

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 28 October 2021

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. D.R. Cregan) took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: COAST PROTECTION BOARD AND COASTAL LEGISLATION

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:01): I move:

That the sixth report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Coast Protection Board and Coastal Legislation, be noted.

The Environment, Resources and Development Committee commenced this inquiry in early 2021 on the motion of the Hon. Mark Parnell, formerly of this committee. It was moved by the Hon. Mark Parnell that the committee undertake this inquiry in a respectful process. It had not had an inquiry or a review for over 50 years.

It was considered that, with all that is going on with the climate and the environment, it would be good to look at our coastal foreshores to see how they are working. The inquiry's aim was to investigate and report on the Coast Protection Act 1972, which will mark its 50th anniversary next year, and determine whether South Australia's coastal legislation and the Coast Protection Board were still fit for purpose some 50 years later.

I recognise and thank the following members and former members of the committee for their contributions to the report, namely: Mr Michael Brown, member for Playford; Mr Fraser Ellis, member for Narungga; Mr Stephan Knoll, member for Schubert; the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC; the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC, the Hon. Robert Simms MLC; and the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC.

The committee received 54 written submissions and heard evidence from 30 different witnesses. The report makes 11 recommendations, the most important of which is the recommendation that the state government develop a statute amendment bill for the Coast Protection Act during the next parliament. Other recommendations to state government aim to contemporise the Coast Protection Act by positioning the Coast Protection Board as a leader in regional and metropolitan coastal area protection and integrated coastal management.

The committee made a commitment early on in the inquiry process to visit as many regional areas as it was reasonably able to do so, given the risk of COVID-19 related restrictions potentially hampering travel. Ultimately, though, the committee was privileged to visit many beautiful coastal areas in South Australia, including the South-East, Adelaide Plains, Yorke Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula and Adelaide metropolitan regions. I highlight that the committee managed to travel all the way from Port MacDonnell to Ceduna. There were at least three very well-organised tours to Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, a South-East tour and the last one was the Adelaide regional beaches tour.

The committee held most of its hearings in Adelaide and was pleased to hold one regional hearing in Mount Gambier. The committee heard a great deal of evidence from regional and metropolitan stakeholders that state leadership in integrated coastal management was vital for the future of South Australia's coastal areas. South Australia's coastal areas are highly contested, with a number of agencies having jurisdiction over coastal geographic boundaries and responsibility for management distributed over state and local levels of government.

This fragmented approach to governing our coastal areas has led to a complex mosaic of plans, strategies and programs across government agencies and councils that incompletely cover coastal areas. Many times we heard from witnesses and local governments of a wheel of passing information around in a consultative process that delayed outcomes. We heard that it would move from local government to the EPA to the Coast Protection Board to the landscape boards and, at

other times, the developers and community consultation. It took a long time to navigate through this process, and it was highlighted to us that it was not clear that everyone knew what their role was or their purpose, and it almost seemed like a lot of buck-passing at times. That is the evidence we heard.

Furthermore, there are gaps in leadership of strategic and statewide policy setting to control coastal development, manage coastal conservation priorities and mitigate impacts from climate change and sea level rise. Another point we heard was the fact that councils are trying to navigate their infrastructure, worried about climate change and potential sea level rise, with a lack of science. We noted and heard that the Coast Protection Board was working with Flinders University and local government agencies, local government councils, to find the best science to tell them about the effect that sea level rise, storm surge, storm directions and those sorts of things are having on infrastructure and our coastlines.

The committee met with and heard from many council representatives as it travelled throughout regional South Australia. Their passion for protecting coastal areas in their regions was very evident, but the committee noted with some dismay that councils were apportioning disproportionately large amounts of their budgets to protect coastal infrastructure and public access to beaches. This is clearly unsustainable for councils. One of the committee's recommendations is for the state government to commit to finding an equitable and sustainable long-term funding model for research and data collection and for the protection and management of our coastal assets across the state.

In our travels, we heard of a number of issues where population, development, sand dune erosion, beach encroachment—perhaps sea encroachment—onto infrastructure were causing a major problem for local council. A lot of the local councils said their issues stemmed from a \$10,000 problem to perhaps a \$100,000 problem. But I thought it was worth noting that in my own electorate of MacKillop, the Kingston District Council's problems extend into the millions of dollars.

It highlighted the big problems that the Kingston council faces on three fronts: a development at Cape Jaffa marina, which is underdeveloped and does not have enough rental and development there to sustain the marina and needs council money to keep open and operating; a stone wall infrastructure to protect roads, bikeways and houses behind the roads that have been eroded at what we call Pinks Beach; and what was the boat-launching facility at Kingston, just north of the jetty, which has been abandoned at this stage and is causing an immense number of problems because their jetty at the moment is nearly half as wet, or as dry with sand now, because of sand build-up behind a groyne that the boat-launching facilities used to use.

The committee also heard from regional councils of the urgent need for local data collection to help inform better decision-making. This is particularly the case for councils seeing an upswing in tourism due to the increase in backyard tourism as a direct effect of COVID-19 travel restrictions. Submitters were strongly supportive of amendments to the Coast Protection Act and keen to retain authorities such as the Coast Protection Board that could collaborate and lead on statewide strategic coastal issues.

Where submitters tended to differ was the authority the Coast Protection Board has in refusing development under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. Amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act were outside the scope of this particular inquiry. However, the committee recommends that the state government reviews this once a sufficient amount of time has elapsed for the board's authority to be properly evaluated.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the people who took time to help the committee while it toured South Australia. In particular, I thank the mayors, chief executives and staff of the 18 regional councils the committee met with, and also representatives from the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board; the Presiding Member of the Coast Protection Board, Mr Jeff Tate; and Dr Murray Townsend from the Department for Environment and Water who accompanied the committee on all the regional visits. Their company was most welcome.

The conversations were very respectful. I know when a lot of the local councils saw Dr Murray Townsend turn up, and also Jeff Tate, the conversations were respectful; they were open, and we discussed all the issues and opportunities that this inquiry perhaps could lend itself to in the future. I

also thank academics from Flinders University who accompanied the committee on its tour of the Adelaide metropolitan beaches.

I am also grateful to the community groups who spoke to the committee at Parnka Point, Lucky Bay and Black Point, and I thank all individuals, community groups and organisations who provided a submission or who gave evidence to this inquiry. Finally, on behalf of the committee, I would like to thank the parliamentary officers: Ms Joanne Fleer and research officer, Dr Merry Brown, for their assistance with organising the committee site visits, compiling this evidence and receiving this report.

With this inquiry, and the opportunities that may come in the future, when it was first noted and put out into the public arena there was almost an air of uncertainty. That is the nicest way to put it. Was this a witch-hunt, or trying find a scapegoat? Or was the inquiry actually saying that this act is 50 years old and is it still working? Certainly, I think that this inquiry has proved that it was the latter. It was no witch-hunt.

Certainly we found some gaping holes. We found some big issues, and the one that really came to light was hearing about caravan parks being washed into the sea and walkways being washed into the sea. We know that local governments have budgets of \$1 million, \$2 million and \$3 million, but that the cost to repair and maintain this sort of infrastructure eats well and truly into their budgets, so we can see that some changes are required.

Another thing that was noted, and I hope that this is picked up, is the lack of science and data about sea level rise and also land level rise. It was noted on Yorke Peninsula that there are some towns still rising with the uplift of continental shelf movements such as on the edge of the Flinders Ranges. However, they may never suffer any sea level rise for the next 50 to 100 years—perhaps. The point is that the data is there, but that is not for me to quantify or even clarify. The point is that I can ask the question: where is the science to prove otherwise?

Talking about sea level rises and global warming and what they will mean, yes, there is a projection that by 2050 we could see a sea level rise of 10 centimetres, 20 centimetres and 30 centimetres. Lidar maps are used that talk about land height and sea level heights, and we see massive inundation along our coastlines and what that means. In all, I hope that this inquiry is seen by all levels of government—federal government, state governments and local governments—as well as the environment departments and the Coast Protection Board because we actually do need the best science possible to find the best solutions.

Another fact I would like to highlight, and it was noted and we see it on our coastlines, is what they call a soft remedial repair—moving sand from one end of the beach to the other. There is a place for it if it can be done effectively and efficiently. This is not a point of criticism, but what is not really given strong consideration from what we have heard are stronger and harder protections for our coastline.

We have seen some reefs being put out in the sea trying to stop storm surge and waves washing away beaches, and that has worked very well. However, these infrastructure builds out in the sea are very expensive and there are also usually consequences, and the science and the money do not seem to back up this idea. The easy answer that has been found at the moment is moving sand from one end of the beach to the other and watching it wash in the normal direction of wave movement, which is normally from the south to the north, and then they have to move it back again. This costs immense amounts of money and it is very much a soft long-term process of fixing.

We noted that groynes have been built along our beaches. Some of them are hard rock walls and some of them are sandbags. We noted that we have seen sandbags behind our beaches trying to preserve our dune system. We do know that the more we interfere and the more we touch, there are always consequences. This comes back to this point where the number one highlight I hope that we address by this inquiry is not only the funds that are required to look at and address these issues but the science.

We already have Flinders University engaged in some of these issues, but I think we need a greater amount of science. If we are serious about global warming, if we are serious about sea level rise, then we need to be serious about the implications and what they will mean for us as a state, as a community and as nation in general.

I note that the Hon. Mark Parnell was privileged to address an inquiry into sea level rise and coastal issues at Cairns, I believe. I think he was even going to note that this inquiry had taken place when he was speaking to this conference in Queensland. He did note that this was taking place. I hope that this is the start of a bigger picture about the coastline in general around Australia. Again, it comes back to how are we going to address it and modify it if sea level is going to rise.

One thing that was noted was that some land in the Netherlands/Holland is already below sea level. The science is out there and the infrastructure is out there. It is very expensive, but you can actually protect our infrastructure from the sea. What is really noted is that it has to be done well and it has to have the best science behind it. I think the science should come from our local bases. We do have universities, with environmental students coming through the system in our own state.

We can channel those resources into these areas and make it work, make it effective and do it in a way that the money is well spent. Sometimes with some sand movements that have been taking place, the community does not think it is money well spent. In all, I will finish up and move that this report be accepted. I thank everyone involved for what we found.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:15): I rise to support the noting of this, the sixth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, entitled an Inquiry into the Coast Protection Board and Coastal Legislation. I congratulate and compliment the committee on their work in relation to this, ably led by the member for MacKillop. I appreciated, as the member for Flinders, hosting them in Flinders and on Eyre Peninsula.

I think I am right in saying that I have more of South Australia's coastline than any other member. It extends all the way from the District Council of Franklin Harbour, south to Port Lincoln, around and up the West Coast to the Western Australian border. There are a lot of beautiful beaches and a lot of pristine coastline, but much of the coastline is being impacted upon, and has been for the last 150 years, by development since European settlement. That really is key, and I think the board needs to be cognisant of that fact going forward.

The Environment, Resources and Development Committee resolved to conduct an inquiry into the current status and potential for reform of the Coast Protection Act 1972. The act is now 50 years old. At the time of its instigation, South Australia was at the forefront of coastal legislation. However, as we have heard from the committee Chair, the act has remained virtually unchanged since its inception, so it is very timely now that we consider amending the act and the role of the Coast Protection Board.

South Australia has more than 5,000 kilometres of coastline in total. Of course, we are all familiar with the indented geography of South Australia. There are numerous peninsulas and gulfs and inlets and estuaries. As I have alluded to, the seat of Flinders is probably home to around 1,700 or 1,800 kilometres of that coastline of the 5,000, so it is a significant portion of the state's coastline and something I have great interest in. There was clear evidence received by the committee from visits to coastal areas, and their inquiry extended far beyond the metropolitan beaches where there is often and rightly a focus right down to Port MacDonnell and all the way out to the Far West, with the District Council of Ceduna.

South Australia's coasts are highly contested areas, with a number of agencies having jurisdiction over geographic boundaries. However, there are policy gaps for integrated management of coastal areas, such as leadership and coordination for addressing impacts from climate change and sea level rise. I would add to that the insurgence created by regular but not too frequent storm events. Of course, when they do hit the coastal regions of South Australia there can be significant damage.

The committee found overwhelming support to amend and modernise the act and that retaining a coastal-focused board and agency with relevant expertise and resourcing was important to lead future coastal management for the state. The committee also found that it was important to integrate coastal management through leadership, collaboration, alignment and other legislative frameworks and agencies who have shared responsibility for various aspects of coastal management, noting that these frameworks were developed after the original act commenced.

The committee heard that regional councils were allocating considerable portions of their annual budgets to simply maintain coastal infrastructure and environments. Many of our country

councils that have a coastline coincide with relatively small ratepayer bases, and that is particularly so on Eyre Peninsula: small ratepayer bases and big obligations from council to try to protect and enhance their coastal environments.

The committee concluded that there was a greater need to support regional coastal councils for strategic policy setting and data collection, on-the-ground technical support and improved processes to streamline the fragmented agency approach to coastal conservation management and planning and development. Bear in mind that it is not all about protecting and conserving. We have to allow for future development. My belief is that we have to support landowners, whether they be private landowners with shacks or homes on the beach or sometimes farming properties abutting the coastline or coastal councils. We need to be able to support them in relation to their management planning and development.

The committee also heard that compliance has been and continues to be difficult to enforce in some regions and that communities and councils have expressed their frustration in trying to navigate where responsibility lies within planning and development processes and legislation. Stakeholders highlighted the need for a strategic and collaborative approach to research and local data collection to help inform decision-making and investing authority in the board to lead with best practice coastal development.

I note the member for MacKillop, as Chair, made mention of not only sea level rise but also the fact that, anecdotally at least, in some parts of the state we have a coastline and land terrain that is actually on the incline. Certainly, work needs to be done in relation to that. The rate of incline, I suspect, is not going to keep up with the rate of sea level rise, but it needs to be factored into the planning going forward.

Stakeholders also expressed and emphasised that the board could improve its relationship with the community by involving stakeholders in decision-making and making its processes more transparent. Isn't that always the way when boards are based in Adelaide? As we know, boards essentially are based in Adelaide. It is the state capital; it is the metropolitan hub of South Australia, but the perception of course is that decisions are made in an ivory tower, sometimes many hundreds or even thousands of kilometres away, with little consideration for the practical application and input at a local area.

Finally, there was some division amongst stakeholders about the level of authority vested in the board in accordance with the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. A number of stakeholders suggested it was currently appropriate, while others wanted the board's authority reduced. The committee considered that it is too late to make a judgement with regard to the board's authority and suggested that a review of the board's referral role take place after the implementation of a revised coastal legislation.

Ultimately, I thank the committee for their work. There were 11 recommendations made in the report. Ultimately, all related back to state government responsibility for coastal protection and the management of the coastal board. Bear in mind that we all recognise the importance of South Australia's coasts; 90 per cent of South Australia's population lives on or near the coast, and that is not surprising given the continent we live in.

I thank the committee for visiting the electorate of Flinders and particularly taking the time to go out west to the District Council of Ceduna, where the council has been successful in procuring state government grants for coastal protection both at Ceduna and down at Smoky Bay, a smaller coastal community but one that is vitally important for holiday-makers and also the oyster industry. Smoky Bay bore the brunt of the storm way back in 2016, when the state famously was blacked out. It was that very same storm.

I would like to reiterate that I do not believe that as a state government we should necessarily preclude further development on our coastline. It is the jewel in the crown as far as I am concerned. European settlement has had an impact on the nature of the way our coastline works and its vulnerability, I suppose, to weather and climate events. We need to vest in our landowners, whether they be council or private landowners, the responsibility, the rights and the option to protect their properties rather than simply see them degrade and come to a point where they are no longer usable.

Finally, in the seconds remaining I would like to implore the state government—and I know this work is probably in hand—to really consider the future of our state's jetties. Jetties dot the

coastline all the way around and were particularly important traffic routes in the early days of settlement. They have come to a point now where they are not used so much for that but certainly are important to small towns, coastal communities, not just for localised fishing fleets but also for tourism attraction.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (11:25): I rise to make a brief contribution as well and, in doing so, I would like to heartily congratulate the committee on launching this inquiry. As the member for MacKillop stated at the outset, I was lucky enough to be on the committee when this inquiry was launched. Having the great pleasure of representing the electorate of Narungga, it was particularly important to our part of the world.

There are a considerable number of kilometres of coastline along Yorke Peninsula and down into the Adelaide Plains and there are a large number of interactions with the Coast Protection Board as a direct result of that. It was particularly pleasing to be on the committee at the start of this inquiry, and I congratulate them on launching it. It was just a shame that I was not able to serve a more fulsome time on that committee while this inquiry was being conducted, but congratulations to the member for MacKillop and committee members on driving this inquiry.

I would also like to, in the same vein as the member for Flinders has done, congratulate and thank the committee for visiting Yorke Peninsula to investigate some of those interactions that we have had with the Coast Protection Board. There are instances up and down the peninsula of different experiences that different communities have had with the Coast Protection Board, and it was really pleasing to see that the committee took the time to come and visit and investigate most if not quite all of those instances and experiences up and down the peninsula.

I would like to touch on a few of them ever so briefly right now so that we can acknowledge in this house the tribulations and successes of the Coast Protection Board on Yorke Peninsula. The first one that I would like to make mention of is the Black Point community. A number of years ago—four, five, six years ago—they were successful in receiving a grant to redevelop the boatramp at Black Point, which is a particularly busy community, increasingly so, I believe. There are a large number of fishermen who go out from Black Point to try their luck and catch a number of whiting.

I believe the council led the charge to try to redevelop that boatramp to recognise the fact that it is an increasingly busy boatramp, and that a large number of boats are launching from it, and to make it a safer and easier to use boatramp. Unfortunately, at the time they did that, part of the plan included raising the ramp itself. Where it used to run basically along the same level as the beach, it now would run a metre or so above the level of the sand. I believe this raised concerns in the community at that time. They suggested to the Coast Protection Board that it would impede the sand flow and result in a build-up on one side and a shortage on the other.

According to the community there, they pleaded and begged that the boatramp not be raised to that height but, unfortunately, that is how it proceeded. Lo and behold, that is exactly what eventuated thereafter: they experienced, unfortunately on the community side of the boatramp, a rather significant shortage of sand and, on the other side, closer to the town of Ardrossan, there was an abundance of it. That boatramp did have the effect of interrupting the sand flow, unfortunately, and it caused a great deal of angst in the community.

Thankfully, throughout this term of government, we have been able to secure another grant with considerable help from the community itself. They have done an excellent job in raising funds and carting sand at their own cost to remedy the issue in the short term but all the while desperately trying to secure enough funding to fix the boatramp. Thankfully, during this term of government, we have been able to do so, and I can report to the house that there are works ongoing at Black Point at the moment to lower the level of the actual ramp to ensure that it does not impede the sand flow there.

That is an example of where it would have been nice to avoid the problem right from the get-go so that we would not have to do it twice. Hopefully, that was part of the feedback that both the committee and the Coast Protection Board took on board when they visited Yorke Peninsula and met with Bill Gill and representatives of the Black Point community.

Unfortunately, the Coast Protection Board and the committee did not have the opportunity to visit Balgowan. I have been out to the boatramp at Balgowan with Sam Johns, a local farmer and

long-term family vacationer to Balgowan, wonderful community that it is, who despairs at the rock groyne that has been built out into the water at Balgowan ostensibly to protect the boatramp and the boats that are launching from there.

This is important because, again, it is a wonderful fishing area for a lot of recreational fishers, and a few commercial fishermen operate from that part of the world as well. Whilst I do not dispute the fact that there might have been a need for a rock groyne to be built to help protect the boat-launching facility, according to Sam Johns, it has had the effect of interrupting the sand flow and causing the beautiful beach to now experience a shortage of sand.

Sam's son showed me photos of what the beach used to look like with cars down on it and people enjoying the beach and whatnot. Unfortunately, now it is basically a rock bed with very little sand on it. It is impossible to get a car down through the rocks. Unfortunately, it precludes any use or enjoyment of that beach at Balgowan as well. I know that Sam and the Balgowan Progress Association are pretty keen to see that rock groyne either removed or shortened so that hopefully the sand returns to that beach and allows them to enjoy it with their kids, just as they did with their parents at one time. I will continue to work for the Balgowan community on that front.

The final matter that I would like to draw to the attention of this house is an area which the committee did have the opportunity to visit. Around near Point Turton, a bit south of that, a significant rock wall has been installed to prevent erosion of what is essentially a cliff face along that way. A number of houses have been built looking out over the water. As the tides continue to lap away at the cliffs, it has come closer and closer to the houses until it became a real concern. Thankfully, the council have managed to find the means to implement a significant rock wall there to prevent that erosion from happening further. That is another success story at Black Point and down near Point Turton as well, and hopefully we can get one at Balgowan.

The final point I would like to make in the time I have left is that high on my priority list as the member for Narungga—and if I am lucky enough to be re-elected will be continue to be high on my priority list—is an improved boatramp at Marion Bay. Marion Bay is a terrific tourist destination. It is one of the most beautiful, untouched beaches on the peninsula. Unfortunately, the boatramp is subject to local knowledge. I am led to believe that tourists visiting there, who do not appreciate the intricacies of the local ramp, can sometimes come unstuck with different sea levels and tides and waves and that sort of thing. It is a high priority of mine to deliver an improved boatramp at Marion Bay.

However, before that time, as the local member I would need assurance from the Coast Protection Board that the beach will not be impacted by any structure or product that is put there to protect the boats being launched. At the moment, as it stands with the various interactions around the electorate of Narungga, I would be concerned that an interrupted sand flow would have a disastrous impact on that beach, which we desperately do not need at Marion Bay. That is the main drawcard for people to go and visit. Any effect that would interrupt sand flow or decrease the suitability of the beach would be undesirable, to say the least.

I would like to take the opportunity in this place to reassure members of the Marion Bay community that it is a high priority of mine to try to find an improved boatramp outcome so that they continue to attract tourists down there and the locals can continue to operate their recreational fishing vessels safely. I would need some reassurance from the Coast Protection Board that it will not impact the beach at Marion Bay, which is such a drawcard for the local tourist economy.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:33): I rise to speak on the sixth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee inquiry into the Coast Protection Board and coastal legislation. I just want to make a few brief comments on some of the commentary that people have brought to my attention over the years in regard to management of coastal land. A lot of it is inland from direct contact with the coast but comes into the remit of the Coast Protection Board. This can involve many hundreds of hectares right across the state. It could run into the thousands of hectares.

I refer to the lengthy impact on some of this land as you come inland, further off the coast, and the management of that by property owners. What I am talking about here in the main is farmland. There has been angst presented to me on how it is managed. Obviously the farmers want the right outcomes and want to be able to farm this land appropriately but, in many of the cases that have been put to me, there have been a lot of restrictions put on them that in some ways seem overbearing.

This act has not been updated in 50 years, and I would like to see that we get the right outcome in the negotiations in drawing up a bill for an act in regard to coastal protection and what needs to happen there, that we get an outcome where landholders get the appropriate input into new legislation so that not only can the land be operated as farmland but also we make sure we have the right outcomes in the longer term for the sustainability of that land.

It does not matter where any farmer is, with the technology we have today—glyphosate in farming, one-pass farming with cultivators putting in crops—people are very aware of sustainable practices and how to manage their properties, especially as time goes on. With global positioning system (GPS) management on many thousands of tractors and harvesting equipment in this state alone, you really get accuracy in managing land and putting in crops.

You can manage it down to a mere couple of centimetres. If you are towing an air seeder to place the seed, you can get so accurate that you can sow the seed right next to the last row from the year before so that as the plants grow they can capitalise on the fertiliser that was put down the previous year. That goes on and on and on, and it assists with production and also with the sustainability of that land.

I would like to think a real look can be had—if and when legislation is drawn up, as it should be—at the new practices of farming that are very sustainable, a lot more sustainable than going over your country eight to 12 times, over various passes, as far as tillage is concerned. I also note there are a lot of new advances in agriculture with managing stock.

We are hearing about virtual fencing coming on board and being trialled, using electronics and electronic tags on animals and that kind of thing. Over the years before that, we have also seen revolutionary technologies come on board, such as electric fencing for strip grazing so that you can maximise a strip of land in a paddock or pasture. It is pretty easy: roll up the tape, move the stock over a bit and get full production out of that land.

That is not to say that people who have set fencing—and, in the main, you would see this in most properties around the state—are not very aware of pasture management and getting it right to get the right outcomes, especially in these times when agriculture is on a high. Grain prices are high at the moment and stock is high. Some people get more rain than others. Obviously in a year like this it is pretty tough in some areas, but some people have already taken the crops off and are getting a reasonable result. But that is farming.

As I indicated earlier in this contribution, in moving this legislation forward I would just like to think that landholders—and I am talking about agricultural landholders here, in the main—get the appropriate input and the right to consult appropriately so that we get that right balance between agricultural production and coastal protection.

On top of that, we also need to be aware of coastal development and, as the member for MacKillop indicated, make sure that we use the right science to work out what development we can have on the coast, where and in the right locations. We have to have appropriate science behind it so that we get the right balance with development. As long as we have been on this earth, there has always been development and, yes, we do have to get it right.

It is not dissimilar to a recent application for a cable ski park at Murray Bridge, which did face some hurdles with the council Development Assessment Panel. It should not have, but that is another story. I just want to commend Adam Bruce for the work he has done so far in moving that forward and going for development approval soon. A similar scenario is where there will be development on the River Murray flats right under the old bridge at Murray Bridge, which we are putting \$36 million into restabilising and bringing up to standard so that it can operate for many decades to come.

The development Adam is proposing to build there is cable skiing with five towers, and it will be a world-class tourism development in Murray Bridge. Any buildings built on that flood zone, which is obviously the river flats where cattle have grazed all my life, have to be buildings that, if there is a repeat of the 1956 flood, can handle that. Obviously any sheds or structures built on that land will have to have openings at each end, and the cable towers for the skiing and wake boarding that will happen there in the future will be fine.

I guess that is just an example of utilising the river flats, but it does bring up a similar conversation in regard to coastal management where you can make development work; you just have to be insightful of how it is done and manage with science all the potential outcomes. We need to make sure that we can develop appropriately and that if someone has something a bit entrepreneurial or a bit different, a bit out of the box, we work with them so that we can get that appropriate development for the betterment of all.

As I indicated earlier in my contribution on the coastal protection changes to the act later on in the next parliament, I think it is absolutely essential to get it right for everyone involved, especially for those in the agricultural sector.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:43): I would like to briefly make a contribution to the Inquiry into the Coast Protection Board and Coastal Legislation and thank all members under the stewardship of the member for MacKillop. At various times, other contributions were made from members who came in during the course of that.

In particular, as the Minister for Local Government and Planning I wish to say that I will of course consider carefully any recommendation or request for state government to undertake the development of a framework in relation to the culmination of powers and functions of the board within the envelope of the Planning and Development Infrastructure Act 2016 and also, following the implementation of an amended act, to further seek the State Planning Commission's collaboration to commit to a cross-agency review of a number of matters.

Whilst those matters are under my direct responsibility as the minister, and we will look at those matters very carefully, a number of other recommendations are essentially under the direct responsibility—as the Coast Protection Act 1972 is—of the Minister for Environment. I am sure he will be looking with interest at the recommendations made.

I am aware that Ms Helen Dyer, the Chair of the State Planning Commission, provided evidence to this committee. I have appreciated her service in relation not only to the commission but also to presenting to the committee and providing her evidence. Furthermore, there is a group that does not appear to have given evidence to this committee, but they have recently requested to meet with me and the Planning Commission to discuss further how there would be an interaction in relation to future coastal protection—I put that in general terms—under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act.

Obviously, if there are any weaknesses in relation to legislation, or there is a need for reform as a result of a number of other recommendations presented for the restructure and amendments to the Coast Protection Act, then of course they will need to be consequential to be dealt with as well. I thank the members for their report and we will certainly have a look at those matters. I just make one observation: I note that there had not been a site visit to Kangaroo Island. It does have quite a bit of coastline, which I understand is under the jurisdiction of the Coast Protection Act.

There are a number of parliamentary committees that regularly visit Kangaroo Island, so I am sure they would have been identified for the benefit of those to be informed for the purposes of assisting in this report as well and the consideration of the matters that have been raised. It seems that the district council of Kangaroo Island has not presented a submission. One thing I think that probably needs to be done is to make some inquiries as to whether they have been invited to make a contribution, if they have not. It seems they are not on the witness list either.

In conclusion, I indicate that the Law Society of South Australia is being asked to undertake some assistance work by providing a scheme—I may be confusing that with another committee. But the Law Society certainly made a submission as well. Again, as I said, we will look at all those matters in detail and I thank members for their consideration.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford): Before I call the member for MacKillop, I ask the Attorney: is there anything in here for cuttlefish?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that I have seen so far.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT AUGUSTA SECONDARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:48): I move:

That the 132nd report of the committee, entitled Port Augusta Secondary School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, Port Augusta Secondary School is located—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford): You do not have to call me 'madam'; Acting Speaker is enough.

Mr DULUK: It reminds me of the Fifty-Third Parliament. Port Augusta Secondary School is located on Stirling Road, Port Augusta, within the Port Augusta City Council. Port Augusta Secondary School was established in 1995 through the amalgamation of the Augusta Park High School and the Port Augusta High School. It is the only public secondary school in Port Augusta.

Port Augusta Secondary School was allocated funding of \$4.6 million (excluding GST) as part of the Department for Education's capital works program announced in February 2019. In November 2020, further funding of \$2 million (excluding GST) was allocated, bringing the total project funding to \$6.6 million. The proposed redevelopment of Port Augusta Secondary School will consist of the demolition of existing infrastructure and new works to accommodate approximately 900 students on the Port Augusta Secondary School site to cater for enrolment growth, including the transition of year 7 into high school in 2022. The Port Augusta Secondary School redevelopment project will include the following scope of works:

- construction of a new two-storey building to provide general learning areas, flexible learning areas for technical studies, food, technology and art, amenities, office space and staff areas;
- demolition of an existing building; and
- provision of additional car park spaces.

The redevelopment works at Port Augusta Secondary School will be staged, with construction expected to commence in February 2021, with completion expected in December 2021. I hope they are almost complete.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (11:51): I, too, would like to quickly talk about the public works on the Port Augusta Secondary School. I would like to talk about this great school, which was established in 1995 with the amalgamation of Augusta Park High School and Port Augusta High School. The amalgamation of these two schools on the one site allowed for a far better education for those students attending the public high school.

As members are well aware, this school is the only public high school in Port Augusta and needs to be at the very top level for those students attending, plus for the attraction of new young students coming out of primary schools. This will allow them to see a greater facility with the very best buildings and greater educational opportunities. As most people here know, I lived in Port Augusta previously for my employment at the time. I also had the opportunity to operate a business in Port Augusta.

At that time, there were two high schools; however, with this expenditure—and I congratulate the Public Works Committee on this—the existing Port Augusta Secondary School will provide the very best for those students attending. This redevelopment will allow for the demolition of some existing infrastructure which resulted in \$4.6 million allocated in February 2019 and a further \$2 million in February 2020, bringing the budget to \$6.6 million. From my observation when I was up

there, some of the buildings were very old. No matter who we are, we would like to also see the greatest opportunities for our young kids.

From my discussions, the whole of these works were very closely discussed with the local people and have the full support of Port Augusta and its surrounding communities. I am sure it also has the support of the education department, all the students, the local member and the council who would have had involvement in this. The project will allow for future enrolments, including the transition of year 7s to high school in 2022. It will give not only the existing students but, very importantly, the new enrolments, the very best opportunities for their educational future. Again, I thank the members of the Public Works Committee for their consideration and approval of this great project. I commend it to the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:53): It is a huge pleasure to rise to speak on this project. I thank our government, particularly the education minister, for funding this \$7.7 million project. It was great to be at the Port Augusta Secondary School graduation on Friday last week, and I can tell you that everybody in this school community is extremely excited about this project.

Of course, the students who graduated on Friday are well aware that they will not get to benefit from it personally. In fact, they have been living with the construction zone, but they are incredibly glad nonetheless for the students who will follow them. Acting Principal, Simon Owens, was glowing about the work that is being done on site. The Minister for Education has actually visited Port Augusta Secondary School twice this year. I am going to do everything I can to get him there again as early as possible in the new year, but I am very grateful for that.

Port Augusta Secondary School achieves results far better than many people would expect, to be perfectly blunt. The people of Port Augusta know what a fantastic institution this is, but there are many people outside of Port Augusta who are not aware of what a great job it does with regard to providing a quality education for high school students in Port Augusta.

We have six public primary schools and one public high school in Port Augusta, as well as two Christian schools, which play a very important role in the educational community, and the special school in Port Augusta. Those six primary schools, and in some cases the primary schools of the other two Christian non-government schools, feed into Port Augusta Secondary School, and what Port Augusta Secondary School does so well is to offer a range of educational opportunities.

A range of educational opportunities includes not only the normal academic style, which we all expect from a high-calibre secondary school in our state, but also a wide range of more flexible and broader educational opportunities. In that respect, I think about pathways to trades, I think about pathways to traineeships, I think about pathways to apprenticeships and, in many cases, the opportunities to undergo apprenticeships while still doing some secondary schooling education.

Importantly, there are partnerships between the Port Augusta Secondary School and other secondary schools around the Mid North and Upper Spencer Gulf region. The Pichi Richi Trade Training Centre is a tremendous initiative where the Port Augusta Secondary School, Orroroo and Peterborough high schools, and others, come together so that they can offer particular training and educational opportunities on their own campuses, and the students are actually able to move between the campuses as and when appropriate.

Some students can get everything they need at essentially their home high school, but for other students it is fantastic to be able to pick up the educational opportunities available from other high schools while they still officially attend their own high school. It is an absolutely outstanding development. This project is there for everyone to see because, as it happens, the work that is going on is on the main road, the Victoria Parade side of the school, so that everybody who comes through Port Augusta is well aware of the fantastic job that our government and our education department are doing.

I cannot support this project enough. I know that the entire Port Augusta community, including members of the other schools, appreciate it as well. This will do wonders for the educational and employment opportunities for young people in Port Augusta for decades to come.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:58): I rise to contribute a few words, especially any time there is an investment in schools in regional South Australia. I support the previous government, which had a fantastic record, especially in my electorate, in the APY lands and in Roxby Downs, and of course

with the big initiative in Whyalla, the \$100 million school that will be open and full of students at the beginning of next year.

It is always good to see improvements to our schools in the regions. Port Augusta has had it for some time now and Whyalla has the one high school model, because the one high school model is a far more sensible approach in some of our regional communities. Of course, Whyalla had multiple high schools and a model that I do not think served our students and teachers that well, with the two junior high schools feeding into the senior high school. Port Augusta had moved to the one school model a lot earlier than Whyalla, so hopefully Whyalla is going to get benefits out of that.

There are still schools in my electorate that need assistance and upgrades. The one that comes to mind readily is Quorn: some expenditure in Quorn would not go amiss. Of course, there are lots of other sites in such a vast electorate where investment is needed in the facilities. I was very proud to see just the other day, with the announcements of a range of policies on the part of the opposition—and hopefully we will be the government next year—a range of very good educational policies, some of which will have a positive impact in regional communities. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES 2021) BILL, CONTINGENT NOTICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (12:00): I move the contingent notice of motion standing in my name:

That standing orders be so far suspended so as to enable all Government Business, Orders of the Day up to, but not including the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill be postponed and taken into consideration after the Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill.

The SPEAKER: Do you wish to speak to the motion, member for West Torrens?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir.

The SPEAKER: If no other member wishes to speak, the question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to.

The house divided on the motion:

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Ayes | 20 |
| Noes | 24 |
| Majority | 4 |

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.

Bell, T.S.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.

Chapman, V.A.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.

NOES

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Whetstone, T.J.

Wingard, C.L.

PAIRS

Piccolo, A.

Tarzia, V.A.

Motion thus negated.

*Bills***ABORIGINAL REPRESENTATIVE BODY BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 October 2021.)

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

The SPEAKER: Attention has been drawn to the state of the house. A quorum may not have been present at the time the matter was called but, in any event, it is now present.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have been generous to the government in similar circumstances, so I intend to continue to be generous.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:09): I rise to speak about the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill and indicate that there are very grave concerns about the nature and the process of this bill that I will be canvassing shortly.

Before I do that, though, I would like to acknowledge Professor Roger Thomas, who I have known for a remarkably long time, stretching back before I was a member of parliament, before I was a public servant, back to when I had the great pleasure of working at the University of Adelaide. I was at that time relatively young and working out where I wanted to go in my career and working for the position that succeeded the title, Registrar.

One day my manager said to me, 'You're going to have to go and run Wilto Yerlo for a short while.' Not being an Aboriginal person, obviously, it would be completely inappropriate for me to run that unit for any significant period of time, but Mercy Glastonbury, who had been doing a terrific job running that unit in the university, had come down with an illness and needed to leave quickly, and there needed to be an appropriate process to replace her with an Aboriginal person. So I had the very great fortune for a period of about three months to step in and take over the acting director role.

The person who then won that position was Roger Thomas, so I had the pleasure of getting to know him, both in the transition time and then ongoing in our period together at university, and to form a very great respect for him and also a deep affection for him. He is a good human being. He is now, of course, the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement. He is a Kokatha Mirning man, and his families are from the West Coast and northern regions of South Australia.

After he was initially the director of Wilto Yerlo, he became the Professor of Indigenous Engagement, an adjunct professor of education at the University of Adelaide and the Dean of the Centre for Australian Indigenous Research and Studies, which was the formal name of Wilto Yerlo. Dr Thomas was the first Aboriginal person to obtain the level of professor at the University of Adelaide and he was the first to receive an honorary doctorate. He truly has been a trailblazer.

In 2017, he was appointed as Treaty Commissioner to lead treaty negotiations to strengthen the relationship between the government and Aboriginal South Australians. In 2018, he took on the role of Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement. As commissioner, he provides Aboriginal leadership across South Australia, advocating on behalf of all Aboriginal people and communities. Dr Thomas investigates and advises on barriers to Aboriginal people's access and full participation in government, non-government and private services.

Dr Thomas has held various positions on state, national and international advisory committees working on strategic initiatives and has presented numerous papers at conferences and forums, both nationally and internationally. In helping the government to develop this bill, Dr Thomas has worked under incredibly challenging circumstances. The commissioner was, I understand, blocked at many turns by a government and a Premier that simply do not understand or prioritise Aboriginal affairs.

The Premier did not provide any dedicated resources for the consultation, and the commissioner had to rely on the modest resources of the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division in the Premier's department. Then the bill was only allowed to be open for public consultation for nine days. Dr Thomas is owed an apology by the Premier, Steven Marshall. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement said on ABC radio on 17 September 2021:

I've expressed to the Premier, I've expressed to the process. I find it very, very insulting that it doesn't give Aboriginal people sufficient time to talk this through because it's such a significant piece of legislation.

A proper consultation period is simply good policy and good practice, but it is even more important for a bill like this. It is unfortunate, and a clear reminder of why we need to do more as a community, that not a single member of this place is an Aboriginal person. Only one member of either of our chambers is an Aboriginal person and he will have a say only after we consider this bill in this chamber.

We cannot fix the damage of more than 200 years of colonisation overnight, but we all have an obligation to right the wrongs of the past: the dispossession, the massacres, the separation of families, the suppression of language and culture. From 1836 to 1962, when it was abolished under the Aboriginal Affairs Act 1962, South Australia had—and forgive me for the language—a Protector of Aborigines. Similar positions existed all around Australia.

Despite the name, this position was more about control than protection. It effectively had the power to dictate where Aboriginal people lived, including restricting them to reservations with few jobs, little education and poor health services. Penalties applied to people who left reservations without permission. Rules were put in place to control who people married and where they could work, among many other issues. A.O. Neville was an infamous Western Australian Protector of Aborigines, who literally encouraged breeding out Aboriginality. He said:

...the children would be lighter than the mother, and if later they married whites and had children these would be lighter still, and that in the third or fourth generation no sign of native origin whatever would be apparent.

Again, please forgive me for relaying these very unpleasant views.

When Aboriginal people were allowed to work, wages were often well below those paid to non-Aboriginal people or they were not paid in money. Despite working hard and even serving in our armed forces in wars, Aboriginal families could rarely save to buy assets like vehicles or land. Until the 1967 referendum, Aboriginal people were not counted in the federal census and the federal government was not allowed to make laws in respect of Aboriginal people.

This meant Aboriginal people could not access federal government support like social security and some forms of education. By not being included in the census, the federal government was not able to provide funding to the states for Aboriginal people like they could for non-Aboriginal people, which resulted in horrific rates of poverty and deprivation. Until 1965, Aboriginal people were either not allowed to vote or were only allowed to vote in very limited circumstances in some elections.

While the 1960s saw significant legal changes in support of Aboriginal people, they were only small steps in addressing more than a century of active discrimination and suppression. Aboriginal people were quite literally not counted as Australians and did not have access to the same rights as everybody else. Over the past 70 years, despite improvements in some laws, Aboriginal people continue to experience poor outcomes in health, employment and justice, among other areas. An Aboriginal person born in remote South Australia still has a life expectancy of around 30 years less than others in the community.

For these reasons and many others, an Aboriginal voice to parliament is an important step in ensuring that Aboriginal people have a greater say in systems that have excluded and punished

them for more than two centuries. For more than a century, calls are being made for greater rights and self-determination for Aboriginal people. For most of that time, these calls have been met with objections from people who were happy to continue the colonial way of doing things.

Sadly, some of these objectives seem to genuinely believe that one group of people should be oppressed and treated as less than equal. Even in modern times, we have seen some of these attitudes continue. Who can forget the TV ads in the 1990s in response to Aboriginal land rights court cases and legislation? The Australian public sat through advertisements that literally said that people's backyards could be stolen if we acknowledged that there was a people and a culture in this land before Europeans arrived. We saw advertisements with walls being built between Aboriginal and other Australians.

When Kevin Rudd made the historic apology to the stolen generations in February 2008, a number of federal Liberal and National Party MPs boycotted the speech. Even in the past year, sadly, MPs' offices have received emails from people who claim that a voice for Aboriginal people should be rejected because it elevates them above other Australians. This is not the view of the Labor Party. Labor has long supported a better deal for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

The then Labor Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Don Dunstan, introduced the first Aboriginal land rights legislation in the nation in 1966 that established the Aboriginal Lands Trust. This was followed in 1981 by the passing of South Australian land rights legislation for the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands. This legislation was built on the work of Labor under Don Dunstan in the 1970s.

On 16 August 1975, Labor Prime Minister Gough Whitlam famously poured a handful of red soil into the hand of Vincent Lingiari. This symbolised the legal transfer of Wave Hill Station back to the Gurindji people. It also meant that the Gurindji people became the first Aboriginal community to have their land returned to them by the commonwealth government:

Vincent Lingiari, I solemnly hand you these deeds as proof in Australian law that these lands belong to the Gurindji people, and I put into your hands part of the earth itself as a sign that this land will be in the possession of you and your children for ever.

Vincent responded:

Let us live happily together as mates, let us not make it hard for each other... We want to live in a better way together, Aboriginals and white men, let us not fight over anything, let us be mates.

That is extraordinary generosity.

On 10 December 1992, the official opening of the International Year of the World's Indigenous People, Labor Prime Minister Paul Keating delivered the Redfern speech. He outlined the outrages committed against Aboriginal people since colonisation and asked us all to imagine if it were us:

...it might help us if we non-Aboriginal Australians imagined ourselves dispossessed of land we had lived on for 50,000 years—and then imagined ourselves told that it had never been ours.

Imagine if ours was the oldest culture in the world and we were told that it was worthless.

Imagine if we had resisted this settlement, suffered and died in the defence of our land, and then were told in history books that we had given up without a fight.

Imagine if non-Aboriginal Australians had served their country in peace and war and were then ignored in history books.

Imagine if our feats on sporting fields had inspired admiration and patriotism and yet did nothing to diminish prejudice.

Imagine if our spiritual life was denied and ridiculed.

Imagine if we had suffered the injustice and then were blamed for it.

It seems to me that if we can imagine the injustice we can imagine its opposite.

And we can have justice.

Those are very moving words from a superb former Prime Minister.

In 1995, federal Labor Attorney-General Michael Lavarch instigated the Bringing Them Home report. The report was delivered under the Liberals, but some findings were rejected and John

Howard refused to say sorry. On 13 February 2008, Labor Prime Minister Kevin Rudd made a formal apology to the stolen generations, whose lives have been blighted by past government policies of forced child removal and Indigenous assimilation. Kevin Rudd said:

We apologise for the laws and policies of successive parliaments and governments that have inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss on these our fellow Australians. We apologise especially for the removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families, their communities and their country.

In 2015, South Australia became the first mainland state to introduce a stolen generations reparations scheme under Labor Aboriginal affairs minister Kyam Maher. In 2017, under Labor in South Australia, the first agreement in a treaty process was signed anywhere in Australia, and in 2019 SA Labor committed to a state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Labor supports greater respect and protection for the oldest living culture on our planet. Labor supports a voice to parliament and a voice to government for Aboriginal people. For too long these voices have been silenced or ignored. The historic referendum in May 1967 was an important step in changing this. It saw Aboriginal people included in the census and allowed the commonwealth to make laws in relation to Aboriginal people. Despite these changes, as the decades wore on improvements in real life outcomes for Aboriginal people were slow to emerge.

Aboriginal people remained the most incarcerated people on earth. Life expectancy, especially for people born in remote communities, remained decades below other Australians. Huge gaps remained in access to health and education. Fifty years after the referendum, in May of 2017, Aboriginal people gathered and developed a new plan for inclusion and reconciliation.

The Uluru Statement from the Heart is short but it is incredibly powerful and was the basis for renewed calls for an Aboriginal voice. With the indulgence of the house, I would like to read the statement so that members can consider how it affects our approach to this bill:

We, gathered at the 2017 National Constitutional Convention, coming from all points of the southern sky, make this statement from the heart:

Our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tribes were the first sovereign Nations of the Australian continent and its adjacent islands, and possessed it under our own laws and customs. This our ancestors did, according to the reckoning of our culture, from the Creation, according to the common law from 'time immemorial', and according to science more than 60,000 years ago.

This sovereignty is a spiritual notion: the ancestral tie between the land, or 'mother nature', and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who were born therefrom, remain attached thereto, and must one day return thither to be united with our ancestors. This link is the basis of the ownership of the soil, or better, of sovereignty. It has never been ceded or extinguished, and co-exists with the sovereignty of the Crown.

How could it be otherwise? That peoples possessed a land for sixty millennia and this sacred link disappears from world history in merely the last two hundred years?

With substantive constitutional change and structural reform, we believe this ancient sovereignty can shine through as a fuller expression of Australia's nationhood.

Proportionally, we are the most incarcerated people on the planet. We are not an innately criminal people. Our children are alienated from their families at unprecedented rates. This cannot be because we have no love for them. And our youth languish in detention in obscene numbers. They should be our hope for the future.

These dimensions of our crisis tell plainly the structural nature of our problem. This is the torment of our powerlessness.

We seek constitutional reforms to empower our people and take a rightful place in our own country. When we have power over our destiny our children will flourish. They will walk in two worlds and their culture will be a gift to their country.

We call for the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution.

Makarrata is the culmination of our agenda: the coming together after a struggle. It captures our aspirations for a fair and truthful relationship with the people of Australia and a better future for our children based on justice and self-determination.

We seek a Makarrata Commission to supervise a process of agreement-making between governments and First Nations and truth-telling about our history.

In 1967 we were counted, in 2017 we seek to be heard. We leave base camp and start our trek across this vast country. We invite you to walk with us in a movement of the Australian people for a better future.

The statement called for three things: voice, truth and treaty.

It was very sad when just two months after the Uluru Statement our then opposition leader and now Premier said that treaty was 'a cruel hoax'. It might reflect the Premier's approach to treaty but it does not reflect the view of the Labor Party.

The Labor Party was disappointed when our now Premier described the treaty as a cruel hoax. The Labor Party was even more disappointed when one of Steven Marshall's first actions as Premier was to cancel the treaty process that had begun under Labor. We were the first jurisdiction in Australia to sign an agreement under a treaty process in 2017. Sadly, we have gone from being a national leader to falling behind. The years lost in this process can never be recovered.

I was so proud in July 2019 when the member for Croydon, the leader of the South Australian Labor Party, committed a future Labor government to a state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart. *The Guardian* newspaper reported at the time, and I quote:

The South Australian Labor party has pledged to introduce a state-based version of the Uluru statement, including establishing a representative body to act as a voice to parliament, if it wins the next election.

The proposal has been welcomed by Aboriginal leaders who say they are not prepared to abandon the resolutions of the 2017 First Nations National Constitutional Convention at Uluru despite a lack of support from the federal government.

Opposition leader Peter Malinauskas told *Guardian Australia* that the policy reaffirmed SA Labor's support for negotiating with Aboriginal nations, a process that began in February 2017 but was halted when the Marshall Liberal government was elected just over a year later.

'Enacting a state-based version of the Uluru Statement from the Heart is an opportunity for Aboriginal South Australians to finally have their aspirations realised,' Malinauskas said.

It is 4½ years after the Uluru Statement and the Premier has presented a bill to this place that proposes to act on just one of its three key elements. While Labor is committed to implementing all three elements of the Uluru Statement, it is fair to say that we have reservations about the bill before us today.

The bill was available for public consultation for just nine days. It has been almost 4½ years since the Uluru Statement, which is around 1,600 days, and this bill was available for consideration for just nine of them. There was no media release from a Premier who will announce almost anything for a quick media hit. The bill was only posted on the website of the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement. The only additional resources provided were a map of proposed electorates and a two-page set of frequently asked questions. The bill was not put on the YourSAy website, an online consultation hub managed by the Better Together team in the Premier's own department.

The government has 19 current consultations on YourSAy and has had hundreds more in the past. It was used for the Attorney-General's consultation on the freedom of information bill, even though her agency asked that public comments not be allowed. YourSAy is currently asking people for their views on the Civil Liability (Serious Invasions of Privacy) Bill. That consultation runs for eight weeks, from late September to late November.

The Premier's department is even using YourSAy to promote the Minister's Recreational Fishing Advisory Council election. The Public Transport Diversity and Inclusion Framework gets a spot on YourSAy but, bewilderingly, not the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill.

Comments on the draft Aboriginal Representative Body Bill had to be emailed and then they were not available for anyone else to read. It is almost as if the government did not want to hear what people had to say and, if they spoke up, the government did not want their voice to be heard. This simply does not line up with a bill that is supposed to be about giving people a voice.

While the federal government has dragged its feet on an Aboriginal voice, at least it did a proper consultation. It ran for four months, from January to May this year. It was supported by media releases, videos, in-language fact sheets and local round tables. There were even special advisory bodies for young people and those with disability. Summaries of the local consultations were posted online and thousands of pages of submissions from the public were published and available for everybody to see and read.

The bill before us today just provides a voice to a committee. The first body would be completely appointed. When elections do happen, only five of the 13 members would be directly

elected. The remainder would be appointed by the Governor and only two of those on the recommendation of elected Aboriginal bodies. The bill is silent on treaty and truth.

Despite these concerns, Labor will listen carefully to the government's argument for the bill in this place and the other place. It is unfortunate that, after a lightning-speed public consultation, we are debating this bill with just a few parliamentary sitting days remaining before the election—that we are aware of. We want a proper community consultation. We want proper parliamentary debate. We want to maximise elected representation in any body. We want the greatest level of self-determination. We want a genuine voice, and we want 'truth and treaty' to stand alongside 'voice'.

In closing, I would like to say that beyond all the statistics and history books, the experience of stories of real people in our lives so often changes our minds and touches our hearts and that is why we have an obligation in this place to do justice to the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:34): I also rise to contribute to this debate and I do not necessarily want to be in a position to repeat all that has been said. The member for Port Adelaide was very comprehensive in both the history and context surrounding the Uluru Statement from the Heart and the history in this state.

There are clearly deficiencies here. I think we all in this place would want a genuine voice to parliament and the question is how we get it through this bill. I have a number of Aboriginal communities in my electorate and it is my belief that this bill is deficient. The point that the consultation process in relation to the bill itself has been incredibly truncated is an accurate point. The people in communities I represent in the APY lands, Oak Valley, the Maralinga lands and the Flinders Ranges area have not been effectively consulted when it comes to the shape of this bill, which is not to say that Roger Thomas did not do a solid body of work in good faith.

You would have to question whether that good faith has been treated well by the government, given the process that has now been entered into and the rush at virtually the last minute in the dying days of this parliament to get this bill through. This is not the way you do this sort of thing when it comes to Aboriginal communities. It might be occasionally the way we do it with one or two bills in this place, not the greater body of bills that we consider. Sometimes they are very protracted processes.

But when it comes to this bill itself, it has only been a matter of days where consultation (if that is what it can be called) has been enabled. There has been no opportunity for people in the APY lands to gather, discuss and take the time—and I put the emphasis on the word 'time'—needed to come to a view when it comes to this particular bill. The same can be said for other people in my electorate, Aboriginal people in my electorate, when it comes to this bill. Indeed, Roger Thomas is on the record in relation to his concern about the rushed nature of the consultation on the bill.

It has also been mentioned about the resources available to Roger Thomas as regards going out to communities and meeting with people—the lack of resources—and these resources were not commensurate with the challenge that was faced. In some respects, we get one opportunity to get this right and, in order to get it right, we need to do it in a comprehensive and respectful fashion, one that acknowledges that this does take time.

When you look back at the Uluru Statement from the Heart, what a powerful collection of words when it came to expressing the commitment and the link to country and the fact that sovereignty was never ceded by the Aboriginal people of this country. They were incredibly powerful words that we should treat with respect, and I do not believe that this process is treating those words with respect. I do not reflect on those opposite because I think we all have a genuine desire to get this right. However, I would ask them to think about this and to think about the bill coming before the parliament and the fact that hardly any time has been given at all when it comes to consultation.

We know that the processes that are gone through in Aboriginal communities can be time consuming, and they are time consuming for a reason: because everyone gets to have their say, gets to have their input and gets to really have a look at what is going on, and this process is not going to do that. It has been mentioned that the first body is not even going to be an elected body: it is going to be an appointed body. That is an incredible weakness. We have had elected parliaments in the state going back over a long period of time, so the idea about a direct election is nothing foreign or alien.

The body then morphs into a combination of some elected members and some appointed members, and you would have to question whether this is the best way of going about this. I would say that it is not, but, once again, let the Aboriginal people of this state have the time and have the space to reflect upon this bill that is before the parliament. If that was done and if that time was given we might have a more considered bill, a bill that would attract the fulsome support of this parliament. However, because of the process this is not going to attract that fulsome support, which is a great pity.

Once again, and notwithstanding the good work by Roger Thomas, it is a bunch of white people imposing their direction and their wishes. We all mention the Uluru Statement from the Heart and that it was a powerful set of words, and the Redfern speech has also been referred to. Whether it was Paul Keating or Don Watson who wrote it, or a combination of both of them, in my mind is neither here nor there, but they were incredibly powerful words, and it was an invitation for us all, given the history of colonisation on this continent, to walk in the footsteps of the traditional owners of this continent and what happened as a result of colonisation to the original owners of this continent.

I know that the word 'owners' is not the correct word given the linkage between the Aboriginal people and the land that they walked. I remember when I first came to this country as a young lad many years ago. During the history lessons of that period there was hardly any reference to Aboriginal people. There was a passing reference to someone with an Anglicised nickname, Jacky Jacky, assisting an explorer. That was about the sum total of exposure to what happened on this continent when I was a student.

Things have improved since then. I did have the benefit of quite rigorous history lessons in the later years of high school. I ended up studying the history of China, the history of India, European history and Russian history. It was a good education, but there was very little about the Aboriginal people of this continent and the interaction between the colonisers and the Aboriginal people of this continent. That was to come later.

As someone of near Irish descent with an Irish mother, we would visit Ireland every year. I had to stay with my grandparents before coming to Australia. Ireland was one of the first places that the English colonised—the English ruling class if you like. It was the first place they colonised. What was interesting was the use of the language and the use of a whole range of oppressive mechanisms to suppress the people of Ireland over hundreds of years. When I came to Australia and did some of my own study, I found a replication, to a degree, of what was done in Ireland, mirrored here in Australia and, indeed, in some of the other places the English colonised over an extended period of time. It was incredibly oppressive.

We all know now to a far greater degree the history of what happened in the Frontier Wars. There is still no recognition on our war memorials of what happened in the Frontier Wars, the first defence of this country. People are surprised by the number of those killed in parts of that Frontier War and, in places like Queensland, the number of people who died in defence of their country.

One famous Australian anthropologist specialised in work on Central America and, when she turned her gaze to Australia, she went into incredible detail about what happened in Victoria and the numbers of Aboriginal people who died in an incredibly short period of time—80 per cent of the population. I cannot even imagine what it would be like to be exposed to something like that, to be at the receiving end of something like that. That was direct killing, that was murder, that was disease, that was dislocation and all the other things that came with it.

As I said, we have an opportunity here to do the right thing. I would counsel patience when it comes to doing the right thing. This now appears to be ticking off a box to get this through in the dying days of this parliament: 'We've done this.' It is important that, irrespective of whether the next government is a Liberal government or a Labor government, we take do that time, that there is patience, that there is genuine on-the-ground consultation on this bill.

If I am not misreading it, this is not even a voice to the parliament directly: it is a voice to a committee, which is then a voice to the parliament. There is the removal of the Aboriginal Lands standing committee and, if I am reading this correctly, another body will be put in its place. The Aboriginal representative body will be a filter. I am on the Aboriginal Lands standing committee, and I have been since I was elected in 2014.

I remember my first meeting of that particular committee as a complete newbie to parliament. I turned up, and some of the members were very keen to go on a study over to New Zealand to look at Maori culture. I know a little about Aboriginal communities in my state, and I thought, 'Why on earth are we going over to New Zealand? It's different in so many respects.' At the time, I spoke out against it and we ended up not going to New Zealand, which would have been at taxpayers' expense, so we did not go there. The next suggestion was to go to the Torres Strait Islands, and I thought that was not appropriate either.

My first visit out to the APY lands left me feeling deeply uncomfortable. Essentially, it was a bunch of white people piling into a chartered jet to go to Uluru to stay at a luxury resort and then each day fly in and out of Aboriginal communities in the APY lands. At the next meeting when we came back, because I had just been exposed to this I said, 'I'm not doing this anymore. If this is what we're going to do, I am not going to go on these trips.' I thought it was not acceptable. If we are going to the community, we should be living in the communities or staying in the communities, more accurately, we are visiting. I have to say that it did change: we now stay in the communities we are visiting.

I put the emphasis on the word 'visiting'. We are not part of these communities. Being part of any community takes time. I have been part of the community of Whyalla since more or less the age of 10. Am I fully across my community? I think I have a reasonably good take, but communities are complex. They change. You need that lived experience in a community. That visit is no reflection on the Aboriginal lands committee. Their motivation is good but, at the end of the day, they are visitors. You just get a snapshot.

We need in this state, we need in all the states, we need in the federal parliament, a genuine voice. When I say a 'genuine voice', I mean a voice that reflects the complexity of the different communities that exist in South Australia. They are scattered far and wide across the great breadth of our state and here in the metropolitan area. That voice will be a complex voice and that voice will be a nuanced voice.

I do not believe this is the way to go. I think most people in this place are entering into this in good faith, but I would ask them to step back and reflect on what is going on here. To attempt to rush this bill through in this way and not give it the time that is needed is just not the way to go. If it was in my community in Whyalla, I know that I would feel insulted if there was a bill before the parliament that affected us directly and we had only a few days to have a look at it, to reflect on it and to have the internal debates that go on. People here should feel far more insulted.

These are people who have been on this continent now, according to science, for 60,000 years. And we take a few days to consult on this bill? A body of work has been done, so it is not as though we are going right back to the beginning, but we need to do this in a way that is going to provide serious resources when it comes to developing a voice to this parliament. It should be a direct voice to this parliament, not a voice that has to go through a conduit or a filter. I think that needs to happen.

To spend a little bit more time is not to the detriment of anybody here. It will not be to the detriment of the government. It would be a positive thing to do, to take this seriously and it is not just seen as part of a short-term political agenda. What we want to achieve here is something that will stand the test of time. In some respects, South Australia has a proud record. It did some of the first things in the country when it came to—and this is a long time ago—setting up the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the APY lands and the freehold and all that goes with it in the APY lands.

It is all powerful stuff. We have moved on and there is an opportunity here to get this right. I have said it again and again and again. It is one of the most important elements of the democratic process. There is dissent, there is dialogue, there is deliberation and decision, but it is often deliberation that is not given the weight that it is due. It is deliberation that assists us to do something in the right way.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:54): I rise to speak on the Aboriginal Representative Body Bill 2021. In doing so I would first like to acknowledge that we are on stolen Kaurna land that has never been ceded. I find it highly appropriate that we as members of parliament can take this opportunity to acknowledge these stolen lands and acknowledge that we respect the elders of those

lands across the whole of our state. Of course, we are here on Kaurna land, but people here represent all the lands across South Australia, and some have been on lands interstate as well, and we do acknowledge all elders past, present and emerging.

I still get questioned about doing an acknowledgement at all when I am at many public events, large and small. It is surprising in this time that people still do not quite understand the meaning of that acknowledgement and why we acknowledge. Of course, there are scripted ways of doing acknowledgements and there are other ways that have been given to you from elders. Mine has been one that I have taken counsel on in regard to why we should push that point, that this land is the land of the traditional owners and it was taken and, even though we have had apologies of sorts and acknowledgements, I think we can do better.

I want to use these few minutes before lunch to perhaps have a discussion about how elected people can get this so very wrong. I have the great privilege of attending many citizenship ceremonies in the City of Onkaparinga. In terms of the process, we have had the absolute privilege of having an elder, Auntie Georgina—who has been in that area for the whole time that I have been in parliament—who has delivered beautiful acknowledgements, Welcome to Country. I have sought counsel and used my acknowledgement as a way of acknowledging that that land has never been ceded.

So it was to my surprise that I received a letter from the Director of Citizenship Ceremonies, federally, from the Department of Home Affairs. I will not read the whole letter, but it was ostensibly telling me that I could not use the speech to be political and that I had to keep my speaking in line with the Australian Citizenship Ceremonies Code, which of course I thought I was. I found that a councillor, Sandra Brown, had made a formal complaint. I will read a bit of what I wrote to her:

Dear Councillor Brown, I was incredibly disappointed and shocked to have received correspondence in November 2019 from the Director of Citizenship Ceremony Services at the Department of Home Affairs, Mr Geoff Fearn, regarding purported comments during the Citizenship Ceremony held on 16 September 2019.

Following the advice from Mr Fearn that comments made by me were 'not in keeping with the spirit of the occasion, including references to a proposal to sell land that is considered sacred to Aboriginal people,' I made an application under the Freedom of Information Act 1991 (The Application) to the City of Onkaparinga asking for:

'All correspondence (including letters, email etc) between all Councillors and the Department of Home Affairs (Commonwealth) and/or Staff of the Department from 16th September to November 2019 relating to Nat Cook MP.'

The results of the application found that the complaint, which was made directly to the Minister for Immigration, Citizenship, Migrant Services and Multicultural Affairs, the Hon David Coleman MP, was made by yourself [insert councillor's name] in an official capacity as Councillor for the City of Onkaparinga; and indeed, you [the councillor] decided to include South Australian Liberal Party Members for Davenport, Black, Gibson and Waite, the latter three whom do not represent any portions of the City of Onkaparinga.

Now who is getting political? The letter goes on:

I found it particularly interesting that you did not include South Australian Labor Party Members the bulk of which—

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Hurtle Vale. I am sorry to interrupt debate. This is an important matter, and I acknowledge the presence in the chamber of the Premier and the Deputy Premier, signifying the significance of the matter.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD ZONE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 303 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 Plan SA's Planning and Design Code.

MILE END

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 541 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to stop the inappropriate high-rise development in the heritage/historical residential zone at 4-10 Railway Terrace, Mile End.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon S.S. Marshall)—

Remuneration Tribunal—

Determination—No. 11 of 2021—2021 Inaugural Determination of Allowances for Members of the Parole Board of South Australia

Report—No. 11 of 2021—2021 Inaugural Review of Allowances and Expenses for Members of the Parole Board of South Australia

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

Children and Young People, Office of the Guardian for—Training Centre Visitor Annual Report 2020-21

Coronial inquest into the death of Gayle Elizabeth Woodforde—Government Response Director of Public Prosecutions, Office of the—Annual Report 2020-21

Electoral Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Office for Public Integrity—Report of a review of the operations of the—Report for Period 2020-21

Judicial Conduct Commissioner—Report of a review of the operations of the—Report for Period 2020-21

Ombudsman SA—Audit of compliance with the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007 September 2021

Privacy Committee of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

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

Small Business Commissioner, Office of the—Annual Report 2020-21

State Records Act 1997, Administration of the—Annual Report 2020-21

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

Adelaide Cemeteries Authority—Annual Report 2020-21

Architectural Practice Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

State Planning Commission—Annual Report 2020-21

By the Minister for Education (Hon J.A.W. Gardner)—

Death of Joshua Marek Stachor—SA Health's response to the Deputy Coroner's Finding of 28 June 2021—August 2021

Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner—Annual Report 2020-21

Principal Community Visitor—Annual Report—2020-21

SA Health's response to the Gayle's Law Review

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon R. Sanderson)—

Children and Young People, Office of the Guardian for—Child and Young Person's Visitor Annual Report 2020-21

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

Dairy Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2020-21

EXPOSURE DRAFT BILL

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:05): I am pleased to table an exposure draft bill to reform the current powers of attorney laws and to open it for public consultation. The draft bill implements a majority of the recommendations for legislative reform from the South Australian Law Reform Institute report on this matter. This bill seeks to modernise and clarify current laws to bring them in line with community expectations.

EXPOSURE DRAFT REGULATIONS

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:05): I table an exposure draft of the termination of pregnancy regulations 2021 for the purpose of conducting a three-week period of public consultation until 16 November. The Termination of Pregnancy Act 2021 passed parliament earlier this year on 2 March 2021 and received royal assent on 11 March 2021. During debate on the bill, I gave an undertaking to parliament to ensure that a copy of the draft regulations would be made available for public comment prior to the commencement of the act.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:07): I bring up the 10th report of the committee, entitled Review of the Native Vegetation Act 1991 Interim Report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:08): I bring up 174th report of the committee, entitled Tea Tree Plaza Park 'n' Ride.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 175th report of the committee, entitled 'South Road trunk main renewal 2020 to 2024: South Road stage 1'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 176th report of the committee, entitled Valley View Secondary School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 177th report of the committee, entitled Mawson Lakes School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 178th report of the committee, entitled Woodcroft Primary School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 179th report of the committee, entitled West Lakes Shore School R-7 Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 180th report of the committee, entitled 'Bolivar Waste Water Treatment Plant: digester No. 3 insulated cover rehabilitation project'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 181st report of the committee, entitled 'Stuart Highway and Old Stuart Highway West junction upgrade and Stuart Highway and Old Stuart Highway East junction upgrade report project'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr DULUK: I bring up the 182nd report of the committee, entitled Westbourne Park Primary School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT INTO HARASSMENT IN THE PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:09): I bring up the report of the committee, together with minutes and evidence.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER (14:09): Before I call questions without notice, I wish to address a matter of privilege. I refer to the precedent established by Speaker Peterson and Speaker Gunn. As you are aware, recently a political party, the Liberal Party, contacted many residents of the Adelaide Hills. The contact was made, as I understand it, without consent and by telephone.

Some residents are concerned that their telephone numbers and other confidential, constituent-only information may have been unlawfully accessed because they only shared phone numbers and other confidential information with me so that I could render assistance, including support following the Cudlee Creek bushfire. The parliament needs to be put on inquiry, in my judgement, as to whether confidential, electorate-only records have been accessed in breach of parliamentary privilege.

Members will know that I gave the Address in Reply to the Governor detailing the harrowing and confronting experience of constituents during and after the Cudlee Creek fire. Many people contacted me so that in part I could inform parliament about the circumstances facing Hills' communities in the aftermath of that fire. It would strike a blow at the very heart of our democracy if those most confidential and private records and contact details, shared in some cases on an urgent basis for the provision of emergency support, were later accessed and used for an unrelated political purpose either by a political party or by a company, Parakeelia Pty Ltd, acting for, in connection with or for a political party.

If it is the case that confidential and intimate records, shared at a time of great distress, have been used in this way it may be a serious scandal and give rise to real questions about the lawfulness and appropriateness of access and use of those records, as well as amounting to a potential and serious breach of parliamentary privilege. I encourage members of the South Australian community, including in the Hills, who have information that might relate to this matter to approach the house. I ask members to bring forward any documents and materials as may be relevant to a prima facie case of privilege.

It would only be for me to form a view, if necessary information is brought forward, about whether those matters meet the prima facie threshold. It would not be for me to form a view about any matter that would be considered by a committee if a committee was in fact formed. The committee would be independent, act independently and have a chair independent to me reporting after its own separate deliberations to the house.

In any event, I refer to the precedents that have earlier been established, and they are important. As well, it cannot be the case that information known to me cannot be ventilated simply because it relates to, in part, parts of my electorate, other parts of the Hills or indeed people who are residing in the Hills, or who have moved or otherwise would not have redress unless it were the case that the Speaker, knowing these matters, could raise them.

In context, an important context, I bring the following matter to the attention of the house. This may become relevant evidence. This is a communication from a member of the South Australian community:

I confirm that I have never provided my details to the Liberal Party. However, I was recently contacted by the Liberal Party by phone to conduct a push poll about you—

The reference is to me—

I have never given my permission for the Liberal Party to contact me directly by phone or in any other way. I found the phone call to be intrusive as it tried to misrepresent my thoughts in the manner in which it asked questions and the way it gave limited viewpoints for responses.

I was in touch with you during the course of the Cudlee Creek bushfire emergency and response and at that time I provided you with my contact and other personal details. I have always found my dealings with you to be of a compassionate, helpful and responsive nature.

It goes on:

I ask that this matter be investigated and would like the Liberal Party to offer a copy of their privacy policy.

The complainant was a volunteer coordinator for an outreach group set up to provide life-sustaining support during and after that bushfire. I also provide this information to the house, another communication:

I confirm that I have never provided my details to the Liberal Party, however...

And it goes on:

I was recently contacted by the Liberal Party.

There is an indication that that contact was by phone. There is also an indication that it was 'to conduct a push poll about you'. The email goes on to say that this particular person was in contact with me during the course of the Cudlee Creek bushfire emergency and response. It also goes on to say that contact information and other personal details were provided to me. It says: 'I ask that this matter be investigated.'

The complainant is a captain of a CFS brigade. As I have earlier indicated, I ask that information be brought forward. My only role will be to form a view about whether the threshold, a prima facie threshold, is met. Thereafter, it will be a matter for the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of clarification, Mr Speaker. May I inquire as to the status of the statement that you have made?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is an invitation to bring forward information in relation to the subject matter that you have made on the basis that you will consider the information that you have already identified, and any other submissions, for the purpose of consideration of whether there is a prima facie case for privileges. If that is so, will you be tabling the three documents from which you have quoted?

The SPEAKER: I will not be tabling the information because it would identify, potentially, those people. However, I have shared that information with the house because it is important and because the complainants have indicated that they wish for the matter to be investigated. I have also shared it on the basis that that information is known to me and therefore it seems to me that it must be brought before the house and it also seems to me that without me bringing it before the house it might never be resolved.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: A further point of clarification, Mr Speaker: is it the intention then of the Speaker that, except for the name and address or identifying address details (email, for example) of the authors of those documents, the Speaker will be tabling the material, the whole of the material?

The SPEAKER: No. The information that might be brought forward would be considered by me but, as I say, I am not going to identify people unless they wish to be identified as complainants. Of course, additional information might well be supplied to the house and I anticipate that it will be.

*Question Time***COVID-READY ROAD MAP**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the secret modelling relied upon for his 200-word road map is reliant on 24 ICU beds being fully operational at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. As I stated yesterday, we will be receiving further information. I have a detailed interim briefing tomorrow and there is a further meeting on Tuesday next week. We plan to consolidate that modelling. I don't plan to go through it in this chamber piece by piece because the Leader of the Opposition thinks that he has some knowledge about what has been provided to the government. We have committed to providing that in a consolidated way. That was done by Professor Nicola Spurrier.

Quite frankly, it's a regrettable situation that on a daily basis now we have the opposition going out trying to undermine the excellent advice that we have for the people of South Australia. The Chief Public Health Officer has asked—

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. A point of order has been raised.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: the minister must answer the substance of the question. The Premier is now debating the answer by making false allegations about the opposition.

The SPEAKER: I am not sure that's necessarily made out, member for West Torrens. I will listen closely to the Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. The Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia, Professor Nicola Spurrier, has on many occasions suggested that she is prepared to provide this modelling, but some further detailed modelling is still coming in. It works in a fairly iterative sort of fashion. I don't know why it is that the Labor Party have been out there, shouting from the rooftops, 'What has the government got to hide?' That to me doesn't suggest that they are trying to—it suggests to me quite unequivocally that they are trying to undermine the credibility that the people of South Australia place in the public health advice that we have received.

I for one believe that it has been excellent. I for one believe that South Australia has done extraordinarily well. I don't know what would be the motivation of those opposite to continually undermine—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, standing order 98:

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

The Premier is now implying a motive to our questions, sir. That is debate.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order to the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The opposition, in framing the question, chose to use the word 'secretive' or 'secret' in relation to the advice and the Premier's answer has been entirely in relation to the choice that the Leader of the Opposition has made in using that term to undermine health advice.

The SPEAKER: I am going to give the Premier some latitude because he is the Premier. I will be listening carefully to his answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, South Australia has done extraordinarily well with regard to the management of the COVID-19 global pandemic. Much of that has been based upon the excellent advice that we have received from SA Health, the cooperation that we have had across government, whether it be the South Australia Police or the government departments more broadly, but mainly our partnership with the people of South Australia, who trust the advice that they have received.

It is extraordinary to me that during a pandemic there are those who seek to undermine the credibility of the advice which is being provided. When those opposite are saying, 'Secret advice: why won't you reveal it?' to me, that undermines the confidence that the people of South Australia would have in this advice at the very time that people need to have that confidence. I can't see that motivation. This is why I say we need to refer—

The SPEAKER: The leader on a point of order?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, under standing order 127: a member may not impute improper motives to any other member. The Premier has consistently throughout his response thus far to this question suggested that members of the parliamentary Labor Party, including myself I think on one occasion, seek to undermine the health advice. The opposition wholeheartedly rejects that assertion. In fact, the very suggestion that members of the Labor Party are undermining the health advice, indeed, undermines the bipartisan approach—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order to the point of order. Leader of Government Business, I will hear out the point of order and then I will come to you for a response.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It undermines the bipartisan approach that has been applied to health advice and I ask the Premier to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: A point of order on the point of order, the Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, the point of order is that the member was not raising a point of order: he was just making a speech.

The SPEAKER: There may have been elements of it which extended beyond the reference to the point of order but, nevertheless, there has been a suggestion that an improper motive may have been imputed. I will consider that matter.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 127 refers to individuals, not to collectives. The Leader of the Opposition wasn't actually sure whether any individual—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: 'And I think including myself' is what he said. So standing order 127 does not apply to what this member is trying to raise.

The SPEAKER: Leader of Government Business, it is a point well made. Standing order 127 of course provides a prohibition on members from digressing from the subject matter of any question under discussion—a matter I will keep close watch on during the course of question time—or imputing improper motives to any other member or making a personal reflection on any other member.

As I understand it, and I will take clarification from the Leader of the Opposition, the suggestion has been put that an improper motive has been imputed to him. There was then a reference to a class of people, in this case members of the Labor Party. I am not sure that I can act in relation to the class, but I am happy to hear any member out on that point. As I understand it, there's a complaint in relation to the member himself, personally.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That's correct, Mr Speaker. The Premier impugned the motive of myself, suggesting that I was undermining health advice when not once have I done that, sir, and I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps I will hear from the Premier in relation to this matter. Premier, do you wish to withdraw or do you maintain—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That would be a matter for you to instruct me, sir.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps that will be the easiest.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You can check *Hansard* and, if you think there has been an infringement—

The SPEAKER: I am eager for us to—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —then that's your decision. But I certainly won't be withdrawing it without your instruction.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It's a subjective test, of course, as to whether a member is concerned about any matter that might impute an improper motive and I think the best course here, Premier. I invite you to withdraw and then we can continue with question time.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I withdraw that comment, sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

COVID-READY ROAD MAP

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I would simply ask the Premier again: does the Premier's road map require a fully operational 24 ICU beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in order to be able to accommodate living with COVID?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): I refer the leader to my previous answer, sir.

COVID-READY ROAD MAP

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Why won't the Premier inform the people of South Australia through this house whether or not a fully operational 24 ICU bed is important for our hospital system dealing with COVID?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my answers to these questions yesterday. We will be providing the information, the modelling, in a consolidated format that we have relied on both for the lifting of the border restrictions on 23 November and then the subsequent reduction in restrictions here in South Australia that we will be relying on. That modelling isn't finalised. It will be and then it will be released.

COVID-READY ROAD MAP

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Premier. How can South Australians have confidence that our health system is equipped to be able to handle COVID when currently we have record ramping and 12 beds at the ICU that currently aren't even operational and instead are allocated to storage facilities and being used to accommodate film crews?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Not only the words but the tone are extremely argumentative.

The SPEAKER: I find that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members! There is a deal more energy in the room than there has been on previous occasions and we are going for the hat-trick of not throwing members out three days in a row, if members do observe the standing orders sufficiently for that to occur.

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

The SPEAKER: I ordinarily wouldn't respond to interjections, but the Minister for Education does make an excellent point.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: That's my point.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is whether the question contains argument. The question before the Chair is whether the question contains argument. It's a reasonably persuasive

point. I am going to give the leader an opportunity to put the question again, mindful of the standing orders.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would be more than happy to ask my question again of the Premier, the question being to the Premier: how can South Australians have confidence that our health system is equipped to be able to handle COVID when currently we have high levels of ambulance ramping, emergency departments under pressure and at least 12 beds in the ICU not operational.

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

Mr MALINAUSKAS: With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

The SPEAKER: Leave has been sought, Leader of Government Business. Let me hear out the question including the section that relates to the leave and then I will come to you.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In a Facebook post made yesterday by one of Royal Adelaide Hospital's leading surgeons, Dr Craig Jurisevic, he stated and I quote:

We have had to cancel another two urgent lung cancer patients today due to lack of operating theatres and ICU beds.

He then went on to say:

Could you please explain these photos taken from the unstaffed and idle 12-bed ICU ward and six operating theatres?

One of those photos showed what he said was an ICU room used as a studio for a 'freelance film crew'.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The point of order, sir, is that you asked the leader to rephrase the question and he did not rephrase the question.

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow the question, but I will remind all members that there is a form of asking questions that deals appropriately with opinion and argument. There has been for quite some time, probably since Speaker Atkinson's time, a tendency to creep over the line in relation to the relevant standing order. We are not going to take a black-letter approach because, apart from anything else, we have well departed from that in Speaker Atkinson's time, but I do remind members that argument and opinion do tend to cloud questions. I will allow the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his poorly worded question but, nevertheless, it did traverse a number of important issues, the first of which was how the public can have confidence in SA Health. Well, let me tell you SA Health is made up of very hardworking, capable men and women here in South Australia who have protected South Australia during a global pandemic. I think our health system in South Australia has stood up extraordinarily—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Why are they posting photos on Facebook?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think our SA Health has stood up extraordinarily well during a global pandemic, whether it be the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call. I am listening carefully to the Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —innovation shown by Dr Tom Dodd and his team at SA Pathology with drive-through PCR testing or whether it be the announcement today at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for the establishment of a COVID care centre, which would treat people without hospitalisation and keep them in their homes a lot longer.

What I have seen from the very hardworking men and women of the Royal Adelaide Hospital is dedication, often in extraordinarily trying situations, where we are trying to deal with a global pandemic that there is no rule book for. What we have seen in South Australia is our state outperform most of the rest of the world. This has been a partnership with the people of South Australia as well

as SA Health, so I do need to acknowledge the great work of the people of our state. There is no doubt about that.

The second part of the leader's question, which was condoned after he sought the leave of the parliament to introduce some facts, related to 12 ICU rooms that were not being utilised as ICU facilities at the moment. There are 60 ICU beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It was never designed for there to be a full 60 patients in there at a single point in time. The reason why is that the Royal Adelaide Hospital is our major trauma hospital. There needs to be a capacity for surge if there is a significant—

Mr Picton: They can't surge when they've got storage in them.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna! The Premier has the call.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna, you are called to order.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You are warned for the first time.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned for the first time.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the first time. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, we need to have a surge capacity in a major trauma hospital, and that's one of the reasons why we do not have those ICU beds occupied all the time. I did ask Lesley Dwyer the question about the film crew's storage in one of the rooms there. She is the Chief Executive of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, and she provided a perfectly plausible explanation.

We know that the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, our largest local health network, does produce videos and material content on an ongoing basis. She did tell me the specific content that was being filmed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital at the moment. I don't have that information at hand, but I am more than happy to provide it for the house. I will be able to access that and provide that information to the house, but I am 100 per cent satisfied—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Is it in secret modelling?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that the purpose for that filming is to provide very important health information to stakeholders, whether they be for internal training purposes or they be provided to people who may be living with an illness or a disease out in the community, so I am happy to provide that information. I think the people of South Australia do have confidence in the health system in South Australia and in this government's handling of the coronavirus pandemic, and I expect that to continue into the future.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next question, I acknowledge that Crows players Luke Pedlar and Mitch Hinge are in the gallery today. They are supporting an auction table for the Lucindale Blackford fire. I appreciate the member for MacKillop drawing that matter to my attention. I also acknowledge in the gallery two distinguished members of the Adelaide Hills community who, in relation to comments I have earlier made, I will not identify in person lest they receive unwanted attention.

*Question Time***GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:34): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee that none of the footage captured by the freelance film crew occupying one of the ICU rooms at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will appear in any government advertisement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34): What I can inform the house is that filming of educational videos within the hospital and clinical settings is best practice to ensure that our clinicians and consumers receive important information and updates. The filming, which I referred to earlier, was for an educational video for the blood management unit and was completed in one day.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:35): Supplementary question: can the Premier guarantee that none of the vision will be used in any government advertisement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35): I refer the member to my previous answer. This is a video for a blood management unit. Last time I looked, we weren't running blood management units out of the Liberal Party in South Australia—maybe some bloodletting, but not some blood management service. I am 100 per cent convinced—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It's only a little flesh wound. It's only a little majority.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am 100 per cent convinced that this is important work, important work for the people of South Australia. Whilst those opposite may choose to mock this important work, which is being done and not listen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the team when important information is provided to the house, that's their choice, but we will just continue to work hard at representing the people of South Australia, making sure that we keep them safe and also our economy strong during this global pandemic.

INTENSIVE CARE UNIT BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Why are there two patients who need urgent cancer operations, who have had their surgery cancelled at the Royal Adelaide Hospital because of a lack of ICU beds, when we see ICU rooms now filled with storage equipment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36): As you would appreciate, clinical decisions regarding the care of patients are made by clinicians. They are not made by politicians. When the Chief Executive of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —Central Adelaide Local Health Network was asked this question, she provided a full explanation to the media pack today. There are a number of factors which come into—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are a number of matters which come into consideration in terms of the scheduling of important cancer treatment. Obviously, from time to time there may need to be an opportunity to reschedule that. We do that with regret here in South Australia and try to reschedule that life-saving treatment as quickly as possible. I don't have any specific details with regard to the two cases the member offered to the parliament a few moments ago, but what I can

say is that the clinicians are the ones that make the decisions. I back the clinicians here in South Australia. I think they do—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana! The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, we absolutely back the work of the clinicians in South Australia. They do an outstanding job, but from time to time there are requirements to reschedule procedures. We do that with regret.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:38): My question is for the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the opportunity for renewables to underpin industrial development in the Upper Spencer Gulf, and are there any alternate views?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:38): Yes, I can. I appreciate this question from the member for Flinders. While not exactly in the Upper Spencer Gulf, he has a very keen interest in the Upper Spencer Gulf, and I appreciate the question, including about other views.

The Marshall Liberal government is focused on making renewables work for consumers and creating new jobs, particularly in our regions. We are moving faster towards renewables than under Labor to net 100 per cent renewables by 2030 while simultaneously reducing electricity bills and the number of blackouts. A big focus is the Upper Spencer Gulf. This region is front and centre of our Hydrogen Action Plan, our export modelling tool and our prospectus.

We want South Australia to become a world-class exporter of renewable energy through the SA-New South Wales interconnector and through hydrogen exports. We also want our industry to be able to purchase competitive, clean energy within the state. That is why we leased the temporary generators to Infigen and Nexif, so they could pair them with their renewable assets to sell firm contracts. It was great to see BHP recently sign an offtake agreement with Iberdrola. It is a fantastic outcome that will significantly reduce BHP's emissions. As the member for Giles highlighted yesterday in this place:

It was good to see BHP just the other day sign up to take an offtake arrangement with the wind and solar farm that is close to being completed at the Port Augusta Renewable Energy Park.

I wholeheartedly agree with this statement. Iberdrola bought the project under our government. Iberdrola said the SA-New South Wales interconnector helped them invest in South Australia, which those opposite thought was a terrible idea, yet the Premier and I have turned the first sod with that view of it being a terrible idea.

Because Iberdrola bought Infigen they can offer contracts to BHP by firming up their renewables with the temporary diesel generators. The member for Giles is supportive of this arrangement. I just wonder whether he talked this through with the member for West Torrens, his colleague and shadow energy minister, who predicted doom and gloom, as he regularly does.

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Another key measure to support industry is the Port Bonython expression of interest to help develop a hydrogen—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, rules applying to answers. In answering a question, a minister replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the answer. The minister is not responsible for any of my views, real or imagined by the minister, nor may he debate them.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The question asked about other views.

The SPEAKER: The question was reasonably broad. It's also a question put by a member of the government to the government. I am going to allow the minister to continue. I will be listening carefully.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. If the member for West Torrens would like to recant any of the views he has expressed, he is welcome to do so.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Taxing electric vehicles, you're really good on the renewables, aren't you?

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, please don't bait the government.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Again, the member for Giles is very supportive of what we are doing. I quote:

The comparative advantages in Whyalla and near Whyalla, when it comes to hydrogen production, green hydrogen production and green ammonia production, stand right out.

Quote again, 'Let's concentrate. Let's get the critical mass. Let's get the resource sharing happening.' Well, the member for Giles won't find any argument with me: he is again correct. That's why we launched an EOI for the land at Port Bonython to develop a hydrogen hub, but there is again another alternative view, one lonely alternative view. It's not the member for Giles but it is again the member for West Torrens, who said, 'Privatising Port Bonython won't create a hydrogen hub.' Well, time will tell.

The government is unashamedly seeking private sector investment to create a hydrogen hub. Our hydrogen plans are not like Labor's, which has a \$500 million black hole in it, and we will work with the private sector to make real projects happen. The projects are developed by capable people, not the former minister and now the shadow minister for energy, and I look forward to updating the house on the EOI as it progresses, and I look forward to the member for Giles sharing with his electorate his difference of opinion with his shadow minister.

The SPEAKER: There have been quiet representations continuing to be made to me about whether that contribution strayed close to argument. It did stray very close to argument. Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have only just survived, sir.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: A point of clarification: is there anything wrong with putting argument in the answer to your question—in the answer arguing your point.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: You are not allowed to put it in the question; you are allowed to put it in the answer.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the Leader of Government Business is quite right. The point instead was that it might stray close to debate.

GIBSON ELECTORATE OFFICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Was the minister consulted in relation to an FOI application made on 7 September 2021 in relation to allegations of intimidation or staff complaints in his electorate office?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:44): I thank the member for his question because I see this is a matter that has been traversed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —by Ms Henson of *The Advertiser* in a demand by the member for West Torrens that there be a disclosure of documents that are the subject of an FOI application. Freedom of information law applies in relation to the production of documents and correction of documents, and most people in this house should be familiar with it, especially the member for West Torrens.

But let me just remind the house that the process is very clear. The assessment of freedom of information applications is done by an independent officer within departments, or officers, as some

of them have more than one. There is a process of review and there is a process of appeal. The South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal largely—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —is responsible for that. If the member is unhappy about the determination of an independent freedom of information officer, then he has a proper process which he can pursue—not to demand that there be a production of documents, of which that independent officer has made that assessment.

The SPEAKER: Attorney-General, there is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: the minister may not debate the answer. I did not ask 'demand any documents'. I simply asked whether the minister was consulted, as per the process, which the minister omitted in her little manifesto she just read out.

The SPEAKER: That's an unnecessary commentary, member for West Torrens.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Let's not have interjections and exchanges across the chamber. In any event, it may be that the Attorney-General has concluded her answer. I will take a number of additional questions from the opposition, and then I will move to the government side.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did the minister make a submission to the FOI officer considering my FOI of 7 September that documents should not be released to the opposition?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:46): Again, I draw to the attention of the questioner in this matter the process that is to be applied. That is, if he is unhappy with the determination of the independent FOI officer, there is an appropriate process by which he can proceed.

GIBSON ELECTORATE OFFICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister advise the house how many allegations of intimidation have been raised against him by his staff in his electorate office since his election in 2014?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:46): I thank the member for the question and note that he is referring to, I think, a document that was tabled in the upper house from a former staff member of mine, who went through a performance management before leaving my office. What I do know in this request for information that the member for West Torrens has made is that the FOI officer operates independently—the accredited FOI officer—and they do their job. I think it's wrong to be disparaging anyone in the Public Service who is doing their job to the best of their ability, and they will continue to do that.

I know the member has also asked and compared and put out in the media comparisons between what came back from someone else's FOI, as opposed to what came back from another FOI. Again, I stress the point that that is done independently by an accredited officer. I don't know how the member for West Torrens can know what was in one FOI and what wasn't in another FOI, especially when information wasn't released.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell the member for West Torrens is nowhere in the FOI process that he applied for from my office would there have been documentation around locking someone in a cupboard, hiding a ladder. It just didn't happen, but he may have received that from other FOIs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In view of the number of interjections, I am going to ask the member for West Torrens to take a seat, and I will invite the member for Elder to ask a question.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:49): My question is for the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister inform the house about the Marshall Liberal government's leadership in climate change adaptation and emissions reduction?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:49): I thank the member for Elder for that question. She has a great commitment to our natural environment, particularly in her electorate and also state-wide, and to South Australia's ongoing leadership when it comes to climate change policy and climate change adaptation in the face of—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader was on one warning and is now on two.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —a changing climate and, of course, emissions reduction so that we can play our part. We are certainly playing a very significant part in national and global leadership when it comes to finding ways to reduce our emissions and the footprint we have as a state in a national and global context.

It was great that in February 2020 this government, through the Governor's address at the opening of parliament, made the announcement that we will establish an interim target in terms of our reduction in emissions. We have had, for some time, a 2050—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call, and I emphasise that I am keeping a very, very watchful eye on the leader.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It is always incredibly disappointing how the opposition take an issue as significant as climate change—they have such a cavalier approach to it, so much anger—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Laughter—they are laughing at South Australia's leadership.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: What can we do? Gestures—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and virtue signalling, the usual woke nonsense, but no interest in practical action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, I am on my feet! There will be silence. There is a spirited mood in the room. The level of interjections has exceeded an orderly level and I ask that all members come

to order and that we listen to the minister in silence. I also add that the Premier has made some very pertinent representations to me.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for taking this matter so seriously. In February 2020, we made the announcement that we would insert an interim target, a 2030 target, to have a 50 per cent reduction in emissions on 2005 levels by 2030, building on our net zero target for 2050. We felt that that interim target was incredibly important to have a goad to action for government, for community, for business leaders to get on and transform the way they undertake their activities and transform South Australia into a decarbonised economy, a decarbonised society.

This week, we announced we will be enshrining those targets, the 2030 interim target and the 2050 net zero target, within legislation. We are doing that because we want to send that very strong signal to South Australians, but more broadly than that to people across the nation and across the globe, that South Australia is a place taking this seriously. We are undertaking this transition in a big way and we are doing so through legislation and practical action.

That will no doubt attract investment to South Australia. It will attract jobs to South Australia. It will set South Australia up for success in terms of saying to the world that we are a place to invest in clean, green technologies, a decarbonised economy and a place that has a strong focus on adaptive technologies that will sustain South Australia's livability and our ability to have economic advancement into the future.

We know this is great for South Australia's brand economically, but we also know that it is great socially and it is great for people's wellbeing in South Australia if we adapt successfully to the inevitable changes, some of them very challenging, that will come with a change in climate as well as from a conservation point of view.

Adelaide has been named Australia's most livable city and one of the most livable cities in the world. This is all part of building that clean, green brand and signalling that we are up to this leadership.

Time expired.

GIBSON ELECTORATE OFFICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister advise the house how many requests for transfers, workers compensation claims or mediations have been raised by staff in his electorate office since his election in 2014?

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: Standing order 96(1).

The SPEAKER: Very well. There is a point of order in relation to standing order 96(1): questions relating to public affairs may be put to Ministers...

And, of course, a second section to standing order 96 states:

2. questions may be put to other Members but only if such questions relate to any Bill, motion...

I defer to the member for Heysen's expertise. It is considerable. I respect his contributions enormously. May we have the question again, please?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do you want me to rephrase it, sir, or ask it again?

The SPEAKER: If you ask it again, and then I may invite you to rephrase it after that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Will the minister advise the house how many requests for transfer, workers compensation claims or mediation have been raised in his electorate office since his election in 2014?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He can ask me to rephrase it. Sit down!

The SPEAKER: It is a matter of fine judgement, particularly because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Chaffey! Member for Chaffey, there are interjections on both sides. It is a matter of fine judgement. I understood that the Leader of Government Business—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Very well. I make two points. First, of course questions relating to public affairs may be put in this place. It is a matter of fine judgement as to whether these issues are matters of public affairs. What is important and maybe decisive is that there is a minister in another place that is responsible for these matters. I ask you to rephrase the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Premier representing the Treasurer. Will the Premier advise the house how many requests for transfers, workers compensation claims or mediations have been raised by staff in the electorate office of the member for Mitchell and Gibson since 2014?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:56): Sir, I am more than happy to speak to the Treasurer about the matter raised by the member for West Torrens, and it does remind me to also follow up with the Treasurer regarding some other issues relating to members of this house. I will also follow those up.

I am particularly interested in the higher than normal turnover of the staff within the electorate office for Badcoe. This is something which has been raised in this house before. We know that the member for Badcoe was handpicked by the Leader of the Opposition to be on the front bench. Now she has moved to the backbench. We still have not had an explanation for that, so that will be a matter that I follow up with the Treasurer.

I will also follow up the matter which the Leader of the Opposition himself committed to follow up, and that is the very serious allegations made by a former employee within the electorate office in Light. I think that most people will remember those issues. It was raised by somebody called Bradley Johnson, who worked as a trainee in the member for Light's office, and he said, 'I would wake up some mornings unable to face Tony in the office, so I would call in sick.'

Several months ago—many months ago, in fact—these were issues which the Leader of the Opposition said that he would follow up—

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and report back. I think that he has had more than ample time—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, which I will take. The member for West Torrens on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir. My question was regarding the Gibson and Mitchell electorate offices, not whatever the Premier thinks he is talking about.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: You haven't spoken about Katrine yet.

The SPEAKER: Order, minister!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections between members we have earlier addressed. We are on the hat-trick. Can we get there? Standing order 98, rules applying to answers:

(a) In answering such a question, a Minister or other Member—

in this case the Premier—

replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter to which the question refers.

The Premier, because he is the Premier, I often give him quite some latitude, and I will continue to do so.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. The question related to whether I would take it upon myself to speak with the Treasurer about matters pertaining to an electorate office, and I certainly have said that I am happy to do that.

I will also make inquiries regarding the electorate office in Badcoe and Light. I will also make an inquiry regarding Reynell. There was a very serious allegation. We still haven't heard from the member for Reynell whether those allegations—which are very serious—were about the member herself or another staff member.

I think that it would be very easy for the member to clear it up if it was not her, but they were very serious allegations, similar to allegations that we saw reported in InDaily when a former employee claimed that they had witnessed and experienced abusive behaviour, bullying and emotional manipulation from the member of parliament, for Reynell. These are very serious allegations.

Mr Brown: How about time sheet fraud? Is that serious?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am very happy, on the suggestion from the member for West Torrens, to make inquiry and I am very happy to come back to house and provide full details of those issues regarding Badcoe, regarding Reynell and regarding Light. I would also encourage the Leader of the Opposition, who has previously indicated that he will be conducting an investigation into what has happened at Light, now denying it, but certainly that's certainly my understanding, and if I am wrong I am happy to withdraw it. It was my understanding that serious allegations were made and that the Leader of the Opposition had made a commitment to investigate. If he is not going to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order so, Premier, continue.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do expect high standards of behaviour on this side of the house. We expect them right throughout the house. We are elected by the people of South Australia to represent them, and clearly there are some very serious issues that need to be answered. For those reasons, I will make those inquiries as directed—or suggested by the member for West Torrens.

GIBSON ELECTORATE OFFICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. Could the Premier please inquire, in his capacity of representing the Treasurer, in total how many individual claims are made in documents held by the Department of Treasury and Finance about issues raised by the staff of the member for Mitchell and member for Gibson in the electorate office? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition submitted a freedom of information request to the Department of Treasury and Finance asking for:

...a copy of all documents that relate to allegations of intimidation, staff complaints and concerns, conflicts or disputes, avoidances, requests for transfers, workers' compensation claims or mediation raised by staff in the member for Mitchell or member for Gibson's electorate office.

The FOI response to the opposition was that there were 28 documents that were identified in answer to the terms of the request. They were denied.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:01): Again the member for West Torrens is referring to an application for freedom of information at which clearly he has failed. I think he has received one document and he is obviously very unhappy about that. This is a process which is set out in the law as to how it works.

Firstly, the independent officer that is appointed under the Freedom of Information Act is required to give consideration to all the matters in the act which, just to remind the member, include

personal particulars of parties that may be disclosed for which consent may be obtained, for example. They are there for good reason. I don't need to revisit them. The parliament has made that decision as to what is necessary that shouldn't be disclosed under that freedom of information process.

The member for West Torrens well knows this process, and he knows also that there is a review capacity—not by the Treasurer, not by the Premier, not by you, Mr Speaker, not even by the parliament. It is actually by a process which starts with the chief executive of the department and, of course, then follows through ultimately to administration by a tribunal. That is the process. It seems that the member for West Torrens insists on somehow or other the government requiring, demanding in fact, information which has been the subject of an assessment by an information officer.

I just remind all members of the house, including the member for West Torrens, that there are also provisions in the Freedom of Information Act for interference with the processes in relation to the operations and duties of an authorised freedom of information officer. He might want to think about that very carefully.

CHILD PROTECTION

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is improving outcomes for South Australia's children and young people at risk through a whole-of-nation framework to better prevent and respond to child sexual abuse?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:04): I thank the member for Newland for his question. On behalf of the Marshall Liberal government, I welcome the National Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Child Abuse (2021-2030). The program was launched today by Prime Minister Scott Morrison. The 10-year strategy, which is supported by a \$307.5 million investment from the commonwealth government, is a whole-of-nation framework to establish a coordinated and consistent approach to better prevent and respond to child sexual abuse. Key measures include establishing a national child sex abuse prevention centre, developing initiatives to better prevent and respond to online child sexual abuse and improve community education and awareness campaigns.

The Morrison government recently announced that the Blue Knot Foundation, along with its key partners, the Australian Childhood Foundation and the Healing Foundation, would establish and deliver the National Centre for the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse. The Marshall Liberal government and my Department for Child Protection have worked very closely with the federal government to design this strategy, and I thank the staff from my department for their expertise and knowledge that assisted in this area. I would also like to thank Senator Anne Ruston for leading the discussions through our Community Services Ministers' committee.

The national strategy released today is the first of its kind in Australia and provides a nationally coordinated strategic framework for preventing and responding to child sexual abuse. I am proud that our government is part of this strategy that seeks to reduce the risk, extent and impact of child sex abuse and related harms in Australia. The national strategy was a key recommendation of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse and responds to the royal commission recommendations to address child sexual abuse in all settings.

The national strategy to prevent and respond to child sex abuse is for everyone: children and young people, victims and survivors of child sexual abuse of all ages, families, kin and carers, communities, organisations and governments. The national strategy focuses on awareness raising, education and building child-safe cultures, supporting and empowering victims and survivors, enhancing national approaches to children and harmful sexual behaviours, offender prevention and intervention, and improving the evidence base. The first national action plan will include:

- \$22.3 million for a national awareness raising campaign;
- \$18.6 million to implement a national victim identification framework for online child abuse;
- \$22.4 million over six years for a second wave of the world-leading Australian Child Maltreatment Study;

- \$59.9 million to establish a dedicated strike surge team to target organised crime aspects of online child abuse, boosting technology capability, and technology detection dogs that are trained to find hidden devices containing illicit content during searches; and
- \$13.1 million on an independent national service to provide free legal advice to victims.

As I have stated previously in this place, child sex abuse is a worldwide issue that requires a whole-of-community response. In Australia, approximately one in three females and one in seven males report having experienced some form of child sex abuse. We must all work together to find a solution.

My department is currently delivering an education program, Power to Kids, respecting sexual safety to all residential care staff in order to improve knowledge and safety from online predators. As Minister for Child Protection, my department and the state government will continue to improve outcomes for our most vulnerable children and young people and their families to prevent and stop child abuse.

GIBSON ELECTORATE OFFICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:08): My question is to the Premier in his capacity of representing the Treasurer. Is the Premier able to tell the house what the improper conduct is in the electorate office of his Minister for Infrastructure and Transport that is alleged in one of the documents identified by the Department of Treasury and Finance? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In the FOI response to the opposition, the Department of Treasury and Finance said that document 27 contains opinions or allegations or suggestions of improper conduct and exempted the document from disclosure.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:08): Again, this is a matter which is the determination and, in fact, the very quotes of words apparently set out by the independent authorised officer in relation to this matter. If he has a concern about it, he can go through a review process, obviously seek that information from the person who is apparently the author of it but not ask other members in the government when we are specifically prohibited in relation to interference in relation to the freedom of information process. This is why the law is there to protect people especially after Bruce Lander QC—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —had prepared a report about the behaviour of intimidation in relation to ministers in the previous government. He recommended that there be legislative protection for freedom of information officers in relation to this field for that very reason. We have that legislation, we have those protections, and it's an absolute disgrace that the member for West Torrens continues to ignore them.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:09): My question is to the Premier. Premier, was the most recent incident of the sexual abuse of a child in care referred to the Significant Incident Reporting Unit? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: On 19 October 2021, a court heard details that a 16-year-old child in care was lured from their place of residence through an online dating app and sexually abused by Richard Ian Squires.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:10): I thank the member for the question, because it has been an important published circumstance in relation to conduct which has just been disgraceful and

obviously it is a matter of concern in relation to any child who is the subject of illegal, criminal, disgraceful behaviour.

What I would say in relation to the unit is that it has been established, subsequent to the Rice inquiry and review of these matters. We have the unit. It's populated. That review was undertaken by my department or via my department and was to coordinate the oversight in relation to these matters and including the disclosure and reporting up to both the administrative head and minister in relation to these matters of child protection in respect of certain incidents.

I won't comment in relation to the particular incident that the member has referred to, other than to say we will make that inquiry as to whether there has been a referral, and what information we can provide to the house I will undertake to do so.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:11): My question is again to the Premier. Premier, on what date were you first advised about the sexual abuse of a 16-year-old boy in care?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:11): Again, I will make the inquiry. I think the Minister for Child Protection has already identified—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Minister for Child Protection has made statements in relation to the parliament. There are certain processes and confidentiality surrounding the information that's reported to that department and minister and to other parties. So, yes, we will make that inquiry as to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —what action has been taken in respect of the unit. But I just remind the member that that doesn't mean that the information in respect of the unit is something that is automatically published in respect of particular cases to anybody in government.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:12): My question is again to the Premier. Premier, can you guarantee that every element of the significant incident management procedure was followed in relation to the recent abuse of a 16 year old in care? With your leave and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, in a media release dated 16 February 2021, your government announced that they will, and I quote:

...be establishing a permanent Significant Incident Reporting Unit, to be headed by the Crown Solicitor's nominee. This person will be working closely with the Department for Child Protection Chief Executive, but will report to the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:13): Can I assure the house that in fact that unit has been established. As indicated, it was developed under the assistance of my department to ensure that the unit was not only established but that it was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am listening carefully to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —populated with persons of sufficient expertise to be able to provide assistance in these matters. Members might recall after the Debelle inquiry, there was similarly a dedicated unit set up in the Department for Education. Thankfully, the minister who was in charge in those days is now gone. But now we have a situation where there has been a developed unit of oversight in relation to the Department for Child Protection, and that's something we have

provided assistance to. It has been established. Without disclosing the particulars of an individual case, I will make inquiry as to whether there has been any action that I am able to report to the house in respect of those matters.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:14): My question is to the Premier. Have you, Premier, through the Significant Incident Reporting Unit process, been briefed about any other cases of children in care being abused?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:14): Again, the member for Reynell asked the question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in relation to briefing to other parties. I just say again, without going into the detail of any individual case, I assure the house the unit has been established, there is a proper process that has been undertaken, it is populated with persons of expertise and it is functioning. The second aspect of that is that what I can provide back to the house in relation to the general operation of that unit I will certainly do so.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond has the call and, may I say, I have a close eye on the clock, and of course the minister in answering might also wish to keep a close eye on the clock.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister explain to the house how the Marshall Liberal government is investing in projects to benefit communities in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:15): I thank the member for Hammond for his very important question. The government is investing strongly in our regions with the establishment of the \$160 million Regional Growth Fund to generate new businesses and jobs, and opportunities in the regions is a key part of underpinning that investment in those regions. We have seen \$60 million committed so far from the Regional Growth Fund, which has leveraged \$373.9 million in total project value.

One of the key projects that we have seen delivered in this area is something that is very important as of today with the storms that have gone through. We have seen reports coming in as we speak about the damage that has occurred in some of our horticultural sector, as well as our grains sector, right from Eyre Peninsula, through the Adelaide Hills and up into the Barossa. There is significant storm damage from the large hailstorms that have gone through. One of the key investments that we have been making into the Adelaide Hills is the offer of protection from that hail by putting in netting to actually protect those crops.

We have seen the opportunity for businesses to apply for up to \$300,000 per farm to put in the investment to protect their crops from these hailstorms. We have seen so far across the Adelaide Hills and Riverland \$8.7 million worth of grants to 97 different farmers across those areas. This is so important. We have seen today crops that have been absolutely decimated when there hasn't been that protection, versus those that actually have the protection having minimal damage. This is such an important investment into those regions.

Unfortunately, it has been difficult to roll this project out just because of the lack of opportunity through suppliers of netting and the fact that there is really only one installer who can actually install these projects. So there is still an opportunity of around \$6 million worth of money sitting there waiting to be granted to other producers to put that protection in place, but we haven't been able to actually realise that.

That's certainly a key project that has been invested in this space. As of today, it can be seen how important it is. I think we need to be very sympathetic to those poor farmers who have been out

there, who have grown their crops throughout the season this year and have got to this point just to see the significant damage. As we hear the reports, we will work with those commodity groups to see how government can help those farmers through this very difficult time.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. I was very interested to hear that answer as well. In view of the weather today, many members are very concerned about agricultural crops and horticultural crops, including myself. We now turn to questions from the crossbench, and can I acknowledge the minister's efforts in ensuring that we come to those questions at the appropriate time. The member for Florey has the call.

SOUTHGATE INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH, SOCIETY AND EQUITY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Health. What effects will the Flinders University's proposed closure of the Southgate Institute for Health, Society and Equity, along with the disestablishment of its key senior staff, have on South Australia's contribution to international and national public health research and development?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:19): I thank the member for the question. I realise that this is a question that is of significant interest to a number of people. I expect that the member would be interested in a detailed response from the Minister for Health, perhaps more than the reflections that I might offer, so I might just take that on notice and I will bring back an answer to the house.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY ITALIAN LANGUAGE COURSE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:19): Supplementary, again to the minister representing the Minister for Health: a couple of weeks ago we were able to save the Italian language course at Flinders University, so I am wondering whether there might be some message in there we can use to save something that has been recognised by the World Health Organization.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:20): I thank the member for the question. I am pleased to note and welcome the decision that Flinders University has made to reverse its decision to cease enrolments for the first year of Italian and, obviously consequently, the ongoing teaching. They have certainly said that there is going to be an ongoing review, but they are taking enrolments for first-year Italian next year.

I am so excited about this decision because it gives the community, the Italian consul, the opportunity, supported by the government, to pursue significant increases and interest of students to take on Italian going forward and, if there are opportunities to seek further support from the Italian government or from students or the community in South Australia, to support the sustainability of that program, which had suffered from diminishing numbers. We now have the time and space to do that.

We also have an incredible enthusiasm unleashed by Com.It.Es. I congratulate the outgoing president, Christian Verdicchio, in particular, who led that body of work. I have been grateful to the Italian teachers, who have spoken with me personally. I am particularly grateful—and I think members would know—to the Italian Consul to South Australia, Dottore Adriano Stendardo, for the leadership role that he has taken already, and has committed to take going forward, in supporting the Italian community in providing that uplift in students and fundraising to support Flinders University.

The Italian government, I believe for 50 years, has been providing a level of support to that program, and that will be ongoing. I hope that it will increase, as some other governments from around the world support languages studies in our universities that they see as particularly beneficial. South Australia's Italian community has over 100,000 people either born in Italy, or their children or their grandchildren, of whom my own are a couple. The power and passion of that community in seeking to save Italian at Flinders University has been commendable.

I spoke to the Vice Chancellor of Flinders University several times. I met with him last week. We put to him very strongly the case that, with the increase in support for languages in our schools in South Australia, we could anticipate, quite feasibly, an increase in school students graduating from our schools taking on university language studies and to cut that Italian language program at such a time would be a disincentive. I am pleased they have listened to the representations from the

government, the consul and the community. I am pleased they have made the decision they have made. I encourage them to make it as an ongoing one.

COVID-19 VACCINATION

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:23): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please advise the house how the foreign crew of a vessel currently berthed at Port Pirie will be able to get vaccinated against COVID-19, as all the 11 crew are currently unvaccinated? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: The crew of this vessel, the *Silver Lining*, travels only between Port Pirie, Whyalla and Tasmania. The crew never leaves the vessel due to restrictions. They have tried to get assistance from Flinders Ports, but to no avail, and they have also tried to get hold of SA Health. The concern that the agent for the vessel has is for the health and wellbeing of the crew. They have been on the vessel going backwards and forwards for months, but they are not allowed off the vessel because they haven't had a vaccination. They are looking for assistance from the government here to understand how we can get them vaccinated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:24): I thank the member for Frome for his question. It's quite a unique situation. It's not one that I have heard of before. Obviously, it's probably not our responsibility to vaccinate foreign nationals but, in this instance, because they are travelling in Australian waters, I see the point that the member is making. I'm happy to consult SA Health. It would have been unsatisfactory to use some of our doses when we had a shortage but, of course, at the moment we have quite a surplus. I will make inquiries as to whether or not that is something that we could accommodate. Precisely how it would occur I would have to seek advice from SA Health.

PORT MACDONNELL HARBOUR

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister give an update in relation to the dredging of the Port MacDonnell Harbour, given I have spoken on this five times and given assurances to the rock lobster fleet that are currently anchored there that remedial action will be taken soon?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25): I thank the member for his question and note that we have been going back and forward on this trying to get a solution. I do acknowledge that it is an issue at the minute between council and the EPA. The latest update I have is that the council want the dredged material disposed at sea, and the EPA want it dumped on land. We have escalated that to the CE of the EPA. Again, I understand the member's interest in this and we do want to get to a solution so it has been escalated to the CE of the EPA, and we hope to have sign-off on where the material will be disposed of very soon, and I will keep you abreast of that as we know.

COUNTRY EDUCATION STRATEGY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on incentives to attract teachers to regional areas like Mount Gambier?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:26): I thank the member for the question. It is an excellent question and it comes hot on the heels of the government's release of our Country Education Strategy, which is a very significant body of work. I would like to thank teachers and leaders in the member's electorate and surrounding areas.

We had, as part of our very significant consultation in developing a richly detailed Country Education Strategy—which is of course a long-term strategy 2021 to 2028—staff from Grant High School, Mount Gambier High School, Yahl Primary School, Kangaroo Inn Area School and Millicent North Kindergarten who were all engaged in that process, as indeed were staff right around South Australia from all corners of our state, feeding in what were the key challenges, the drivers of behaviours, the things that will encourage more people to come to country South Australia—to enter towns and communities where they are going to be teaching, and to enter those towns successfully

and to integrate into the community successfully—and what is best practice and how can we consolidate that across South Australia?

That is a really important question. We have a range of initiatives that are outlined under our Country Education Strategy. Some of the early activities involved working with universities to reduce barriers to strengthen our pipeline of teachers to the country and accelerate our replacement of ICT infrastructure within all public schools, including in the country.

We have already laid fibre-optic cable to all except I think three of our public schools in country South Australia. In the far, far north of our state there are different solutions for Marree and Leigh Creek, I understand, and Kangaroo Island has had a significant upgrade to their facilities, but it doesn't at this stage involve fibre to the school. But every single one of our other schools, I believe—I could be mistaken with one or two, but I think it is every single one of them—now has that fibre-optic cable. The internal work within those schools is to make sure those schools can get maximum benefit out of it and that teachers can have the optimum work experience, which is really important.

The strategy is also bolstering allied health supports to schools in speech pathology and psychology through telehealth practice and is one of the key things where we are now recruiting roles to assist in making the workload in those schools better supported. It will also be improving our permanent and temporary relief teacher supply to the country, increasing our pool of available permanent and country relief teachers, and funding the removal of barriers to their deployment in country regions.

It is also supporting schools to partner in curriculum delivery across our regions, operating best practice so that students can access subjects they desire without having to necessarily rely on an open access college offering high quality, as it may be, but where a teacher in Adelaide might not have that personal engagement that a teacher operating in three or four partner schools in a local region may have, a better personal contact—and, indeed, bringing country voices to the fore.

I think one of the really interesting things that is going on at the moment is a partnership the Department for Education has with the Teach For Australia charity, a really important group that is bringing incredible individuals who have been successful in life already, the best of the best in their areas, and encouraging them to undertake teaching without having to go away for several years to do a degree where they are not being paid. Instead, it is supporting them to do a master's from day one. The first three were rolled out this year in Roxby Downs and Whyalla and in one of the member's own local schools—at least one of them, possibly up to three.

There will be more Teach For Australia associates next year in that area. There is a lot of exciting work that we are doing. I think the removal of the right of return from country South Australia, as I believe has been proposed by those opposite in the Labor Party, would damage massively the opportunity, the enthusiasm that people can go to the country to take permanent positions. I certainly think that would be a detriment to the attraction of country teachers, but we are very excited about building up that workforce, including in Mount Gambier.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:30): My question is also to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in the house. Minister, can you update the house on the question I asked on 21 September regarding a Dean Marshall from Clare? He needs to have chemo treatment but was not able to have it at Clare and had to go to Gawler. With your leave, I will just explain a bit further, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Dean's treatment was arranged by staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to be carried out at Clare Hospital but, upon arriving, he was advised that the tablets that were required were missing. After several phone calls, the tablets were found. However, Dean was then told to come back the next day, prior to having to then travel to Gawler with the tablets that he had collected prior to leaving Clare. He has now been advised he will need to travel to Gawler each time for treatment and not to Clare Hospital. The minister did indicate on 21 September he was going to get an answer from the Minister for Health and bring it back, but I haven't seen an answer at this stage.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:31): I will take that question on notice.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:31): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. In his reply to a question on notice, he again asserted that the CWMS conversion of the Tea Tree Gully council area would come at no cost to residents, yet I see there is an initial \$65 million set aside for this work. Is this \$65 million coming from state revenue?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:32): That \$65 million is an SA Water funded project, so I guess indirectly that is state revenue, yes, all \$65 million.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:32): Supplementary: therefore, if I were a ratepayer and a taxpayer in the City of Tea Tree Gully, I would be actually paying for this work twice?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:32): I find that question—

The SPEAKER: Order, members on both sides!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are 25 seconds remaining in question time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! And there are members of the gallery who have watched patiently throughout.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: They would be delighted to know that the Marshall Liberal government is delivering an upgraded CWMS at no cost to the City of Tea Tree Gully ratepayers.

Grievance Debate

COVID-19

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:33): This has been an important week in the context of South Australia's immediate future because we are about to embark on a very substantial transition, quite deliberately, of going from living in a state that is COVID free to living in a state that has made a conscious policy decision to have COVID come in.

I think there are a lot of South Australians who welcome the news of being able to travel interstate relatively freely, but there are other South Australians who do have a degree of concern and trepidation about what COVID coming into South Australia means for them, particularly in the event that they contract COVID, which of course will happen. There has been no shortage of representations made to me, and I think to every member in this place, that they are worried about the preparedness of our health system to be able to deal with COVID.

The truth is that none of us knows exactly what is going to happen. The government has assured us that everything that can be done has been done to prepare our health system, but it is also true that day after day, including today, we have seen clinicians coming out on the public record desperately frustrated that our hospital system is not operating at full capacity because there are resources laying idle, principally through a lack of resourcing around staff.

This state government made a decision to make hundreds of staff redundant, including nurses, during the course of the pandemic. That strikes us as a novel approach. I cannot think of too many other places around the world that during the course of a global pandemic decided to make nurses redundant—an extraordinary act. Nonetheless, the government has assured everyone that everything is fine.

What we do know is that, irrespective of how this transition to living with COVID goes over the course of the months ahead, in years to come our children are going to look back on this moment and ask, 'What was all that about?' because hopefully the world will have moved on, whether that be in five years or 10 years or 20 years' time. What we have to work on assiduously is an exercise ensuring that we have a policy for the future that guarantees the legacy of COVID is not just a bad memory and a ginormous debt. We have to ensure that the legacy of COVID is a transformational moment when collectively we actually delivered something that set us up for generations into the future.

That is why on this side of the house we have not been preoccupied with internal division: we have been preoccupied with actually developing that policy. On the weekend, we announced a very substantial policy in that regard, a policy to comprehensively invest in our education system because that is the lever that will determine the future prosperity of the state more than anything else.

We are unapologetic about not going to this election with a short-term view, with a short-term policy, with three slogans, to try to just get us over the line. We are committed to a long-term vision, a long-term policy and a strategy to set up our kids for the future. They have already paid a big enough price in respect of COVID. We owe them a legacy that makes a material difference. More than that, we have announced another comprehensive policy that sets us up for the future.

In coming days, the world's eyes are going to be on Glasgow, an absolutely critical moment that yet again has been characterised as our last chance to properly address what is sincerely a great moral challenge of our times. I note that today it has been reported in *The Australian* that the nation's former Chief Scientist, Dr Finkel, has said in regard to hydrogen:

It's the opportunity to take renewable energy captured in one continent and send it around the world to countries that don't have enough of their own.

He went on to say, 'The scale of that hydrogen export opportunity is almost beyond imagining. But let's try.' Well, there is only one party that wants to try here in South Australia when it comes to hydrogen.

They have a plan for hydrogen, to sell off an asset that is currently publicly owned that could be central to a hydrogen capacity in this state. We have a \$500 million-plus policy to give us the hydrogen industry of the future. Hydrogen for the future, education for the future, policy and vision for the future—that is what we have on this side of the house. On the other side, they have a rabble that is divided, and today we see that yet again.

EDUCATION POLICY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:38): Moments ago the Leader of the Opposition told this house and the people of South Australia that the Labor Party has a vision, a \$500 million-plus hydrogen job plan. That 'plus' refers to the \$500 million extra they did not consider including in their document because they failed to notice that you actually need to build the whole system.

They also said that they had an education policy, an education agenda, because they know the children are the future and they know that they deserve better than they have had under COVID, and it is been a difficult time under COVID. The Liberal Party took a very substantial education policy to the last election. It included reforms that were groundbreaking in early childhood literacy, and we are seeing groundbreaking results. They included the transition of the year 7s into high school, the most significant structural reform to our public education system in generations.

That is on track to be a remarkable success, and already the pilot schools that have been doing it have been reporting outstanding improvements, wellbeing and academic results from their kids. We had a broad suite of policy measures that we have delivered, and the results are there for all to see. I encourage members interested to have a look at my grieve from yesterday and the question from the day before, when I announced some of those.

The Leader of the Opposition made a claim that I do not think is entirely accurate. The Leader of the Opposition said that they have taken a substantial education policy and announced it to the people of South Australia before the election. They have released a number of headlines with a

garbled, unsustainable and internally incoherent and inconsistent set of remedies to the issues they face.

Yesterday, I took the house through how the principal hiring and firing so-called announcement was in fact a damp squib, that the changes they are proposing to principals firing underperforming staff were little more than a one-week difference in the performance management, unless of course they are proposing to take away teachers' WorkCover rights. I do not know whether that is part of the policy; if it is, I invite them to say so.

They then also said that they are going to give principals the right to hire people without intrusion from head office. If you are not giving any advice to the people of South Australia about what that means, then you are doing them a disservice because most of the people in this circumstance who are not necessarily a first choice are people who are permanent teachers. Permanency is something the Labor Party says that it has valued because another part of their policy says that they will increase permanency rates by 10 per cent—from 80 per cent of the workforce to 90 per cent of the teaching workforce.

Mr Boyer: That's not what it says.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: What does it say? The member for Wright says, 'That's not what it says.' Let's talk about it: 'A Malinauskas Labor government will increase the percentage of permanent teachers by at least 10 per cent,' is the quote from the document, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The member for Wright wants to take the percentage of permanent teachers when they were in office maybe and increase that by 10 per cent. That is up to him to explain. Nevertheless, when you give somebody permanency, that means they have a right to then stay in a job.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: So, if they are exercising a right of return from a country school—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that means they have to be found a school.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Interjections are becoming spirited.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: If the member for Wright and the Leader of the Opposition are proposing to take away their right to return to the city after five or six years, well, then let them say so because, if that is the case then, sir, I submit to you that it will be very hard to attract teachers to the country in the first place. I invite the member for Wright to consult with any teacher in a country school, any principal of a country school, and ask them whether they are happy to take away that right of return which this government is not proposing to take away.

The Labor Party's third part is improving teaching in the country through the ongoing country allowances. I note that the department is already extending that incentive to teachers working in their sixth to eighth year in country zone 4 and 5 schools. With respect to subject specialist teachers, they say that a Malinauskas Labor government will create a workforce plan. Fantastic! And that is sitting alongside the royal commission, which will deliver all their child protection reforms. The member for Wright and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, or whoever is writing the education policy for Labor, do not have the gumption to come up with the detail of how to actually deliver on their headlines.

They have their headlines, they have market tested the headlines, they have done the focus groups, they do not know how to deliver—that makes their policy utterly insubstantial, uncostered and

bordering on worthless. I welcome them to the debate. I welcome them to the new position of having stuff to say about education. I now invite them to do a moment's research on the matter.

REYNELL ELECTORATE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:43): I rise today to speak about an extraordinary group of young women in Reynell, women whom I have had the pleasure of meeting and talking with on many occasions over the past few years: those who attend the young mums class connected to Christies Beach High School.

There are many, many reasons that I love talking with these young women, which I will detail, but I also want to put on record from the outset that, as well as visiting these young women in their classroom, it is always such a pleasure to meet and spend time with their beautiful babies and young children too.

We often say in this place that we are inspired by people and, for many different reasons, we of course are. I am absolutely inspired by these young women. It is hard to find another group of people so strong, so resilient and so very determined. Many of these young women have gone through a lot—some really difficult circumstances—and continue to do so. Each of their stories is different but there are elements common to every one of those stories. Without exception, they are devoted to their beautiful, delightful children. Their love for them drives them in all that they do.

During my most recent visit, I was asking the women about how their studies were going. Many of them are at various stages of their SACE and others have, whilst completing their SACE, begun studying various vocational certificate courses in community services and other disciplines. We spoke a lot about the challenges that come with juggling the raising of children and undertaking study.

In different ways they spoke about how determined they are to complete their studies and that having a child has made them even more so, that they had a sense that they wanted to do their study for their child, to show them what was possible and to ensure future pathways for them and their children. Their courage and their determination, often in the face of adversity, is inspiring indeed.

There were other elements of each conversation that were common. Sadly, almost every one of them had experienced the most extreme difficulties with accessing secure, affordable housing. One young woman reported to me that she had attended around 40 open inspections without success. She does not have a vehicle and was catching buses to each of those inspections.

Another, after months and months of her and her partner trying to secure public housing for them and their baby, was finally told that a house was available—at Elizabeth. This woman goes to school in Christies Beach. Her and her partner's networks are all in the south. She accepted the house, determined to catch even more buses to keep connected with her learning and with her family's networks. She also accepted it because she understood that, should she not, it would be extraordinarily difficult for her to secure another.

This story was absolutely common amongst these outstanding young women and it begs the question: why can this government not do better for these young women and their children? These are young women who have done everything possible to build a secure future for their family, young women who, in the face of adversity, have shown courage and perseverance and, above all else, love for their children in all that they do.

Another thing which was common and which was also raised by their teachers and other support staff—and this is an issue that I will take up on their behalf with the Minister for Education—is that whilst these students can be transported by teachers in their cars or other school vehicles, the insurance provisions, as I understand it, through the education department mean that their babies and young children cannot be transported with them in teachers' cars or any school vehicle. It means that those who are there to support them can, in reality, never help with their transport.

We should be doing everything possible to ease the burden on these remarkable young women and to help facilitate their ongoing learning and care for their children, not making things harder. I am known to cry at many school graduations. I find them deeply moving, hopeful and always fine celebrations of young people, their hard work and leadership. I very much look forward to this year's young mums' graduation. It is always absolutely a celebration of courage, leadership, sheer

hard work, possibility and an acknowledgement of how important these young women are, of how much they and their voices matter, and of what a difference they can make.

I hope that I can attend this year's graduation with news about resolution of this vehicle issue. At this graduation, as well as acknowledging these young women, I will also certainly be thanking their incredible teachers, support workers and the many other staff who make up the flexible learning centre and who work tirelessly with, and for, these young women to support them and their children.

CHAFFEY ELECTORATE

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:49): I rise to speak about some of the iconic events that have been happening in the Riverland and Chaffey over the recent week. We know that spring is in the air and the Riverland is one of the great horticultural sectors in the state and also one of the great flower regions. I was privileged to go along with Senator Anne Ruston, who is synonymous with Ruston's Rose Garden, the country's largest rose collection, to open the Waikerie garden show and celebrate with Glennis Crawford and her committee, who do an outstanding job in the floral displays right across the board. There were many different varieties of flowers and flower arrangements that won numerous awards. It was an absolute spectacle at the Waikerie Institute.

I was also privileged to attend and speak at the Riverland Rose and Garden Festival. It is a renamed event that previously was the Renmark Rose Festival. It is now celebrating its 27th year as one of the region's largest and most supported festivals. Not only do we have festivities and flower displays, with all the gardens in full flower, but we also have open gardens and those open gardens are absolutely spectacular. There are very proud gardeners and house owners who open up their gardens for the public to have a look at the great dedication and hard work these people put into showing off their gardens.

I was thrilled to have the Premier in Chaffey over the weekend. He was in awe of the spectacular showcasing of what the region had to offer, particularly at the Jarrett Memorial Gardens. A range of events and attractions took place showcasing not only the gardens but local produce as well. I would also like to commend the outstanding job that the committee and volunteers do to plan to be COVID safe and the outstanding job by Sheree Chappel, the chair, and John Chappel, the secretary. Richard Fewster, Priya Tomar, Lorna Taylor, Chris Petersen, Helen Davenport, Jill Knight and Sandy Lloyd make up the dedicated committee.

Also on Saturday night, it was a privilege to take the Premier to Loxton to a dinner/theatre event. It was *Kick Off Ya Boots*, by Little Town Productions. The Premier did not stop laughing for 2½ hours. It was great theatre, showcasing the challenges faced by a typical farming family, whether it is the isolation, commodity prices or the lack of rain. It really did highlight what those farming families go through.

The *Kick Off Ya Boots* event was attended by over 500 people over the three performances. I would like to acknowledge some of the great people who were involved: John Gladigau, the producer and playwright, did an outstanding job and put a lot of comedy into that show; director, Aimee Gladigau; assistant director, Aub Mattner; technical coordinator, Paul Kaesler; sound technician, Jayden Gladigau; and light technician, Brady Fulham, who is in year 12, did an outstanding job, as did the website and ticketing volunteer, Chris Fulham. I would also like to have a shoutout to Will, my trainee in the EO. He was one of the cast members and he also did an outstanding job.

The food was great and the catering team needs to be congratulated on good country cooking. It really was an absolute treat. The entire production was one to remember, as are all the Little Town Productions in Loxton.

The Premier and I managed to visit the Berri Rowing Club to celebrate its 100th anniversary. We were joined by South Australia's only gold medal Olympian, Alexander Hill, who was there in attendance as one of the boats was named in his honour. I want to thank the Clark family. In attendance were both Steve and Wyatt Clark for a boat changeover. Steve is now the recipient of his grandfather's four and he in turn swapped for a brand-new four. It was great to see.

I would also like to acknowledge some fantastic Riverland businesses. Banrock Station was named the joint winner of the Sustainable Wine Tourism Practices category. The historic Overland

Corner Hotel was voted the Best Country Pub in South Australia in Wotif's Uniquely Aussie Awards. And finally, the Berri Hotel was awarded the Australian Hotels Association (SA) 2021 Award for Excellence and the Community Service and Support Award. It was a great weekend with great festivities and it is always great to have the Premier up in Chaffey.

BADCOE ELECTORATE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:54): Imagine waking up on a sunny Sunday morning, collecting your paper from your driveway, unfurling it over a hot coffee to see images of your own neighbourhood looking nothing like your own neighbourhood. You splutter your coffee as you realise that outside your home you will soon have, not just the 50 metre-wide sunken roadway that you were expecting to be built in place of the existing South Road, but additional at-grade roads, three tunnel exits and, most surprisingly, an elevated flyover road right in front of your home, all spanning some 120 metres wide.

That would have been a surprise to anyone. It was certainly a shock to those who just escaped being scooped up in last month's compulsory acquisition notices in Glandore to find they are now facing this triple-decker highway, severing them from Black Forest. It was an even bigger surprise to people in Everard Park and Ashford along Anzac Highway itself who had no idea this was coming at all seeing as they do not even live on South Road. They were simply stunned beyond words.

It was also a pretty big shock to veterans in Badcoe whose memorial boulevard will be forever changed by an aerial roadway touching down and plunging into the centre of this tribute to our Diggers. It came as a big surprise to the many residents in my area who have long fought and continued to fight for more tree canopy in our area to find that 120 fully grown and towering old trees will be lopped down.

Put simply, the artist impressions show an expanse of my electorate completely transformed. Is this a proposal? No, seems not. This is what the government is telling us will happen. They are not asking. Those artistic images are rather flattering. Compared to the concept diagram, there are some rather notable things missing like the fact that there are two elevated roadways, not one; and there is a 15 metre-high exhaust stack which is not highlighted in the pretty pictures either.

This is no doubt a necessary project. Labor was pleased to commence all other stages of the north-south corridor. But it is very difficult for my community who are the ones sacrificing their homes and sacrificing their way of life in Glandore, Black Forest, Ashford—and soon Kurralta Park, Marleston, Everard Park and Keswick—to understand the rationale, the alternatives that have been explored and the eventual consequences amid so little communication and, indeed, misinformation. Put simply, if this was happening to you, it is not the way you would like to be treated.

I listened intently to the minister's address on this topic yesterday and there was not a word of sympathy or understanding in his address for people in my area. Nothing. What that says to me is that this government simply does not give a stuff about people in Badcoe, and it is another kick in the guts. This government is not interested in how we might feel about these really wideranging impacts on us, from land acquisition, to our communities being split, to the loss of trees, to impinging on our veterans' heritage, to the way we move around our community, to the impact on property values.

The minister is happy to tell the media of significant developments before the affected residents, which directly contradicts his comments on ABC Adelaide radio on 29 September when he said, and I quote:

...that's why we've always said we wanted to do was deal with the people impacted first, not do it through the media...

Am I surprised about this treatment by the Liberal government of my community? No, but I am disappointed. I did think that after the outcry over renegeing on their CBD school zone promise in 2018 and then the disgust over suddenly allowing up to eight-storey buildings for selected developers on Anzac Highway, also at Glandore, without any consultation, I thought maybe this government might have learned. But clearly they simply do not care.

Tough decisions have to be made in government, and it is not easy. But the way you deal with people at these times matters. The lack of information, the lack of a genuine conversation and

the lack of compassion for local people who are humans with their own complicated lives to lead is absolutely galling.

At an expert forum I recently held to help my community get access to high-quality information about South Road, considering the vacuum of information that has been presented so far, one woman said, 'What has this government got against Glandore? It's like they've got it in for us,' and she is not the first to say that.

We need genuine consultation from this government, we need the reference design released so that our community knows what is going on and can actually make informed decisions and, above all from this government, we need some compassion.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:59): With the Prime Minister attending the upcoming Glasgow climate change summit, I want to take some time to share the Marshall Liberal government's clear path for responding to climate change by building a strong climate smart future. In December 2019, the government released our direction for Climate Smart South Australia, with the goal of net zero emissions by 2050. At the opening of the 2020 parliament, we then set an interim goal to reduce emissions by at least 50 per cent by 2030.

Addressing climate change takes government leadership, with the capacity to deliver real action through an intentional focus on tangible outcomes and a commitment to engaging with business and the market. Our action plan for climate change includes our government understanding that adapting to climate change and developing low emissions industries will be key to South Australia's economic recovery and growth.

In December 2020, we released our most powerful vision for climate action of any South Australian government in history. The Climate Change Action Plan 2021-2025 provides an ambitious practical approach to dealing with climate change, building a strong green economy and further reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The plan includes 68 actions across seven focus areas, those being clean energy transformation; climate smart economy; climate smart agriculture, landscapes and habitats; low emissions transport; climate smart built and urban environments; resilient communities; and government leading by example.

The action plan was developed with input and advice from renowned climate change expert Professor Ross Garnaut. The plan shows that we could achieve a level of renewable energy that is more than five times the current local grid demand by 2050. Examples of how the Marshall Liberal government is already tackling climate change include our clean energy transformation. South Australia is well on the way to achieving 100 per cent net renewable energy generation by the 2030s, with around 60 per cent of electricity generation coming from renewable sources in 2020.

We have the Project EnergyConnect interconnector, and South Australia is also well on the way to becoming a net renewable electricity exporter to New South Wales and Victoria through a \$2.3 billion interconnector being built. This will deliver cheaper, cleaner electricity and thousands of jobs. We also have clean, green hydrogen. Our Hydrogen Action Plan provides 20 actions across five key areas to help scale up hydrogen production for export and domestic consumption. The latest budget includes \$47 million over four years for the upgrade of the Port Bonython Jetty to support hydrogen and ammonia export.

We have our solar and battery expansion. The latest budget also commits an additional \$10 million towards a home battery scheme. We have our low emissions transport. Our Electric Vehicle Action Plan included government investment in a statewide electric vehicle charging network. This included \$18.3 million over three years for electric vehicles charging infrastructure. The \$2 million Greener Neighbourhoods Grants Program provides funding for councils to improve the livability of our city through increased greening, reduced urban heat and improved natural environment.

The government is leading by example. We have committed \$60 million over two years for capital upgrades to government buildings to improve energy efficiency. I believe we need to protect our environment. In South Australia, we have been pioneers in many environmental initiatives, being the first state to introduce the container deposit scheme for recycled bottles and cans, to recently

being the only state to introduce legislation to phase out single-use plastics. We have introduced renewable energy systems, such as solar, and made them widespread in our state. All these initiatives will contribute to tackling the causes of climate change.

It is clear to see that the Marshall Liberal government has a clear and strong plan to respond to climate change by building a strong climate smart future.

WAITE ELECTORATE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:03): Mr Speaker, as you know, there is always an abundance of activity and a hum of vibrant community engagement throughout Waite, and I just want to spend the couple of minutes that I have today touching on a few of those events that have been happening in the last month.

First of all, starting with the Blackwood Footy Club, they recently had their annual presentation evening, which was a cracker night. It was a pleasure to be there for what they call the Moulden Medal count and season presentation evening. A special mention to the 2021 men's A-grade award winner and Moulden medallist winner, Nathan Dunn, and the 2021 A-grade award winner for best and fairest, Tamika May, on their achievements this year. Whilst the A-grade did not get a flag this year, there was some finals action seen by the club.

What really makes Blackwood footy club the tremendous club it is is what happens off the field. A big shout-out to president, Kris Winchester, for his leadership at the club again this year and to sponsorship officer, Vicki Trevena, who has done a great job ensuring that the club has great support from the community. Thanks to so many others for organising the event that evening and all the events throughout 2021 footy season. A big congratulations to all the medal winners, club volunteers, players and supporters who create a fantastic on and off the field culture at the Blackwood footy club.

Two weeks ago, we saw the start of the cricket season. It was great to join the Coromandel Valley Ramblers Cricket Club for their season launch a few Friday nights ago. It was fantastic to hear from former Australian, state and Marryatville High cricketer Callum Ferguson, who shared some of his insights into the game of cricket. He recounted a story about when we once batted together in the first 11 at Marryatville High School. I think he made 99 and I made one in that hundred-run partnership. A shout-out to president, Jarryd Simister, and past serving committee members, including Matt Smith, who are driving so much change at that cricket club, including looking for a new home at Frank Smith Reserve.

Last week, it was great to pop down to the Coromandel Valley Tennis Club, where I caught up with Ash Firth and the committee. It was great to see so many social members using their freshly surfaced courts and new windbreaks. A big thank you to Jordan Tomopoulous, who had a big hand in putting up the windbreaks there. Thanks to club coach, Sam Wall, for all his work. Of course, for those who follow tennis, they know that Sam is a six-time recipient of the Tennis SA Talent Development Coach of the Year. There are always a lot of smiles start at the Corrie Valley tennis club.

On Tuesday morning, before parliament sat I was able to pop down to Gamble Cottage to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the Friends of Gamble Garden. It was a beautiful morning at the cottage. The garden is so well kept and is truly thriving with many flowers at this time of the year. Thanks to the many volunteers, the Coromandel Valley and Districts Branch of the National Trust and the City of Mitcham for hosting this event and being custodians of what is one of the few working-class cottages around South Australia, with the original garden as well. It was a gift from the Gamble sisters to the City of Mitcham and is now part of the National Trust. A big mention to founding member Gwen Gardner; president, Alison Oldlands; Iris Rowlands; Chris Box; Robyn Cations; and National Trust member Bruce Harper for putting on a wonderful morning.

Another important group in the valley is the Sturt SES station. It was great to meet with the new unit manager, Jono Binkowski, the other week and others from the leadership team—Caleb and Con. I am really glad to hear that the new pathways program recruitment drive has resulted in several new members for the Sturt SES. For those who do not know, the SES across the board have played a huge part in COVID operations in the last two years. They have been manning our airports and playing a big part in COVID compliance. It has taken them away from their nine to five roles as

volunteers. I thank them for what they do. They have been very busy, and I know the community is always appreciative of their time.

In the time I have left, a big thank you again to the Brownhill Creek Association, which have just been awarded an extra \$20,000 for their stationary Kaurna shelter. A big shout-out to Ron Bellchambers and the work they do. Just last week, 300 students took part in the fifth environmental school days at Brownhill Creek, with Urrbrae Agricultural High School, Mercedes College, Scotch College, Mitcham Primary School all participating in the fantastic greening of Brownhill Creek, learning about so much Kaurna history and the Kaurna Shelter Tree as well.

There is so much happening in the valley across my electorate. A big plug for the bushfire forum being held next Thursday at the Blackwood Church of Christ, which is of course my annual bushfire awareness forum, so I encourage everyone to get along as we head into the bushfire season.

ADELAIDE HILLS AMBULANCE SERVICES

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (16:09): I am deeply concerned that ambulance services in the Hills are unsafe. I am informed that there has been a single ambulance in Mount Barker since 1992 or certainly from the early nineties. From that date until today, there has been massive population growth in the Hills. Frequently, the Mount Barker ambulance is called away from Mount Barker or ramped, as is the Woodside ambulance, with the result that Woodside is effectively without an ambulance and so is Mount Barker unless effective cover is provided. Of course we need more ambulance services in the Hills. Neither major party has provided additional ambulances, and I call on both parties to bring forward a plan for massive population growth in the Hills.

My decision to become an Independent was partly informed by the desperate need in my community for more ambulance resources. This is no criticism of the extraordinary commitment local ambulance officers make to my community. They are working their guts out. They rely on the government to support them. I refer to and will continue to refer to the precedent set by Speaker Atkinson, which ensures that I can make a contribution on the floor, contrary to assertions made by others.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 16 November 2021 at 11am.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: My attention has been brought to the state of the house. I am counting, and I see that there is not a quorum present. Please ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 26 October 2021.)

Clause 6.

The CHAIR: I think what we might do, Attorney, is report progress, because we need to deliver messages from the Legislative Council. I will ask you to move that the committee report progress.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

HOLIDAYS (CHRISTMAS DAY) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (16:16): I move:

That the second reading be taken into consideration forthwith.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22

Noes 22

Majority 0

AYES

| | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| Bedford, F.E. | Bell, T.S. | Bettison, Z.L. |
| Bignell, L.W.K. | Boyer, B.I. | Brock, G.G. |
| Close, S.E. | Cook, N.F. | Duluk, S. |
| Gee, J.P. | Hildyard, K.A. | Hughes, E.J. |
| Koutsantonis, A. | Malinauskas, P. (teller) | 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. | Teague, J.B. |
| Treloar, P.A. | van Holst Pellekaan, D.C. | Whetstone, T.J. |
| Wingard, C.L. | | |

PAIRS

| | |
|-------------|--------------|
| Brown, M.E. | Tarzia, V.A. |
|-------------|--------------|

The SPEAKER: There being 22 ayes and 22 noes it falls to me to cast a ballot. I cast my vote with the ayes. I make this statement following that decision, as has been the custom of Speaker's breaking a deadlock. I have always believed in a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. That is not a principle exclusive to the Liberal Party or the Labor Party but a principle that I and many others in the state believe in. The motion passes.

Motion thus carried.

Second Reading

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (16:23): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to be able to make a contribution on something that, quite frankly, I cannot believe we are even debating. What has South Australia's parliament descended into, to find itself debating whether or not people working on Christmas Day should be getting recognition for it?

I have to say that over the course of the last 3½ years, particularly the last six weeks, I have been stunned as to the events that have occurred in this place, but you could have knocked me over

with a feather when I heard that the Premier of this state was opposed to Christmas Day, of all days, being declared a public holiday.

What sort of state are we living in where our status in terms of holding an exclusive position is relegated to being the only state or territory in our great federation that is not treating Christmas Day as a public holiday? There are a whole range of adjectives that could be allocated towards all those in this place who would hold the view that Christmas Day should not be a public holiday, and I have no doubt they will be thoroughly canvassed in the coming hours during the course of this debate.

What is not in dispute I would have thought is that, as a state and as a country, for over 100 years we have established that Christmas Day is an important day. It is a special day. It is a unique day. Regardless of your faith, regardless of your background, Christmas Day is acknowledged, I think quite widely, as an opportunity for people to spend quality time with their family and friends, to be able to enjoy the custom of having a summer Christmas celebrating an important milestone.

The sad reality is, though, that there are so many people in our community who do not get to enjoy public holidays as much as the vast majority. Those are the people who are serving our community when others are enjoying time off. I think of the nurses, the doctors, the police officers, the ambulance officers, all those people in the MFS, all those people who are in paid responsibility and even in an unpaid responsibility in our volunteer emergency services, the SES and the CFS. It is not uncommon for people in these important roles to find themselves sacrificing probably the most sacred day of the year in terms of family time in the name of everybody else's safety.

Often we hear members in this place rise to their feet wanting to pay homage to those people who have made big sacrifices in the course of the pandemic, such as people in our health system who have given up a lot, and what does this government say to those people their reward will be this Christmas? More work and less pay. The Premier of this state astoundingly believes that the reward for nurses working on Christmas Day should be a pay cut. It is an absolutely astonishing position.

As this debate transpires, there will be an opportunity to explore whether or not the member for Newland believes his constituents working on Christmas Day should not get paid penalty rates, and rest assured we on this side of the house will do everything we possibly can to ensure that every last constituent in suburbs like Tea Tree Gully, Ridgehaven and Fairview Park are fully attuned to whether or not the member for Newland believes that people deserve penalty rates on Christmas Day. Similarly, the member for Elder, the member for King, the member for Stuart and even the member for Finnis, no-one will be spared scrutiny when it comes to whether or not they believe that Christmas Day is different.

Allow me to anticipate some of the arguments that the Marshall Liberal government will proffer during their rationale as to why Christmas Day should not be a public holiday. Back in 2010, the same circumstance occurred. But what was different back in 2010 was that we had a federal Labor government at the helm of responsibility across the country with fundamentally different industrial relation conditions than what we have today.

Throughout critical industries there were enterprise agreements that put in place very specific arrangements that you usurp the South Australian Holidays Act—which is a 1910 act, from memory—to ensure that everyone on Christmas Day got due reward if they were sacrificing their labour, and similarly for those people who were not able to work as a result of its being a non-trade day.

Since then, over the course of the last 11 years the industrial landscape has changed dramatically in no small part because we have had a federal Liberal government at the helm since 2013. Now we find ourselves in this extraordinary situation where South Australians, through no fault of their own, can find themselves missing out on penalties rates or being paid on and around Christmas Day.

South Australia is not the only jurisdiction in this situation because other states have in place arrangements where the Christmas Day falling on Saturday substitutes to the Monday. We are not the only state with a Public Holidays Act that does that. What has occurred in other jurisdictions is that their governments of both political persuasions have sought to act, either through legislative

change or, indeed, the government of the day using its power, using its authority, to declare Christmas Day a public holiday.

At any moment since this issue was first aerated with the government, which I understand was sometime in February/March this year, the Premier of the state could have said, 'I'm going to fix this problem. I'm going to fix this problem and I'm going to use my authority to make it Christmas Day,' and everything would have been solved. I do not even think there would be too many employers who would complain about this.

There might be a couple of people who express a degree of frustration, but by and large the overwhelming majority of the employer community do accept that Christmas Day should be a public holiday. In fact, I have heard no shortage of arguments from the employer and industry groups across our state over years constantly argue for a degree of uniformity across the federation when it comes to industrial relations laws and conditions, but here in South Australia there is no uniformity because this Premier refuses to act.

This Premier has actively decided not to declare Christmas Day a public holiday, which not only deprives those workers of the industrial relations conditions they would otherwise reasonably expect but also puts South Australia at odds with every other jurisdiction in the commonwealth—so no consistency and no fairness. It begs the question: what is going on here?

I would have thought there would be a few members opposite, many of whom proclaim very strong, value-orientated positions in regard to their faith, who would have the view that Christmas Day was particularly important, but thus far we have heard radio silence from them—radio silence. I would have thought there would be some members opposite who sympathise with a large number of their own constituents who will be working Christmas Day in the name of their service.

I would have thought there would be some members opposite who might have areas that have large shopping centres within them, like the Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre, where there are thousands of workers, who would think, 'I want to make sure they are looked after.' I would have thought that there are those opposite who have a penchant for working on Christmas Day.

Let's take, for example, the member for Hammond. We know how seriously he takes his obligations to work Christmas Day, and he sure as hell wants to make sure he gets paid for it. He wants to make sure that he gets paid for it. He wants to make sure that when he works on Christmas Day, representing the good constituents of Coomandook down at Glen Osmond, that he is getting remunerated accordingly. I am astounded that we have not heard anything from the member for Hammond during the course of this debate.

But, when you distil it all down, there is just one simple question here that needs to be answered. There is only one question and there is no complexity to this: it is a simple question of whether or not you believe someone working on Christmas Day should get paid due recognition for it. I would have those members opposite know—well, let me put this another way: I would invite members opposite to reflect on something that none of us in this place can avoid, and that is that we are all incredibly well remunerated.

Members in this place are well paid. We will not spend our Christmas Days wondering whether or not we can pay the bills or buy the kids the presents we desperately want to purchase for them, because we are well remunerated. But there are other people in our state who are remunerated a lot less than any of us—a lot less. Forgive me if I do think about people working in the retail industry who are on salaries for full-time work commensurate to one-third of what a member of parliament gets.

When you ask those people in fast food or in retail to give up their income for working on Christmas Day, it seems a little bit stiff that people on 200 grand a year are going to say, 'No, no, you can't get penalty rates.' I find that an egregious position, quite frankly. I would have thought that it was incumbent on all of us every now and then, when we contemplate the decisions we make, to walk a mile in other people's shoes and to think about the consequence of this decision for the people it affects from their perspective.

What those opposite are seeking to do here, if they vote against this legislation, as they did in the upper house, is to ensure that large multinational corporates, whose profits are higher than ever before, retain more money at the expense of people working for them on Christmas Day. I am not the guy who normally argues and uses highly emotive language about corporate greed and the

excesses of capital weighing down on workers in an oppressive way. That is not the sort of industrial relations leadership I have ever sought to aspire to. But I just cannot believe we are in a situation where there has never been a more evident example of corporate greed having its impact on the Liberal Party of this state.

The Liberal Party of this state ostensibly have a position against people on low incomes getting paid a little bit extra for giving up time with their family and their kids on Christmas Day. I submit to those opposite: imagine you are the worker waking up on Christmas morning, not seeing your kids opening the presents because you are the nurse at the hospital, or you are an ambulance officer doing a shift looking after South Australians, or you are someone working in a hospitality venue preparing Christmas lunch, which is a busy time of the year. Imagine you are one of those workers, leaving the house at 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning before your kids get up and open the presents under the tree from Father Christmas. Imagine you are that person.

Now imagine that you are that person and the Premier of this state says, 'No, you can go do that work, thanks very much, and you are going to get paid less than you normally do on a public holiday.' What sort of state are we living in? What sort of state are we living in where we are even debating this question? This does not accord with basic Australian values, basic Australian values that say we try to look after others, particularly those who are in the service of us, particularly those who are giving up the most sacred and the most precious time we have in our community. What sort of values does it speak to that this Premier, given all the authority vested in him, does not even deploy that authority in the name of Christmas Day?

I do not know what the point of being in charge is if you are not willing to do an occasional kind act for thousands of people that almost no-one would complain about. Who would complain if the Premier of South Australia declared Christmas Day a public holiday? Would anyone actually complain about that, apart from maybe Rob Lucas? To be fair to the Treasurer of South Australia, he is the one guy I would expect to be consistent about this.

Ever since Malcolm Fraser was Prime Minister and he got elected to the parliament, he has absolutely done everything he can to deny working people just that little bit extra recognition for their sacrifice in the name of community. So we will spare the Treasurer from our judgement because he has been utterly consistent. But for what reason, for what possible purpose, for what constituency does the Premier believe that he should not use the authority vested in him to declare Christmas Day a public holiday?

Well, when it comes to consistency, on this side of the house we remain true. We in the Australian Labor Party have always subscribed to the idea that those people who are giving up their labour deserve to be remunerated fairly for that. We have always subscribed to the view that those people who are making big sacrifices at particularly special times deserve a little bit of extra recognition for that.

At a time when we see the profit share of our economy accelerating to the highest levels on record, at a time when we see capital being rewarded with bigger and bigger and bigger returns every single year and at a time when we see wage growth continue to stagnate relative to capital growth in this country, we believe that people on Christmas Day should get paid public holiday rates accordingly and we will vote accordingly and we will continue to mount the argument, as we have for over 100 years as a party, that people working on Christmas Day, heaven forbid, might get a little bit of extra recognition for it. We commend the bill to the house. We call on this house to pass the bill expeditiously and we call on the Premier to once, just once, use his authority and show some heart.

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:39): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain suspended to allow the passage of the bill through all remaining stages without delay.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I seek clarification. Would that be through until 5 o'clock for the Auditor-General's Report or all the way through?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All the way through, through all remaining stages.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I appreciate that clarification being sought and given. There is not an absolute majority present, so please ring the bells.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you wish to speak to the motion, member for West Torrens?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just briefly, sir. Regardless of your opinion on this legislation, regardless of what your views are, whether you are with us on the penalty rates or you are with the Premier opposed to penalty rates, I think it is incumbent on all of us to give South Australian business and the South Australian community certainty about what is coming up this holiday season. People need to know if they will be paid penalty rates to work on Christmas Day. Businesses need to know.

So I say to the government members, regardless of the government decision, one way or another, let's just sort this out now. Let's just make a decision. Let parliament have its say. The Legislative Council has spoken. It is time for the House of Assembly to speak. If it is rejected here, it is rejected here. If it is passed here, it is passed here. At least, let's let people know some certainty before Christmas. That is the least that we can do for them.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 21
Noes 24
Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Basham, D.K.B. | Bell, T.S. | Chapman, V.A. |
| Cowdrey, M.J. | Duluk, S. | 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. | Teague, J.B. | Treloar, P.A. |
| van Holst Pellekaan, D.C. | Whetstone, T.J. | Wingard, C.L. |

Motion thus negatived; debate adjourned.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (BUSHFIRES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

MOTOR VEHICLES (ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEVY) AMENDMENT 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 2, page 2, after line 6—Insert:

- (a1) Subject to this section, this Act comes into operation on the day on which it is assented to by the Governor.

No. 2. Clause 2, page 2, line 7 [clause 2(1)]—Delete 'This Act comes' and substitute:

Part 2 and Schedule 1 come

No. 3. New Schedule, page 7, after line 6—Insert:

Schedule 2—Review of Act

1—Review of Act by Select Committee

As soon as practicable after the day that is 1 year after the commencement of this Schedule, the Legislative Council is to appoint a Select Committee to consider longer term issues relating to the use of electric vehicles in the State (including infrastructure, training and the disposal of batteries and other electric vehicle components) and to recommend strategies to address these issues, in accordance with terms of reference determined by the Legislative Council.

Consideration in committee.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 6.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I indicate that the member for Enfield requested, at the time that we last considered this matter in committee, the following information: can the minister confirm that the proposal from Consumer and Business Services (CBS) is in the form of this bill; and have there been any changes to what was recommended? I indicated to the committee that I would ascertain a response.

I confirm that there have been no changes to the bill from what Commissioner Soulio has recommended. I note that there have been amendments filed and these were initiated and recommended by the commissioner following subsequent stakeholder comments, namely, the South Australian Council of Social Service Incorporated (SACOSS).

The commissioner has advised that the demand for these reforms has been demonstrated and reinforced by the commission's identification of deficiencies in its available powers and regulatory responses to assist and take action where issues have been identified that warrant intervention. A need for increased oversight and regulation of the sector has been evidenced through investigations undertaken by the commission.

A successful prosecution in recent years involved the misappropriation of funds of approximately \$160,000 by the association's president who blocked attempts by members to investigate discrepancies in the accounts. This prosecution demonstrably highlighted the inadequacy of the commission's compliance and enforcement powers and the absence of sufficient mechanisms to ensure transparency, protection and access to the information for members to inform any allegations of serious misconduct in a timely fashion. The problematic circumstances of this particular matter were compounded by the fact that the association relied solely on government funding, highlighting the apparent lack of accountability for ensuring that funding had been applied for approved purposes.

Other recent case studies from the commission demonstrate widespread issues with poor governance and lack of understanding of rights and liabilities of associations with their members and officeholders. The commissioner has advised of a number of ongoing investigations involving alleged

misappropriation of significant amounts of commonwealth government funding, and the powers provided for these reforms are desperately needed to investigate and address any misconduct and to protect the interests of the communities these associations were incorporated to serve.

The member for Enfield also asked, in respect of Indigenous incorporated associations: 'What consultation have you done with these two specific groups and how much additional funding are you proposing be provided to CBS to be able to educate these groups?' The response is as follows in relation to both Indigenous and multicultural incorporated associations. As I have already noted, the commissioner consulted with multicultural affairs and supported those proposed reforms in the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations. I am advised that the commissioner also met with the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, and his staff has had specific dealings with a number of Indigenous incorporated associations to assist with a number of recent governance or other issues that have come to light.

The commissioner has also taken into consideration a significant number of submissions made to the Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations parliamentary inquiry. Whilst not being issues restricted to Aboriginal-controlled organisations, the ACCO inquiry has heard evidence that affirms the need for reform of the sector to ensure that appropriate regulatory structures are in place to support accountability and transparency in the decision-making of the associations and to ensure that the commission is appropriately empowered to address misconduct and investigate potential breaches.

I am very pleased to further confirm that the government has approved funding of \$2.47 million for Consumer and Business Services now between 2024-25. The funding includes both ongoing and implementation support in recognition of the significant need for a robust education and communication package to support these reforms. This is expected to include the production of publication, paid media outreach and translation services to ensure that associations are properly supported in the implementation of the reform package and ongoing good governance mechanisms under the amended act.

The commissioner provided evidence to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee that improved and tailored education support is required for committee members of Aboriginal community-controlled organisations around their obligations, responsibilities and liabilities under the act. This is integral to supporting a governance capacity-building framework and will enable these associations to deliver on Aboriginal community aspirations of self-determination.

I am also advised the commissioner may also be seeking Indigenous support officers to provide tailored support. I also bring to the attention of the house that only this week, on 26 October, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee tabled its interim report in relation to Aboriginal community-controlled organisations. I commend it to all members to have a good read of that.

The interim report provides a clear recommendation that the parliament pass these proposed reforms to increase oversight and dispute intervention powers for the commissioner assisting Aboriginal incorporated associations. There were, I think, a further three matters raised by the member for Enfield, which I will deal with in a further hearing of this matter.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(17:01): I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6pm to complete the investigation of the Auditor-General's Report as scheduled.

Motion carried.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 27 October 2021.)

The CHAIR: The house is in committee and we are examining the Auditor-General's Report. The minister appearing for examination this afternoon is the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. I remind members that those asking and answering questions need to stand and that questions must refer to a budget line or page number.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, I would like to refer to page 377. In reference to the fact there is no evidence to support the approval of grants in tranche 2, the Strategic Business Round grants, the Auditor-General was advised by your department that cabinet notes would provide evidence of the approval of projects in tranche 2. However, when the Auditor-General sought that information, it was denied by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Why did your department provide incorrect advice to the Auditor-General?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I thank the member for the question. As outlined in the report, there was no supporting evidence to those grants in tranche 2. It states there that they were advised by PIRSA that there were 13 projects from tranche 1 that were approved by the government, and it was confirmed it was those 13 projects.

We were also advised by PIRSA that cabinet notes would provide evidence that there was approval of tranche 2. The fact that PIRSA told them that cabinet notes were the documents that would provide that evidence and then the Department of the Premier and Cabinet did not make those documents available does not mean that PIRSA misled the Auditor-General.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It is quite concerning that the advice was obviously changed. On the same page, 377, it states there was no evidence of nine projects from tranche 2 being appropriately approved. The question is, minister: were they appropriately approved? That was a concern raised by the Auditor-General.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As I previously stated, the process was that those were, as PIRSA stated, taken through to cabinet and therefore cabinet documents were the evidence. The cabinet documents were not released by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, but they were approved.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously this was a concern for the Auditor-General because it has been raised on page 379, where the Auditor-General states they were advised that the cabinet submissions PIRSA referred to as evidence of approval for tranche 2 projects were later changed to cabinet notes. The Auditor-General requested those cabinet documents under Premier and Cabinet Circular PC047. I quote:

Disclosure of cabinet documents to investigative agencies, which allows the Auditor-General to request a cabinet submission subject to certifying that it is required in the proper exercise of statutory functions... The department of the Premier and Cabinet declined our request for these documents on the basis that cabinet notes do not contain approvals.

On what date were the cabinet submissions changed to cabinet notes, which denied the Auditor-General access to them?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am advised that these are cabinet documents that are in the remit of cabinet and they are documents that would require the cabinet office to approve. I do not have the authority to approve those cabinet documents. It is an issue for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: But you are the minister and you would have signed in that cabinet submission. Will you take on notice to come back to the house on what date those cabinet submissions were changed to cabinet notes?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I thank the member for her question. I am certainly happy to investigate whether it is appropriate for me to supply that particular date, if such a date occurred, around a change of cabinet document to a cabinet note. I am more than happy to investigate if appropriate.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, my last question was focused on what date the cabinet submissions changed to cabinet notes. My consequent question is: who made the decision to change the submission to cabinet notes and who authorised it?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I did as minister.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: If you authorised it, why do you not have the date that you authorised it, and why did you do it? Why did you change it?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As I said, I am happy to investigate this. The issue here is that the decision to put them in as a cabinet note was mine. They may have been prepared in another form, but we need to investigate whether that was the case, that is, whether they were prepared in another form and then changed. They were only ever lodged as a cabinet note, is my belief, but we need to check carefully that that be the case.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, can I just clarify that you are not clear whether you lodged it as a cabinet submission and then subsequently changed and lodged it as a cabinet note? This is a clarification.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As I said, this is a reasonable time frame ago. I do not have the exact detail and documents in question in front of me at this point of time, hence I am happy to investigate to see whether that was the case. At this point in time, I cannot you give any further clarity.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just turning back to page 377, what were the nine projects that were included in the Strategic Business Round grants that the Auditor-General sought to look at.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Can I please get a bit of clarity. You are asking for the nine from where in particular?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On page 377, it states:

[There is] no evidence to support approval of grants in tranche two.

We were advised by PIRSA that the 13 projects from tranche one were approved by the SA government.

It further states:

We could not be provided with any other documentation to evidence the approval of tranche two projects. As a result, we have no evidence that the remaining nine projects were appropriately approved.

I am asking you today: what were those nine projects?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I can go through the tranche 2. There was \$2 million to McMahon Services Australia Pty Ltd for the construction and operation of the Port Pirie Resources Recovery Facility. The next one was \$2 million to Australian Grain Exporters Pty Ltd for the construction of a high-tech cleaning, splitting, sizing and bagging plant for value-adding to pulses.

Then there was \$2 million to Timberlink Australia for construction of Australia's first combined cross-laminated timber and glue-laminated timber manufacturing plant. Then there was \$1.25 million to Pernod Ricard Winemakers to relocate ready-to-drink beverages manufacturing from Victoria to South Australia and then \$2 million to Kingston Estate Wines for the expansion to increase onsite capacity from 136 megalitres to 157 megalitres.

There was \$2 million to Aurora Limited for a glass beneficiation plant, \$2 million to Beresford Estate for Vale Brewing Taphouse and accommodation pavilions, \$2 million to Beston Pure Dairies for an accelerated lactoferrin plant expansion and a bioprotein research cluster, and \$2 million to The Bend Motorsport Park for construction of an international standard group 1 quarter mile dragway.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, did the Auditor-General ask you about these nine projects?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I am informed, not specifically.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I just find it quite curious, of course, that he makes considerable mention of it in his report if it was not raised with your department previously. You were obviously able to provide the house with these nine projects so it just seems unusual.

Looking also at page 377, the Auditor-General has identified 22 successful Strategic Business Round applicants through PIRSA's internal records. However, the 22nd applicant is not

listed on PIRSA's website. There is the 22nd plus an additional grant he raises on page 377. So who are these successful applicants that are not listed on the website?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I thank the member for her question and, yes, there were a couple at the time that were not identified on the website. As we work through the process with the funding deeds and arrangements with the applicant, we will work with them on announcing those projects—in their interests and ours as government—for timing for the benefit of the project. Those projects were not on the website at the time due to that.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Has that now been corrected? Is that 22nd project now on the website?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: No, the last one is not currently on the website because we are still in the process of finalising those arrangements.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, the financial year ended on the 30 June 2021, so this is a reflection of that financial year. It seems unusual, given we would have had a funding deed, an agreement, and I would take it that that agreement would include a disclosure publicly. Why has it taken so long? Why are you hiding this 22nd applicant?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Thank you again for the question in relation to this. The arrangements in relation to this particular business are there to actually facilitate the wishes of the business, at their request, so we are working through that project with them. Also, there is a period of three months particularly after the end of the financial year to bed these things down as well, so there is that opportunity for this to happen.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, it is now four months after the end of the financial year. Am I correct that the funding deed was signed last financial year?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: My understanding is that, no, that deed was not signed necessarily before the end of the financial year due to some arrangements with the project that we were dealing with. We progressed that deed on the basis that we saw the importance of this project and we will continue to work with business around that.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, this must be a very, very special project for how you have spent money to be denied to the people of South Australia, and this has been raised by the Auditor-General. So I raise my concern with you that it seems completely remiss that this is not there, but I will move on. Looking at page 374, in regard to the Regional Growth Fund, how much is the Regional Growth Fund over the forward estimates and how much of it has already been allocated?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I guess, firstly, just some clarity about the risk: the way we manage the Regional Growth Fund is it is paid to the grant recipient on the reaching of milestones, so the risk of the money is not actually incurred until the milestone is reached. The risk is minimised to government in relation to money not being used appropriately because we require the project to meet those milestones before payment. The Regional Growth Fund is \$160 million in total over its life; \$75 million has been allocated and, to this point, \$16 million has actually been paid out to people who have reached those milestones.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can I clarify: the \$75 million is allocated for this financial year? Or could you detail how over the forward estimates that is allocated?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: The \$75 million is actually over the period up until now that the projects have been approved. As I said, the \$16 million has been actually spent. As the projects are reaching those milestones, the money will be drawn down and paid to those grant recipients, but it is actually allocated in the budget year when the projects are awarded.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, when you talk about \$160 million over the forward estimates, how much is exactly unallocated given that you have milestone projects coming?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: It is quite simple maths. The \$75 million that has been currently allocated means that, of the \$160 million, there is \$85 million still to be allocated. That is based on \$15 million per year into the forward estimates for projects. So there is \$5 million in the competitive round and \$10 million in a strategic round.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just moving onto questions about the legislative compliance framework, I refer to page 372 under Financial statistics. It states here that PIRSA has 831 FTEs. Can you provide a breakdown of where those FTEs are situated?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As this is a primary industries and regional development portfolio, and PIRSA has offices right around the state, we do not have that detail in front of us to be able to tell you how many full-time workers are in each of the offices. But we are more than happy to get that breakdown to you to show how many there would be here in Adelaide versus how many would be out in those regional offices.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Thank you, minister. Minister, it is quite concerning to me that this is the third year in a row that the Auditor-General has raised specific concerns relating to the implementation of the legislative compliance framework. In fact, I raised it with you last year.

The Auditor-General raised concerns about the implementation and the need for your department to improve, and last year in this house you advised me that you and the department acknowledged the Auditor-General's findings and that significant work had been undertaken in the legislative compliance framework. You also said that it would be intended that that work would be completed by June 2021 that will enable central monitoring to register of all legislative compliance responsibilities. Why is it then that on page 373 of this year's Auditor-General's Report he once again states that implementation of the legislative compliance framework needs improvement?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: Thank you again for the question. I guess one of the important things is to actually understand what this compliance issue is in relation to. This is a longstanding issue, not just recent but longstanding, that is in the process of being corrected.

It is in relation to keeping a register of any issues around PIRSA's arrangements and legal obligations, whether they be financial reporting or whether they be pieces of legislation that require action by PIRSA. This is a register to keep a record of when there are failures in those cases. It is actually understanding when there has been a problem, whether it be meeting a date to appoint someone, whether it be meeting time lines on lodgements of documents, those sorts of issues.

This has now been put in place. The compliance is in place, and as it is being rolled out through the organisation the staff are being educated on this process so that they can understand how the process now works. It has been done in those usual operations of staff management to make sure they have an understanding of their obligations under this register going forward. It is also allowing them to understand now what their requirements are in keeping this register.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Well, I hope we need not speak of this again. Looking at page 374, the Auditor-General criticised the former Minister for Primary Industries, Tim Whetstone, for awarding Regional Growth Fund grants to projects that were not recommended by the department. What have you done to ensure that this does not happen again?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: I thank the member again for the question. It is something that we take very seriously in making sure that we have an understanding of these projects that are being submitted. I have a panel that makes recommendations to me as minister. It is independently chaired so that we get a good, independent recommendation.

We also make sure that I am presented the full gamut of applications, not just those they have chosen to recommend, so we can have a full look at any projects that are there. This is to have understanding of why those recommendations have been made by the panel and to make sure that we are delivering the best outcome for the opportunity that is there. I think it is a very robust way of bringing projects to me as minister, to make sure that the selection of the right project is made so that we can actually deliver the outcomes for the state.

The CHAIR: I will give you one last question, member for Ramsay.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Thank you very much, Chair. Going back to the nine projects where information was not released to the Auditor-General, will you now release all the supporting documentation to show that the grants were awarded appropriately?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As I stated before, those documents are cabinet documents and they are not for my release. They are for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to determine whether they be released.

The CHAIR: The time for the examination of the Minister for Primary Industries and the Auditor-General's Report has expired. Thank you, minister, and thank you to your advisers. Member for Ramsay, thank you. We now move to trade and investment.

Welcome to the Minister for Trade and Investment to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report. Welcome also to your advisers. The member for Ramsay is leading the questioning today. I just remind the minister and other members that you need to stand to both ask and answer questions. Questions must refer to at least the page number and a dot point, if you can. Member for Ramsay, you have the call.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: My first question refers to Part C, page 1. Why was the Department for Trade and Investment not audited as part of the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: The agency was audited by the Auditor-General and we got an unmodified opinion from the Auditor-General. It just was not in the annual report. He chose that.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just to clarify, minister, the department was audited but was not a part of the report. On that note, did the Auditor give a reason for excluding DTI?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: As I reiterate, the Auditor-General did issue an unmodified opinion on the Department for Trade and Investment's 2020-21 financial report. I also draw your attention to the fact that it is at the Auditor-General's discretion to choose which agencies are included in his or her annual report. You will notice also in the annual report Part A: Executive Summary the point is also made:

Not every public sector agency I am required to audit is included in this report...I give priority to areas I assess as important enough to be published in this report.

However, there is an opportunity down the track if the Auditor-General wants to. I should note also that we discussed this at length in last year's Auditor-General's Report and similar reasons were given. I get confidence from the fact that the Auditor-General's approach replicates last year. I think what it says is that he has a high degree of confidence in the financial statements, the financial reports of the department and, as I said, gave an unmodified opinion both years.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In the work the Auditor-General did do with the department and the audit he did do, was DTI given a performance audit from the Auditor-General 'examining the efficiency, economy and effectiveness with which the public authority uses its resources'? That is on page 10, Part A.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I am advised that he did not give a performance audit.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can I stay on Part A, looking at SA government's financial assistance response on page 33. This section notes that \$657 million was allocated to financial assistance for educational institutions. Can you please provide a breakdown of which educational institutions received assistance and how much? Perhaps to put some clarity to my question, my focus is around the support to international students and any compensation perhaps to the downturn of the enrolments.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: Thank you, member for Ramsay. I was going to make the point also that the detailed breakdown of that \$657 million certainly is best asked of the Treasurer, as he was the minister responsible for providing these programs. But, yes, part of that \$657 million may well have been from the International Student Support Package. I will make sure with my advisers that that is the case, but that is what I am advised at the moment. That is what I first thought as well. Of that, there was \$13.8 million for the International Student Support Package.

That was also in conjunction with the university sector. I believe all three universities—the University of Adelaide, Flinders University and the UniSA—put in substantive funds as well. I am advised it was around the \$10 million mark. But in terms of our breakdown for our \$13.8 million, it is broken down as \$10 million towards the university students, then also a \$500 emergency cash grant per student and also a \$200 one-off assistance payment for Homestay families. There were Homestay families looking after students as well.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just to clarify, DTI's part of that was \$13.8 million plus you indicated that the university sector gave \$10 million.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: Yes, the \$10 million we provided to university students, and the \$13.8 million, and in addition to that there was money from the university sector. I believe it was in excess of the \$10 million. I think it was per university as opposed to just in one lump there.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I refer to Part A, 3.3, grant management, looking at pages 41 and 42. When was the last time that DTI was audited by the Auditor-General in regard to the management of grants?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I am advised that part of the audit the Auditor-General does every year includes an audit of the grant programs. The response would be that the last time it was audited was in the 2020-21 year. I remind you that the Auditor-General gave an unmodified opinion.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I can take it that, because you have shared with us in the house and I am sure you are being very transparent, it was an unmodified opinion, but did he make any comments about the grant process? Obviously what we are looking at in the grants process—he indicates very clearly, looking at the selection process, the development and administration of grant agreements and the monitoring and evaluation of activities under the program. That is what he would look at.

While I accept that it was unmodified, was there any commentary made? I ask this in the acknowledgement that this was in response to COVID-19. Maybe the grants in the form that they came were not the traditional way the department has issued grants in the past. I am curious to understand whether there were any comments made.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I am advised there were no issues raised about the processing of grants. Just to give you some comfort that, had that been the case for the previous year, it has here in Part A: Executive Summary that the Auditor-General has the discretion to follow up. He states here that, if there were any issues, that would be part of a report in early 2022. I do not expect there to be. I am just saying it is not as though there is no oversight. You will be able to know that what I am saying is being transparent by virtue of the fact that that mechanism is in place, so I have good confidence.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can I turn now to Part A, cybersecurity, on page 44. The Auditor-General states:

In 2020-21 our specialised IT audit team conducted ITGC testing over seven agencies and 13 key agency financial systems. Our testing also assessed the remediation of ITGC issues we raised in prior years.

Was DTI one of the agencies included in the ITGC testing, or were your financial systems that you use included?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I am advised that the Department for Trade and Investment was not audited as one of these seven agencies. It is worth pointing out again that there were no issues raised by the Auditor-General's Department in relation to the Department for Trade and Investment's ICT or cybersecurity.

It is worth pointing out that the South Australian Cyber Security Framework is a whole-of-South-Australian-government cybersecurity policy framework. We discussed that a little bit in last Auditor-General's Report for 2019-20. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet is responsible, of course, for leading South Australian government's cybersecurity agenda, but our department does work closely with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and, by so doing, is able to leverage what are significant investments that have been put into the state regarding cybersecurity.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On the same Part A in regard to ICT vulnerability management, page 45, the Auditor-General states:

In 2020-21 we undertook a high-level review of 10 public sector entities to understand the level and maturity of their penetration testing and vulnerability scanning of their public facing ICT environments.

Was DTI one of the agencies reviewed for their public facing ICT environments?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I am advised that we were not.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can you tell the committee when was the last time DTI was audited by the Auditor-General in regard to the robustness of their public ICT?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I am advised that the department has not been audited, bearing in mind that the department is quite a young department. Again, I take comfort in the fact that the SA Cyber Security Framework is a whole of South Australian government cybersecurity policy framework, and that puts in place the work. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet is responsible for that.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I turn now to the financial statement and reflect on the expenses on page 3. My question is about the significant increase in expenditure for supplies and services from \$13,365,000 in 2020 to \$17,825,000 in 2021. What was the reason for this increase?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: Some of it is, in part, just because of COVID, because there are carryovers of things that were underspent in the previous year finding their way into the 2020-21 year. An example is overseas travel. The connection overseas dropped off because international borders closed, so rather than travel overseas that was held across.

Another aspect of it is that our overseas trade representation will increase as well. In the 2020-21 year, we brought online the overseas office in Houston, which has done a fantastic job. That came in in the 2020 year, and then we brought in other ones in August. I just want to get my time line right for you: Seoul came online in that 2021 year, New York came online and New Delhi. Those trade offices really started hitting their straps as well. Houston came online towards the end that 2020 year, so you are getting a whole year of Houston in there, if I do my sums correctly.

Just to put it in perspective, these trade offices were vital while international borders were closed. While our exporters could not travel, they gave a fantastic conduit to importers and distributors in the market, including with virtual wine tastings. I have updated the house about that. When wine exporters cannot be there in person, trade offices were able to set up a virtual wine tasting session where they gave, for example, a collection of wines to importers and distributors and then from South Australia the wineries could take them through a virtual wine tasting.

Another example in Houston was the Central Market, where we had some fantastic South Australian food producers able to put their goods onto a major Texas retailer there. It has been fantastically well received.

The CHAIR: It all sounds very enjoyable.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: It was.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On the same page, I note that \$12,439,000 was returned in cash to the Department of Treasury and Finance. Why was this expenditure returned?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: The reason is that technically it is complying with the Treasurer's direction around giving that back to the Treasurer. The reason being, again because of COVID, there were some underspends in some areas and other ones were with the office relocations. So some savings were made there in terms of the leasing costs. With those carryovers, they will get transferred across into the 2021-22 budget. You would have seen them coming through there.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Just some clarification on that: there were not any exceptional areas that did not proceed? It was a significant increase in return.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: There was not anything extraordinary in terms of why that happened. Elaborating further on a previous response, I have further advice that a large degree of that cash return is because of grant programs that were budgeted to occur in that year but, because of COVID, the grant programs that were to be given to business could not proceed. That will then just get picked up again in the 2021-22 year.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As long as you got the money back. An area that I want to raise with you is in regard to investing expenditure on page 10. I have to say this is a concern I raised during the estimates process, and I notice it in the Auditor-General's Report, in reflection on the financial statement it is there as well. The total for existing investing projects is \$0.5 million compared to the original budget, primarily due to the change in timing and scope of the fit-out for the relocation of the department to SA Water House on Victoria Square.

I am trying to get more information about it. In fact, I actually have an FOI—but I am sure the minister is aware of that—that you seem to be unable to release even though I have been advised it has been ready for some time. When was the minister made aware that the budgeted cost to relocate the department was going to more than double in cost? Let us remind ourselves it was \$448,000 for the budget cost and now we have spent an additional \$499,000. That is more than double. How on earth did we get it so wrong, minister?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: When the decision was first made to move to the office of SA Water, it was of course before COVID happened. That was from an office location where the department was spread across four storeys now into the SA Water building on the one floor. As I said, when the department was first trying to go in there, that was delayed because the department could not get access straightaway. As we talked about in estimates, it was apparent that those desks there were at end of life, but also, because we were in COVID, there was the changed working environment, where videoconferencing became very important. So there were changes in the way the department worked, which I think is really positive going forward.

It is worth reiterating that the benefit of the rotation means an annual operational saving of around \$500,000 per year. That is money that we can spend on programs but, importantly, we are now also leasing off a government entity and so the money is staying within government, which is a magnification of that saving.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I must say that these must be the most expensive desks in the whole of South Australia. What I want to know is whether you were aware that the budgeted cost to relocate the department was going to more than double and did you have an opportunity, prior to this massive expenditure, to change the scope, to re-evaluate this project? What did you not do?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: We were leaving commercial premises. The tables were not able to be taken. As I said before, the facilities we were moving into were at end of life and there was other expenditure as well. The department was locked into it when the decision was made back in 2019. The Department for Trade and Investment moved in in 2021. As I said, COVID has changed the work environment and how we work has also changed markedly since 2019.

What I take great comfort in is that overall we are saving \$500,000 a year. The staff are working in an environment where they are able to get the best out of themselves and they are able to interact with exporters through videoconferencing and increased collaboration. Overall, it has a really positive effect for the department and, as I said, saving \$500,000 a year.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, I look forward to getting that FOI so that I can have a transparent look at those costs. Talking about the staff, I want to go to page 14 and the employee benefit expenses in regard to long service leave. The financial statement saw a reduction in the accumulation of long service leave entitlements from 219,000 in 2020 to 160,000 in 2021. Can you account for this reduction? Most importantly, did any DTI staff use their long service leave during lockdowns, and were they asked to do this? Were they asked to take long service leave?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I will just confirm, member for Ramsay. Are you talking about the long service leave line item?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: Yes. I am advised that no-one was forced in terms of that because of COVID, but I think I will take that on notice because that is unnecessary.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I want to know, minister, whether—

The CHAIR: So you are seeking clarification. We have passed our expired time. I will allow this. You are seeking clarification. The minister will answer succinctly.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes, I am seeking clarification and you will take it on notice to come back to me if the DTI staff were requested to use their long service leave during COVID.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: I am advised no-one was requested to use their long service leave.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. Thank you, member for Ramsay. Thank you to the advisers. That concludes the examination of the Auditor-General's Report for today in relation to the Minister for Trade and Investment.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Parliament House Matters

REJMAN, MR A.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (18:07): I rise on a matter of indulgence. It has been drawn to my attention that today is the last day for an important staff member here in this house. I understand that Antoni Rejman is having his last day after 13 extraordinary years of service to our parliament. Antoni has had to suffer me both in the upper house and the lower house, so I owe him a particular debt of gratitude.

I think it is true to say that in this place those members who are elected can often take for granted the extraordinary work that goes on behind the scenes of so many dedicated and professional staff who are utterly committed to the smooth functioning of the people's house, the people's parliament. Antoni, I understand, is making his way back to the United Kingdom. All of us on this side of the house are very grateful, as I am sure all members are, for his hard work and diligent service. Humble as it may be to him, it is incredibly important to the state, and we thank him for that.

The caucus whip, the member for Mawson, has arranged a small token of our thanks with a card. I thank the caucus whip for doing that. Most importantly, we thank you for all your service, Antoni, and we certainly wish you all the very best for your travels and future endeavours.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (18:09): I appreciate the words of the leader, and I would just like to make a very short contribution on the same topic. While we are incredibly fortunate to be looked after so well by chamber attendants and many other people in this building, I have found the support of Antoni to be very special. Not that there is anything wrong with anybody else, but he is extraordinarily attentive and has done a wonderful job.

We have also had the opportunity to engage with each other on other non-official matters, and that has developed a bit of a bond between us, which I value and will never forget. Certainly, on behalf of the government, I wish Antoni and his wife all the very best. It is a shame that they are leaving Australia, but we wish them all the very best in their return to the UK.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (18:10): Thank you, minister. I, too, reiterate those comments. Thank you, Antoni, for your time here and the polite and professional way in which you have carried out your duties, and I wish you well for the coming years.

Bills

CONSTITUTION (INDEPENDENT SPEAKER) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:11 the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 November 2021 at 11:00.