642 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Who makes the final determination for projects applying for funding under the Leisure Events Bid Fund?

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

Since the inception of the Leisure Events Bid Fund in 2014-15, the decision for funding lies with the South Australian Tourism Commission.

LEISURE EVENTS BID FUND

643 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is cabinet approval required for successful applications for funding under the Leisure Events Bid Fund?

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

Since the inception of the Leisure Events Bid Fund in 2014-15, cabinet approval has not been required for successful applications for funding.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

644 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How much money did the South Australian Tourism Commission allocate for marketing to New Zealand?

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

In 2020-21, the South Australian Tourism Commission allocated \$1.8 million for marketing in New Zealand.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

645 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Did the South Australian Tourism Commission have key performance indicators or a target percentage of New Zealand visitors and, if so, what were they?

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

The key performance indicators include increasing awareness, consideration and bookings of South Australia as a holiday destination as well as recommending direct airline access into Adelaide from Auckland.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

646 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Has the South Australian Tourism Commission investigated into other prospective travel bubble locations and, if so, what locations are being considered?

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

The South Australian Tourism Commission continues to work with Tourism Australia and airlines to ensure the State is in the best position to capitalise on the opening of international travel bubbles when they are announced by the federal government.

TOURISM MARKETING BUDGET

647 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). As there is a budgeted \$9.3 million cut from the tourism marketing budget, will the Minister or the South Australian Tourism Commission seek additional funding from the Jobs and Economic Growth Fund for tourism marketing?

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

There has not been a reduction in marketing of \$9.3 million in 2021-22. The 2021-22 budget for marketing has remained consistent with the original budget for 2020-21 and actuals for 2019-20. The \$9.3 million decrease in tourism marketing from 2020-21 estimated result to 2021-22 budget is predominantly due to spending more than usual in 2020-21 on the Great State Voucher stimulus measures to further boost the visitor economy and local jobs.

RIVERBANK ARENA

648 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is the South Australian Tourism Commission going to be involved in the marketing and promotion of the proposed Riverbank Arena?

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

The project sits within the remit of Adelaide Venue Management.

STATE BUDGET

649 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Why does the capital spend in the 2021-22 state budget indicate that there will be a large increase of approximately \$5.8 million in the 2023-24 financial year?

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

The increase is due to the accounting treatment of the South Australian Tourism Commission's (SATC) head office lease. Under the Australian Accounting Standards, leases are capitalised and subsequently amortised over the life of the lease. The SATC's head office lease is due to expire in March 2024, at which time a new lease will be entered into for office accommodation. The increase in the capital budget in 2023-24 reflects the estimated discounted future value of all ensuing lease payments over the life of the lease.'

REGIONAL TOURISM

650 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). With regard to regional tourism, is the government going to give targeted support to regional areas where expenditure has dropped significantly?

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

The government has announced two further rounds of the successful Great State Voucher (GSV) program. The GSV program was established to drive expenditure back into the Adelaide CBD and regions by increasing accommodation occupancy. The voucher program has been successful in providing targeted stimulus where it was

needed the most, the Adelaide CBD, regional accommodation and hosted tourism experiences. The first four rounds have injected more than \$60 million into our visitor economy right across the state.

Rounds 5 and 6 were announced on 15 August. Round 5 will focus on hosted and guided activities and tours. Round 6 will offer accommodation vouchers for regional and CBD accommodation.

As in previous rounds, the South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) will assess the economic impact of rounds 5 and 6, and take advice from the sector, before considering future rounds.

An additional \$1 million has been provided to support regional events in South Australia annually from 2021-22 onwards. Round 2 of the Regional Event Fund is currently open and successful applicants are expected to be announced in November 2021. This additional support represents a 50 per cent increase in available funding through the fund, which means more events will receive support.

The SATC continues to focus on supporting airlines that link South Australia with its key tourism markets, which includes providing marketing support to promote the destinations to which they fly. Kangaroo Island has been particularly impacted by bushfires and COVID-19 and SATC has sought additional funding support from the federal government's Recovery for Regional Tourism program.

The SATC maintains close links with each regional tourism manager, providing the agency with clear and direct feedback on issues facing regional operators.

The SATC also continues to engage broadly with the tourism sector, businesses and other stakeholders to ensure we are doing what is needed for our regions and state to recover strongly.

TOURISM

651 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is the projected time line for the visitor economy expenditure to return to its pre COVID-19 high of \$8.1 billion?

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

It is anticipated that the visitor economy will return to the pre COVID-19 high of \$8.1 billion in the first quarter of 2024.

CRUISE SHIP INDUSTRY

652 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, what was the average number of cruise ships porting in South Australia?

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

South Australia hosted 82 cruise ship visits in the 2018-19 cruise ship season.

CRUISE SHIP INDUSTRY

653 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is the estimated economic impact by the decrease in cruise ship visits to South Australia?

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

The most recent cruise ship season (2019-20) saw a decrease in economic contribution due to the bushfires and COVID-19. In 2019-20, \$122 million was generated, compared to \$145 million in the 2018-19 cruise ship season.

The human biosecurity emergency period under the Biosecurity Act 2015 has been extended until 17 December 2021, restricting entry of cruise vessels within Australian territory. Therefore, there is no data for the 2020-21 cruise ship season.'

CRUISE SHIP INDUSTRY

654 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What advocacy has the South Australian government provided on behalf of the cruise ship sector?

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

The South Australian government has been in discussions with the federal government, key industry stakeholders (including the Cruise Line Industry Association Australasia (CLIA) and the Australian Cruise Association) along with domestic and international cruise lines, working towards a safe resumption of cruise framework for Australia and South Australia.

The human biosecurity emergency period under the Biosecurity Act 2015 has been extended until 17 December 2021, restricting entry of cruise vessels within Australian territory.

CRUISE SHIP INDUSTRY

655 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Has the government conducted any feasibility studies into the construction of infrastructure that would support South Australia cruise ship industry?

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

The state government has not undertaken any feasibility studies into the construction of cruise ship infrastructure. However, the South Australian Tourism Commission has contributed funding to the City of Victor Harbor to undertake a feasibility study into the development of a recreational boating facility that would also have capacity to support cruise ship tender vessels.

TOURISM INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT FUND

656 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is the total number of applications that have been made for the Tourism Industry Development Fund?

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

As at 7 September 2021, there have been 198 applications submitted under the Tourism Industry Development Fund.

Out of these, 71 projects have been approved, with a combined project value of more than \$41.6 million and a grant amount of \$11.1 million.

TOURISM INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT FUND

657 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Are there regional quotas for the Tourism Industry Development Fund?

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

There are no regional quotas for the Tourism Industry Development Fund. Each project is assessed on its merit and must meet all eligibility criteria outlined in the program guidelines.

There have been approved projects from all eleven tourism regions.

TOURISM INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT FUND

658 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How is the government and the SATC measuring success of projects funded under the Tourism Industry Development Fund?

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

The success of the projects funded under the Tourism Industry Development Fund is measured through:

- The number of jobs created during construction of the project and the ongoing tourism jobs in the business.
- The projected jobs generated outside of the grant recipient business to the broader local economy.
- Projected additional visitor expenditure to the region.
- The return on investment from total funding amount awarded against total private investment.
- Delivery of the priorities specific to the region contained in the Regional Visitor Strategy 2025.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

659 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Who has access to the list of organisations that the office of multicultural affairs and/or the South Australia Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission have in their databases?

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

Multicultural affairs maintains a confidential database comprising key contacts within the multicultural community. This database is only accessible to employees within the office of multicultural affairs.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

660 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is authorisation required when using either the office of multicultural affairs or the South Australia Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission databases? If so, whose authorisation is required?

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

Authorisation is required from the director, multicultural affairs to use any office of multicultural affairs or the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission databases.'

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

661 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is it possible to check if any copies have been made of data held by the department of multicultural affairs or the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission?

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

Any data held by multicultural affairs or South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission is only held for appropriate purposes.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

662 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How does the Premier and the Assistant Minister to the Premier divide responsibilities for the multicultural affairs portfolio?

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

The Premier and the Assistant Minister to the Premier divide responsibilities for the multicultural affairs portfolio as appropriate.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

663 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many staff are employed in the Assistant Minister to the Premier's office?

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

While no staff are employed by the assistant minister, the Premier's office allocates 0.5 FTE to support the assistant minister.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL BILL

664 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Why didn't the original version of the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020 include recognition of First Nations peoples given this was raised multiple times in the consultation and review process of the bill?

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

In the drafting of the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020, careful consideration was given to how to most appropriately recognise First Nations peoples within the legislation, in response to feedback received during the review consultation process.

In keeping with feedback received in the review consultation, the government considered it most fitting for provisions recognising First Nations peoples to be contained within the South Australian Multicultural Charter. The bill therefore provides for the development of the South Australian Multicultural Charter following the passage of the legislation, to set out principles of multiculturalism and essentially provide a foundation for new multicultural policy for our state.

It is the government's intention that the charter will be a highly visible and accessible document and as such, would be a more powerful way of recognising First Nations people.

For this reason, clause 18(2)(b) of the bill stipulates that the charter must contain 'provisions recognising the Aboriginal peoples of South Australia and their role in the diversity of the people of South Australia'.

Following the introduction of the bill, community feedback was received about the need to strengthen the parliamentary declaration, which resulted in an expanded parliamentary declaration, incorporating the recognition of First Nations peoples.

This inclusion has not changed the original intent of the bill, which will see the South Australian Multicultural Charter contain provisions recognising First Nations people.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

665 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many people applied to be members of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission?

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

A total of 129 submissions were received for positions on the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

666 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How much did the application process for appointing the new South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission cost?

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

The cost of engaging the recruitment agency Hender Consulting was \$37,500 (GST exclusive), plus advertising costs of \$7,662.64 (GST exclusive).

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

667 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Do the South Australia Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Board members complete a register of interests and, if so, is that register publicly available?

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

The South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission members complete a Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form to declare any real, perceived or potential conflicts of interest in relation to their appointment. The completed forms are internal documents and are not publicly available.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

668 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Are the projects funded under the Multicultural Grants Program publicly available?

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

Projects funded under the Multicultural Grants Program are publicly available on the multicultural affairs website—www.dpc.sa.gov.au/responsibilities/multicultural-affairs/grants.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

669 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is the breakdown of funding allocated to each of the Multicultural Grants Programs?

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

Multicultural affairs does not release information related to the sum of money in each grant stream.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

670 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How is the Multicultural Grants program advertised to multicultural organisations?

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

Multicultural affairs distributes email messages promoting the Multicultural Grants Program to their distribution list of more than 1,500 multicultural contacts.

The Multicultural Grants Program is also promoted on the multicultural affairs website www.dpc.sa.gov.au/responsibilities/multicultural-affairs/grants/celebrate-together-grants and GRANTassist website www.grantassist.sa.gov.au/

Further, the Multicultural Grants Program is advertised via social media platforms Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn.

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

671 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What was the total amount of money allocated for grants pertaining to multicultural affairs?

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

The total amount of money allocated for multicultural grants in 2020-21 was \$3,031,211. However, due to COVID-19 restrictions and the cancellation of events, the total grants paid was \$2,767,261.'

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

672 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What was the split between metropolitan and regional for recipients of grant funding pertaining to multicultural affairs?

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

In 2020-21, regional grant recipients received 5 per cent of the total grant funding, and metropolitan grant recipients received 95 per cent.

Multicultural organisations tend to be based in the metropolitan area. Only 3 per cent of the grant applicants in 2020-21 were located in regional areas.'

MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

673 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many grants pertaining to multicultural affairs from the 2020-2021 period remain unacquitted?

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

As at 31 August 2021, 32 grants from the 2020-21 period remain unacquitted.

ADELAIDE VENUE MANAGEMENT CORPORATION

674 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What modelling has the Adelaide Venue Management Corporation done to project a 192 FTE increase to staffing by 2022?

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

The full-time equivalents (FTE) figures referenced in Budget Paper 3, page 81 of the 2021-22 state budget are reflective of AVM's financial targets across the forward estimates and AVM's anticipation of returning to its pre COVID-19 business activity levels. AVM is constantly monitoring the ever-evolving impact of COVID-19 on the business conditions under which it operates and will submit updated financial forecasts to the Treasurer as part of the 2021-22 Mid-Year Budget Review process with a decrease to FTE's expected to be submitted for approval.'

ADELAIDE VENUE MANAGEMENT CORPORATION

675 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Are there any specific events that the Adelaide Venue Management Corporation are targeting to achieve their projections for the increase in staffing?

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

The full-time equivalents (FTE) figures referenced in the Budget Paper 3, page 81 of the 2021-22 state budget are reflective of AVM's financial targets across the forward estimates and AVM's anticipation of returning to its pre COVID-19 business activity levels, and are not related to any specific events. AVM is constantly monitoring the ever-evolving impact of COVID-19 on the business conditions under which it operates and will submit updated financial forecasts to the Treasurer as part of the 2021-22 Mid-Year Budget Review process with a decrease to FTE's expected to be submitted for approval.

ADELAIDE VENUE MANAGEMENT CORPORATION

676 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What grants and subsidies were provided to the Adelaide Venue Management Corporation as referred to on Budget Paper 3, page 71 of the 2021-22 state budget?

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

The grants and subsidies provided to Adelaide Venue Management Corporation (AVM) referred to on Budget Paper 3, page 71 of the 2021-2022 State Budget, are provided by the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF), and relate to interest payments and guarantee fees on an interest only loan from the South Australian Financing Authority (SAFA), used to fund the redevelopment of the Adelaide Convention Centre (ACC).

AVM has managed the ACC since 2015 when it took responsibility for the Adelaide Convention Centre Corporation.

The ACC redevelopment project budget was \$396.821 million with approval to draw down \$382.321 million in borrowings. The balance of the project cost was funded from AVM's future asset replacement account.

The ACC redevelopment project was to be wholly funded by a capital injection to the ACC through state Australian government grant funding. However, as part of the 2012-13 budget process, cabinet approved a change in funding arrangements to an interest only loan facility to be provided by SAFA to the Adelaide Convention Centre Corporation. It is understood that the grant funding was diverted to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment project. At that time, cabinet also approved that the ACC would be provided with an annual grant equivalent to the interest repayments and guarantee fees on the loan. AVM received \$19.1 million in 2020-21, in relation to the grant which was subsequently paid to SAFA.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION BUREAU

677 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Has the Adelaide Convention Bureau formed any recovery plans or strategies to aid South Australia's convention sector?

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

This is a matter for the Adelaide Convention Bureau.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION BUREAU

678 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Has the Adelaide Convention Bureau been liaising with the Events Advisory Group or the South Australian Tourism Commission formally to attract new conventions to South Australia?

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

No, the Adelaide Convention Bureau works directly with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to secure business events for the state.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION BUREAU

680 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is the Adelaide Convention Bureau going to receive \$1.25 million per year funding on an ongoing basis?

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

The Adelaide Convention Bureau will receive \$1.25 million per year through to FY 2024-25.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

681 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Why was it decided not to increase any performance targets for the Department for Trade and Investment?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

I have given consideration to the challenging global economic environment and the aspirational nature of the Department for Trade and Investment's existing performance measures and believe they consist of extremely ambitious job creation, export and investment attraction objectives for South Australia.

MEAT AND MEAT PREPARATIONS INDUSTRY

682 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How is the government supporting the meat and meat preparations industry after a 32 per cent decrease since 2018 as per the SA Overseas Goods Exports figures and how many jobs are at risk from this decrease?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised:

The decrease in meat and meat preparations since 2018 correlates directly with the catastrophic Thomas Foods International (TFI) abattoir fire in January 2018. TFI is South Australia's largest supplier and exporter of meat and meat preparations, so stopping production at its largest South Australian facility has an immediate effect on the production and export of meat and meat preparations.

Since the fire, the Marshall Liberal government and my department, through case management services, has facilitated the commitment of TFI to rebuild in Murray Bridge.

Thomas Foods International is building a new state-of-the-art processing facility on a greenfield site north of Murray Bridge. The new facility will be a massive boost for the regional economy, exports, and jobs.

The South Australian and Australian governments will facilitate the necessary utilities (electricity, gas, water and sewer) and road infrastructure at an estimated cost of approximately \$24 million, to ensure the significant Thomas Foods International operations rebuild takes place in South Australia.

Local construction company BADGE has been awarded the contract to construct the new processing facility.

Construction of the facility is underway with civil works recently starting on site. Construction of the road to the site and the intersection at Mannum Road is complete.

Renewal SA is working with gas and electricity providers to deliver electricity and gas utility infrastructure to the site. The northern electricity line is already constructed and energised.

SA Water is developing the water and sewer utility infrastructure, with all utility infrastructure to be delivered in line with the commissioning time frames of the new facility.

Once fully operational, the new facility will have a considerably larger processing capacity with an estimated 2,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) being employed on site. This doesn't include the jobs created in the construction of the processing facility and indirect jobs in the agricultural sector.

DTI will continue to work with TFI when the facility is operational through its onshore and offshore teams, to identify and develop export opportunities through the introduction to potential overseas buyers.

SEAFOOD INDUSTRY

683 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How is the government supporting the seafood exports industry after an approximate decrease of 33 per cent since 2019 as per the SA overseas goods exports figures and how many jobs are at risk from this decrease?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

On the latest data to July 2021, I am advised that South Australian seafood exports by value have fallen 6.8 per cent since 2018-19.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics labour force data for combined seafood processing and fishing, shows an 8 per cent increase in average employment for the 12 months to May 2021 compared to the year to May 2019. The labour force data estimated 2114 jobs in the year to May 2021.

Most of the falls in seafood exports reflect losses in southern rock lobster exports.

China was the largest export market with 97 per cent of this South Australian premium product being air-freighted live to China.

The decrease in seafood exports was initially impacted by the COVID-19 outbreak that resulted in difficulty accessing China in early 2020, followed by the widescale grounding of flights and then most critically, China's effective blockage of SRL from November 2020.

The Department for Trade and Investment (DTI) has worked with the Australian government to ensure industry could access the International Freight Assistance Mechanism (IFAM). IFAM is a temporary, targeted, emergency support measure put in place by the Australian Government to keep global air links open in response to the ongoing effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

More recently, IFAM has provided strong support to the annual export of tuna to Japan.

Latest trade data for July shows that 4427 tonnes of South Australian southern bluefin tuna was exported, valued at A\$55.4 million to Japan.

The Marshall Liberal government's international office network has been critical to providing support to the seafood industry particularly in relation to market diversification options, providing in-market information and connections to potential buyers.

DTI has also introduced a range of grant programs available to the industry that seafood producers are able to apply for: the Global Expansion Program, the e-Commerce Accelerator Program and the South Australian Export Accelerator Program.

The Marshall Liberal government will continue to support South Australia's fishing industry through our export programs and services, including efforts to diversify markets.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

684 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How is the government supporting the manufacturing export industry, in particular relating to elaborative manufactured engineering products, after an approximate decrease of 20 per cent as per the SA overseas goods exports figures?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The latest data (2020-21) shows a decline slowing to 7 per cent, better than the national result which declined 11 per cent in the same period.

More positively though 2020-21 this sector increased exports with vehicle parts manufacturers increasing by 8 per cent year on year.

The Growth State plan is the Marshall Liberal government's mechanism to drive growth—growing investment into the priority growth sectors, which in turn drives increased exports.

The manufactured engineering products mentioned occur across the Growth State sectors, especially the space, defence, hi-tech, and the minerals and energy sectors.

A detailed assessment of Growth State initiatives are available on the Growth State plan website.

<<https://www.growthstate.sa.gov.au/plan>>

These initiatives are driven by priorities identified by industry in the nine industry-driven Growth State sector strategies.

I CHOOSE SA

685 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many registrants are on the I Choose SA database?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The Department for Trade and Investment combines registrations for the state brand and I Choose SA into a single registration. Any company registering for the state brand is automatically entitled to leverage the I Choose SA branding.

As of 31 August 2021, there are 7,797 registrants for the State Brand, which includes an entitlement to use the I Choose SA branding.

I CHOOSE SA

686 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many applications for the I Choose SA brand have been approved since 30 September 2020?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The Department for Trade and Investment combines registrations for the state brand and I Choose SA into a single registration. Any company registering for the state brand is automatically entitled to leverage the I Choose SA branding.

Between 30 September 2020 and 31 August 2021, the Department for Trade and Investment approved 384 applications to use the state brand, which includes an entitlement to use the I Choose SA branding.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

687 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many of the Department for Trade and Investment's direct clients export to the UK?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

In the last 12 months, the Department for Trade and Investment has helped nine clients to secure export deals in the UK market. Further, the department is actively working with another 40 clients and supporting them to explore export opportunities in the UK market.

UK FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

688 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Has the Department for Trade and Investment made any one-on-one contact with exporters to discuss potential opportunities with regard to the UK free trade agreement?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

Yes. In 2021, the Department for Trade and Investment export advisers discussed potential opportunities with regard to the UK free trade agreement with a range of exporters.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT

689 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What international markets have the government identified as potential target markets for South Australia?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The Marshall Liberal government has opened international trade and investment offices where markets of opportunity have been identified: in Shanghai and Guangzhou, China; Tokyo, Japan; Seoul, South Korea; Houston and New York City, United States; Dubai, United Arab Emirates; New Delhi, India; and Singapore.

These new representations add to the existing overseas network of South Australian offices located in China (Jinan and Hong Kong), Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur), and the United Kingdom (Office of the Agent General in London).

Paris, France is proposed to open in 2021-22.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT

690 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Does the government have a publicly available trade diversification strategy and, if not, is one being developed?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

Trade is undertaken by business and not government.

The Marshall Liberal government's international trade office network has been critical to providing support to the export industry particularly in relation to market diversification options, providing in-market information and connections to potential buyers.

The Department for Trade and Investment is responding to trade areas of particular need as they emerge and where government has a legitimate role.

For example, the Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program was announced to aggressively drive South Australian wine export to the United States, United Kingdom, Canada and other key markets in direct response to the loss of market access to China.

STATE BUDGET

691 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Where are the saving or efficiencies going to come from as per the \$1 million savings target in the 2021-22 budget?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The \$1 million savings target will be achieved through general operating efficiencies within the department.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT

692 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Can you breakdown the funding allocation to:

- Artificial Intelligence and Health Hub

- Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program and
- Investment Office in France?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The Artificial Intelligence and Health Hub initiative provides \$1.6 million over four years, including \$985 000 of matched co-funding to rapidly establish artificial intelligence and health application pilots with technology companies and \$589 000 for investment concierge services to assist these companies to link to expanding market opportunities. The breakdown of funding is:

	2021-22 \$'000	2022-23 \$'000	2023-24 \$'000	2024-25 \$'000	Total \$'000
Concierge Services	117	149	160	163	589
Matched Co-funding	220	250	250	265	985
Total	337	399	410	428	1574

The Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program initiative provides operating expenditure of \$5.4 million over four years to support South Australian wine industry export growth in priority markets. The breakdown of funding is:

	2021-22 \$'000	2022-23 \$'000	2023-24 \$'000	2024-25 \$'000	Total \$'000
Program Support	101	137	139	141	518
Market Support	990	890	790	790	3 460
Co-investment with regional association	300	200	100	—	600
Inbound trade events	—	200	300	300	800
Total	1 391	1 427	1 329	1 231	5 378

The initiative to establish trade and investment representation in France provides operating expenditure of \$1.8 million over four years to support the state's trade and investment outcomes in Europe. The breakdown of funding is:

	2021-22 \$'000	2022-23 \$'000	2023-24 \$'000	2024-25 \$'000	Total \$'000
Staffing (Austrade)	105	162	166	170	603
Austrade hosting and administration fees	101	208	213	218	740
Promotional and travel	50	150	150	150	500
Total	256	520	529	538	1 843

ECOMMERCE ACCELERATOR PROGRAM

693 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many businesses received funding via the eCommerce Accelerator Program?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The eCommerce Accelerator Program has funded a total of 156 businesses.

EXPORT FUNDAMENTALS PROGRAM

694 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many businesses received funding via the Export Fundamentals Program?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The Export Fundamentals Program is not a grant program. The program's focus is to provide information, training and advice to build export capability. Since commencement, more than 300 businesses have participated in workshops and/or additional activities such as bespoke training, masterclasses and training webinars.

EXPORT ACCELERATOR PROGRAM

695 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many businesses received funding via the South Australian Export Accelerator Program?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The South Australia Export Accelerator Program has funded a total of 114 businesses.

GLOBAL EXPANSION PROGRAM

696 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How many businesses received funding via the Global Expansion Program?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

There were 20 grant recipients in cohort 1 of the Global Expansion Program in 2020-21.

ECOMMERCE ACCELERATOR PROGRAM

697 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is the eCommerce Accelerator Program going to continue being funded and, if so, what is the allocation of funding?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The eCommerce Accelerator Program was a short-term initiative implemented by the Department for Trade and Investment in 2019-20 and 2020-21 in response to the COVID-19 situation which saw a pivot to e-commerce channels.

Refer to omnibus question No. 14 for funding details.

EXPORT FUNDAMENTALS PROGRAM

698 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is the Export Fundamentals Program going to continue being funded and, if so, what is the allocation of funding?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The Export Fundamentals Program will continue to be funded and the budget for the 2021-22 financial year is \$320,000.

EXPORT ACCELERATOR PROGRAM

699 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is the South Australian Export Accelerator Program going to continue to be funded and, if so, what is the allocation of funding?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

Refer to omnibus question No. 14 for funding details.

GLOBAL EXPANSION PROGRAM

700 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Is the Global Expansion Program going to continue to be funded and, if so, what is the allocation of funding?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

Refer to omnibus question No. 14 for funding details.

GROWTH STATE PRIORITY SECTORS

701 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). Has there been any change in priority to the focus of the Department for Trade and Investment within the outlined nine Growth State priority sectors?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

The nine growth state sectors remain the focus and priority of the Department for Trade and Investment.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

702 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). What is the definition of a direct client under the Department for Trade and Investment?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment): I have been advised the following:

A direct client is defined as: a DTI program participant; or recipient of bespoke advice and service (including without limitation through online B-to-B matching events) from trade and/or investment business development staff, DTI overseas offices staff, or TradeStart team members.

SA TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

703 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). With regard to the SA Transport Subsidy Scheme:

- (a) How many total users did the program have in the 2020-21 financial year?
- (b) How many active users did the program have at the end of the 2020-21 financial year?
- (c) What was the total expenditure on the program in the 2020-21 financial year?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The SA Transport Subsidy Scheme is administered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

- (a) 69,158 registered users of the program
- (b) 21,051 active members
- (c) \$8.442 million

GRANTS SA

704 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How much money was given out in each of 2019 and 2020 from the Grants SA funding pool?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

In 2019, Grants SA paid organisations \$2,623,105.

In 2020, Grants SA paid organisations \$4,938,122.

COMMUNITY BENEFIT FUND

705 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How much money was given out from the Community Benefit Fund pool in 2019 and 2020 (broken down by year)?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Grants SA replaced the grant program known as Community Benefit SA.

COMMUNITY BENEFIT FUND

706 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). Of the total funding pool in the Community Benefit Fund in 2019 and 2020, how much money went to volunteer training and volunteer resource organisations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Refer to the response to the previous question on notice No. 705.

VOLUNTEER SCREENING

707 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). With regard to the free volunteer screening during financial year 2020-21:

- (a) How many of the volunteers who availed themselves of free screening subsequently went into paid work and repaid the waived fee for their screening?
- (b) How many people have been found to be using a free screening as a worker?
- (c) Has the department had any reports of this and/or investigated any cases of fraud?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Since delivering on the Marshall Liberal government's election commitment of abolishing all screening fees for volunteers, 185,602 South Australians and organisations have not been forced to pay the \$59.40 per screening they were required to pay under the previous Labor government. To date, no person has been found to be using a free screening as a worker.

VOLUNTEER SCREENING

708 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). What was the total cost value of volunteer checks in 2020-21 for each category of screening check?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

185,602 South Australians and organisations have benefited significantly—by over \$8 million—since the volunteer screening fee was abolished by the Marshall Liberal government.

HAMPSTEAD REHABILITATION CENTRE

709 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). With regard to NDIS participants placed at Hampstead as part of transition to home, please provide:

- (a) How many in total?
- (b) Length of stay for each participant?
- (c) How many discharge outcome into up transfer?
- (d) How many discharge outcome into acute care?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The transition to home program facilitates the timely discharge of NDIS participants from hospital into the community. The length of stay varies for each participant. The term up transfer is not used. 10 per cent are discharged into acute care where required.

DISABILITY SERVICES

710 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021).

1. What is the industry standard for frequency and content of advanced manual tasks for high care settings support staff?
2. What is the industry standard for frequency and delivery of advanced manual tasks for agencies delivering high care?
3. Does DHS meet these standards?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

There is no disability industry standard relating to advanced manual tasks. Safework SA has published a code of practice (COP) for hazardous manual tasks. The Department of Human Services meets the standards set out within the COP.

DISABILITY SERVICES

711 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How many hospital transfers have been required from disability supported accommodation in each of the past three financial years:

- (a) How many individual?
- (b) How many multiple presentations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

I am advised that people living in disability supported accommodation are transferred to hospital on an as needs basis.

DISABILITY SERVICES

712 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). Who was responsible for the supported disability accommodation site in Salisbury on 8 December 2019? Who was the manager/area manager/shift supervisor?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Chief Executive, Department of Human Services, is ultimately responsible for all supported disability accommodation sites.

It is inappropriate to disclose details of individual staff rosters.

DISABILITY SERVICES

713 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How many capacity building officers are employed across DHS accommodation services?

- (a) How many residents are in the accommodation services?
- (b) How many residents have a capacity building officer allocated?
- (c) How many residents does each capacity building officer have responsibility for?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Supported community accommodation has improved its service delivery model significantly over the past three years under the Marshall Liberal government.

The employment of capacity building officers per area is one such improvement, allowing residents within our supported homes to experience enhanced choice and control.

SA HOUSING

714 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How many Housing SA properties originally existed at the Felixstow Renewal SA site?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

At the launch of the neighbourhood renewal program, there were no existing dwellings included as part of the Felixstow initiative.

HOUSING AUTHORITY

715 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How many executive assistants and senior managers have been hired to report to Mr Andrew Atkinson since he started work with SA Housing Authority?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Two executive assistants and seven senior managers have been employed by SA Housing Authority, reporting to Mr Atkinson.

KIDS UNDER COVER

716 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How many people have utilised the Kids Under Cover studio program announced on 25 February 2021?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority has awarded \$2.3 million for Kids Under Cover to provide 51 fully relocatable studios over a three-year period to support young people.

The process for homelessness service providers to apply for the studios is currently open on behalf of clients.

HOUSING AUTHORITY

717 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). Is the SA Housing Authority investigating the AGFMA model for use with maintenance tender?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The SA Housing Authority released its head contractors for maintenance services (HCMS) invitation to supply via the SA Tenders and Contracts website. The tender is now closed.

HOUSING AUTHORITY

718 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). Regarding maintenance of SAHA properties:

(a) What is the contractual benchmark time frame for properties to be made tenantable once the previous tenant has vacated the property?

(b) Over the last 12 months, what were the 10 longest time frames for a property to be made tenantable once the previous tenant has vacated the property, including suburb and month of vacancy?

(c) Over the last 12 months, what were the 10 shortest time frames for a property to be made tenantable once the previous tenant has vacated the property, including suburb and month of vacancy?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Multitrade contractors are expected to complete standard tenancy maintenance in an average of 21 days.

Longer time frames occur where major maintenance works such as kitchen and wet area upgrades, internal and/or external upgrades of group sites, major domestic violence security item installations or major modifications for tenants with a disability are required to ensure its longer term use.

HOMELESSNESS SERVICES

719 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). Regarding homelessness services:

- (a) How many individual homelessness cases were handed over from previous providers to the new Toward Home Alliance in the Adelaide/southern region?
- (b) How many people are currently employed in the Office for Homelessness Sector Integration?
- (c) How many deaths of people sleeping rough in the CBD occurred in each month since March 2018?
- (d) Where are the crisis beds located for the Adelaide/southern region?
- (e) How many crisis beds are at each site?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Toward Home Alliance worked with existing homelessness providers to advise clients of the new homelessness services available across South Australia and to support a smooth transition to the new service providers.

There are 18.1 FTE within the Office for Homelessness Sector Integration.

On average, two clients are reported to have passed away each year by specialist homelessness services.

Toward Home support clients in crisis accommodation options in the Adelaide CBD and across the southern metropolitan region. The number of crisis beds in the region remains unchanged from previous years.

HOUSING AUTHORITY

720 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). With regard to the SA Housing Authority:

- (a) How many executives are now employed?
- (b) How many roles were created in each of the 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 financial years?
- (c) What was the net change in SAHA staff in each of the 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2021-21 financial years?
- (d) How many executive roles were reduced in each of these years?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Executive employment is reported in the SA Housing Authority's annual report.

Workforce data is reported by the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment in the annual Workforce Information Report.

VIRTUAL POWER PLANT

721 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). With regard to the Virtual Power Plant:

- (a) Is the government still committed to installing an additional 3,000 solar and battery systems for SAHA tenants as part of this program?
- (b) Is the government still committed to having 3,000 systems installed on SAHA properties with SAHA tenants during the current phase of the program?
- (c) What is the process for the government determining whether a property is eligible to join the program?
- (d) What happens once a property has been marked as eligible to join the program?
- (e) How many properties has the government deemed are eligible for the program?
- (f) The government have provided about 20 per cent of SAHA properties to the program. What happens to the other tenants who want to join the program but the government says they aren't eligible?
- (g) Were any of the Hove properties where tenants were evicted originally eligible for the program?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Marshall Liberal government is assisting South Australians to reduce their living costs, including energy bills.

Under phases 1 and 2 of the SA Virtual Power Plant project (SA VPP), 1,100 home energy systems have been installed on SA Housing Trust properties. Under phase 3 of the SA VPP, which is currently underway, a further 3,000 systems are proposed to be installed.

Further information about the SA VPP is publicly available at the Department for Energy and Mining's website.

YOUTH JUSTICE

722 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). When will the construction on the upgrade of the Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre begin? What is the expected completion date of the upgrades?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Construction is planned to commence in the first half of 2022. The expected completion date is mid 2023.

YOUTH TRAINING CENTRES

723 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). What additional resourcing has been provided to the Training Centre Visitor in the 2021-22 budget?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Additional resourcing to the Training Centre Visitor currently provided in the 2021-22 budget is \$20,000.

YOUTH SERVICES

724 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How many DHS staff are allocated specifically to youth services projects and programmes?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Staff are flexibly allocated to meet the changing needs of youth services projects and programs.

YOUTH ACTION PLAN

725 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). Does the 2021-22 state budget contain any additional funding for the delivery of the Youth Action Plan? How many of the Plan's actions have now been delivered?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Initiatives under Strong Futures, the SA Youth Action Plan 2020-22, are funded by the agencies responsible for delivering the relevant projects and programs.

A range of initiatives and actions are currently in progress, reflecting collaborations across government and the broader sector.

SOLAR ENERGY

726 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (25 August 2021). How many SA Housing Authority tenants have received solar and battery systems during the current phase of the rollout announced last September?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Progress of the SA Virtual Power Plant rollout is reported in the SA Housing Authority Annual Report.

ABORIGINAL POSITIONS

727 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). How many Aboriginal-specific positions will be available across all of government at or above ASO8 classification, to mentor and encourage Aboriginal voices and engagement in parliament?

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

The establishment of the proposed Aboriginal Representative Body to engage with the Parliament is subject to legislation which will be introduced soon.

The Office of the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement has been funded to establish and support the Aboriginal Representative Body.

MUSEUM OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HISTORY

728 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). The state government has allocated \$250,000 to develop a business case for a Museum of South Australian History—how will this new Centre affect the Centre of Democracy and its funding?

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

The History Trust of South Australia is developing a business case to test the feasibility of a museum dedicated to presenting the rich and varied history of South Australia.

The History Trust currently operates four subject specific museums: the Migration Museum, South Australian Maritime Museum, National Motor Museum and, in collaboration with the State Library of South Australia, the Centre of Democracy.

There is no intention to replace or diminish the History Trust's existing museums. The proposed South Australian history museum would complement and broaden the History Trust's offering, providing public access to more of the State's exceptional cultural collections.

VETERANS

729 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). How will the state government engage with veterans and their families to ensure their opinions are considered in new policy and program proposals, which will affect the services and support initiatives available to them?

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

There are already opportunities for veterans and their families to provide opinions to the South Australian government through the Veterans' Advisory Council, which provides independent advice to me as I have responsibility for the Veterans' Affairs portfolio; and to the Veterans Health Advisory Council, which sits in the Minister for Health and Wellbeing's portfolio.

Additionally, this year Veterans SA has created a number of opportunities for veterans and their families to engage on matters that are important to them, and this will further develop into 2022.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

730 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (25 August 2021). With regard to the Veteran Pilot Mentoring Program:

(a) Why is the program only offered to a total of 24 veterans when there are approximately 7,950 service pensioners in SA as of March 2021?

(b) Why is the program not provided within South Australian prisons, to assist veterans who are serving custodial sentences?

(c) If this pilot program is a success, will the state government consider introducing it into prisons?

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

The Veteran Pilot Mentoring Program received applications from 24 veterans to participate, and this was the number then matched to mentors. There was no cap on participation numbers—the final pairings were based on the number of mentee applications received.

The mentoring program offered two streams, one for female veterans and one for veterans who were other ranks or non-commissioned officers and transitioned from the Australian Defence Force between three and eight years ago. These two particular cohorts of veterans were identified based on research and transition data relevant to South Australia. The premise of the pilot mentoring program is to empower veterans to further develop their professional capabilities to become our community leaders of the future. It attracted a number of veterans who still have great value to contribute through their employment and careers.

As this is a pilot program, the scope was defined to enable meaningful evaluation to occur at the program's conclusion and assess the value and impact of the program. The program will conclude in January 2022 and then be evaluated. I anticipate there will be recommendations provided to government based on the program's assessment, including areas of focus should further mentoring programs be offered.

COURT SYSTEM

731 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). What impacts or delays are caused to the court system because lawyers cannot access prisons to receive instructions from clients in a timely manner?

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

I am advised by the Office of the Minister for Correctional Services that lawyers' access to clients has continued.

I am further advised that the member for Florey received advice from the Minister for Correctional Services in response to these questions in a letter dated 28 August 2021.

HOUSING PROPERTY SCHEME

734 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). Will the government consider a scheme, like WA's Key Start Scheme, allowing a joint venture with purchasers and when property is sold the profit is split?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

HomeStart currently has a shared equity loan scheme that has enabled more than 1,400 low to moderate income households to access the housing market, and/or more suitable housing for their situation.

PRIORITY CARE CENTRES

738 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). How much has it cost in 2020/21 to run the Priority Care Centre program, and how much will it cost to run the expanded program in 2021-22?

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

The cost of these programs is reported annually.

PRIORITY CARE CENTRES

739 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). How can the success or otherwise of the Priority Care Centre model be measured in reducing ramping in hospital emergency departments?

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

Priority Care Centres contribute to the alleviation of pressure on emergency departments (ED) by providing an alternative care pathway for people with lower acuity conditions who would otherwise attend an ED.

Since August 2019 when the Priority Care Centres pilot commenced, through to 29 August 2021, a total of 19,769 patients have attended a Priority Care Centres. These 19,769 people would have otherwise presented to an ED putting additional pressure on the system to deal with emergency patients.

COVID-19 QR CODES

740 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). How much of the overall \$77.7 million of COVID funding is allocated to the digital QR check-in system, and then necessary for contact tracing after outbreaks?

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

The contact tracing team within SA Health has been established to rapidly up-scale and down-scale the workforce to meet changes in COVID-19 case numbers, without any loss of scope or effectiveness of contact tracing.

Effective rapid up-scale is achieved through the use of casual contracts, recalling available SA Health staff and sourcing mobilised staff from the wider state government sector with the support of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. The mobilisation of public sector employees, outside SA Health, has been extremely successful with the delivery of a contact tracing surge response in excess of 12,400 hours.

The cost will vary depending on the number of cases through the year.

The Premier has been advised:

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) reprioritised existing work to support SA Health, including building the COVIDSafe check-in QR system and supporting infrastructure. DPC provides ongoing contact tracing support to SA Health. A total of \$1,553,425.77 excluding GST has been on charged to SA Health during 2020-21 to cover a portion of DPC costs.

COVID-19 QR CODES

741 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). How much has it cost the State to enforce COVID-19 check-ins, and quarantine compliance?

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

It is not possible to extract the cost for QR code compliance specifically as the compliance officers undertake enforcement work across all restrictions within the Emergency Management (Activities – General No 3) (COVID-19) Direction 2021.

COVID-19 QR CODES

742 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). What progress has been made on implementation of a uniform national QR code check-in system?

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

SA Health is not aware of any plans by the commonwealth government to deliver a national system.

COVID-19 QR CODES

743 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). Queensland allows additional people to be added to their digital QR check-in – is this something the SA Government will consider implementing?

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

Features of the mySAGov app are constantly being considered and prioritised. Whilst there is no current plan to include this feature of additional check-ins, multiple people can check in from the one user's login. Checking in additional people can be done by rescanning the QR code and changing the name of the person checking in.

COVID-19 TESTING CLINICS

744 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). What measures were taken after the Parafield cluster to reduce waiting times and managing queueing at COVID Testing sites?

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

In partnership with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, SA Pathology has now established an online booking system at the Bedford Park, Port Adelaide, Regency Park, Ridgehaven Waterworld, Repatriation Health Precinct and Victoria Park Pakapakanthi drive-through sites to reduce wait times.

SA Pathology currently provides 24-hour testing at the Victoria Park Pakapakanthi, Waterworld Ridgehaven and Tailm Bend COVID-19 drive-through testing sites.

SA Pathology continues to monitor local testing demand with a view to quickly and efficiently increase the operating hours at its COVID-19 testing sites as required.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

745 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). At the new Women's and Children's Hospital, will there be a separately identified and self-contained birthing centre of 2-3 birthing rooms, operating within a birthing centre philosophy, and as a separate department from the proposed general birthing suite?

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

The birthing centre will be co-located within the new Women's and Children's Hospital (WCH) delivery suite.

The birthing centre's identity will be developed through wayfinding and the interior design. All necessary support spaces, such as a consult room will be provided.

The birthing centre philosophy is incorporated in all delivery suite rooms by the known midwife who provides continuity of care.

The new WCH Delivery Suite rooms will all provide evidence-based women centred care. All rooms will provide options for a low intervention labour and birth, and will allow for additional resources to provide the mother and baby the necessary medical support, if required. This will prevent moving women from the Birthing Centre to the delivery suite rooms whilst in labour, which currently occurs.

The integration of midwifery group practice in the birthing centre, enables flexibility for an increase in the service delivery and promotes women centred care approach.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

746 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). At the new Women's and Children's Hospital, will the outpatient and inpatient clinical areas for maternity and neonatal services, be distinctly separate from the paediatric services? (including entrances, limited drop off areas and parking).

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

The project has now commenced concept design which will articulate how the hospital will work, with a focus on determining where all of the hospital functions will be located.

Location and flow of paediatric, women and neonatal services will be determined during the concept phase.

This will be developed in consultation with Women's and Children's Health Network clinicians and consumers through established advisory groups over the next 12 months.

WOODLEIGH HOUSE

747 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). Where will acute adult mental health services currently provided at Woodleigh House be accessed following the decommissioning of Woodleigh House beds?

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

The Northern Adelaide Local Health Network will be undertaking a review of all acute adult inpatient mental health services based on population modelling and current demand.

This will include consideration of how the announcement of the decommissioning of Woodleigh House and the development of a Northern Crisis Retreat Centre with the additional 16 respite beds will impact service delivery and access for people in the north and north-east seeking mental health services.

Formal discussions and consultation regarding the decommissioning of Woodleigh House beds will occur in the near future.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

748 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). When will construction begin on the 20 new older person acute mental health unit and how long will it take to finish?

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

Construction is forecast to commence in the 2022-23 financial year and be completed in mid-2025.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

749 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (25 August 2021). What changes arising from the Retirement Villages Act review are forecast which would require Valuer-General support for property owners?

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

There are no changes forecast to come from the review of the Retirement Villages Act 2016 that would require Valuer-General support for property owners.

YOUTH JUSTICE

753 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). In 2020, 48 per cent of youths in detention on an average night were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders. What improvements has the government made to assist South Australia meet Closing the Gap targets to reduce the rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people in detention by 30 per cent by 2031?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The Hon Michelle Lensink MLC, Minister for Human Services has advised the following:

The Marshall Liberal Government's Young People Connected, Communities Protected: South Australia's Youth Justice State Plan 2020-23, released on 11 June 2020, has a strong focus on addressing the overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) children and young people in the youth justice system through the following improvements:

- Opening of the Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre (KTYJC) Aboriginal Cultural Connection Space, to provide a unique space for Aboriginal children and young people in custody to reflect, learn, grow and celebrate their cultural identity, spirituality and connections.
- Review of the Youth Justice Cultural Champions Network, creating a Communities and Justice Cultural Community of Practice, led by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal staff, which partners with Aboriginal communities to build cultural intelligence and culturally safe and responsive practice.
- Delivering the Aboriginal Engagement Strategy, including the inaugural Communities and Justice—Aboriginal Community-Controlled Organisations (ACCO) Forum, which facilitated discussions on partnerships and shared decision-making for service and program delivery, with further forums planned in both regional and metropolitan locations.
- Development of an Aboriginal Visiting Program in KTYJC.
- Launch of an Aboriginal Recruitment Guide and Aboriginal Employment and Retention Strategy, which is guiding strategies to increase Aboriginal employment in DHS Youth Justice Services.
- Partnering with key stakeholders and Aboriginal organisations to identify and implement youth justice prevention and diversion strategies for Aboriginal children.

Between 2019-20 and 2020-21, the average daily male and female population of KTYJC decreased by 26.4 per cent and 11.9 per cent respectively and the proportion of individual Aboriginal young people admitted decreased from 48 per cent to 43 per cent.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

754 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). How much of the \$25 million for capital works, vehicles and equipment will be allocated to the replacement of the Mount Lofty group (9 brigades) bulk water tankers?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The South Australian Country Fire Service (CFS) has advised:

The existing Mount Lofty CFS group bulk water carrier 10 will be replaced with a bulk water carrier 11. A bulk water carrier 11 has a cost of approximately \$335,000.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

755 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). The Mount Lofty Group has been identified as needing further bulk water tankers – when will these be provided, and will they be accessible before the next bushfire season?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): The South Australian Country Fire Service (CFS) has advised:

The Mount Lofty CFS group is allocated one bulk water carrier, which is consistent with CFS risk and capability requirements for this group.

COURT SYSTEM

756 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (26 August 2021). What impacts or delays are caused to the court system because lawyers cannot access prisons to receive instructions from clients in a timely manner.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services):

The Department for Correctional Services are not aware of any instances of lawyers being unable to access prisoners to receive instructions from clients in a timely manner.

Questions relating to the Courts Administration Authority fall within the portfolio responsibilities of the Attorney-General.

SCHOOLS FUNDING

763 Mr BOYER (Wright) (27 August 2021). How many schools granted funding under the Building Better Schools program have had some of that initial grant money clawed back by the education department? Please provide name of school, original grant figure and final tendered amount figure?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

Under the Department for Education's capital works program, contracts are awarded through a competitive tender process following a rigorous evaluation. Savings from any projects that come in under budget are retained by the department to be used as a pool of funding for managing any higher costs that may arise for projects that exceed tender budgets or face particular cost pressures due to unforeseen issues.

This is standard practice for Department for Education capital works programs over many years and is a key component in mitigating risk to the delivery of the overall program of works.

Some building works are in the final stages of documentation completion with final costings being part of that process. A number of other projects are in much earlier stages of development, given that the original announcement was for a six-year program of works.

FRUIT FLY

779 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (9 September 2021). Can the minister provide a breakdown of the \$33.3 million total spend for the eradication of fruit fly, itemised by the spend on each of the following:

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):

- (a) purchase of traps;
- (b) bait costs;
- (c) production of sterile fruit fly;
- (d) wages; and
- (e) advertising?

I am advised:

- (a) Bait costs represent 7 per cent of the total, including the purchase of traps
- (b) Refer to answer (a)
- (c) Sterile fruit fly represents 5 per cent of the total
- (d) Wages represent 69 per cent of the total
- (e) Advertising represents 3.6 per cent of the total

FRUIT FLY

780 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (9 September 2021). How often are fruit fly traps and fruit checked in homes/residential yards per outbreak area and how many flies and/or larvae have been found in traps per outbreak area?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): I am advised:

Depending on their location and the time of year, traps are checked on a fortnightly schedule, with traps in fruit production areas being serviced weekly in the warmer summer months.

Temporary supplementary traps deployed (when an outbreak is declared) into the centre of an outbreak, are checked every week.

The fruit flies and/or larvae found in traps per outbreak area are:

Metropolitan Area		
Suburb	Flies detected	Larvae
Angle Park	3	0
Black Forest	6	0
Blair Athol	40	0
Campbelltown	122	0
Croydon Park	214	0
Klemzig	4	0
Pooraka	49	0
Ridleyton	7	0
Rosewater	23	0
Semaphore Park	147	0
Marleston	21	0
Warradale	0	0

Riverland		
Town	Flies detected	Larvae
Berri	4	0
Cooltong	1	0
Monash	3	0
Pike River	0	0
Renmark West	46	0

Port Augusta		
	Flies detected	Larvae
	30	0