

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30 November 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 Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:01): I move:

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

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required. An absolute majority is present and I accept the motion; is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I put the question at once.

Motion carried.

Matter of Privilege

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (11:02): I rise to move the motion that appears as Notice of Motion No. 1 on the *Notice Paper* today in an amended form, with three changes. For the benefit of the house, I wish to delete paragraphs (g) and (j) of the motion as it appears on the *Notice Paper* and amend paragraph (e) to refer to six days' suspension, being two days for each finding of misleading the house. The balance remains as printed on the *Notice Paper*.

I also wish to move that the debate be confined to one hour, 30 minutes on each side of the chamber.

The SPEAKER: Member for Enfield, I am informed that it is only a minister who can move to allot time to a debate.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:03): I move:

That debate on this motion be confined to one hour in total, 30 minutes each side.

Motion carried.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (11:03): I move:

1. That this house agrees with the recommendations in the report presented to the house of the Select Committee on the Conduct of the Hon Vickie Chapman MP regarding the Kangaroo Island Port Application, and that the house—

- (a) find the Attorney-General guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading the parliament, following its factual findings that statement 1 (relating to property and pecuniary interests) was false and was known to be false by the Attorney-General at the time those statements were made and was intended to mislead the house;
- (b) find the Attorney-General guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading parliament following its factual findings that statement 2 (relating to proposed transport routes) was false and was known to be false by the Attorney-General at the time those statements were made and was intended to mislead the house;

- (c) find the Attorney-General guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading parliament, following its factual findings that statement 4 (relating to a government report on alternative wharf sites) was false and was known to be false by the Attorney-General at the time those statements were made and were intended to mislead the house;
- (d) consider the following penalties for each finding of contempt:
 - (i) ordering the Attorney-General to be brought before the bar to be admonished by the Speaker;
 - (ii) insisting the Attorney-General issue a public and unreserved apology for her conduct; or
 - (iii) suspending the Attorney-General from the service of the house for a period of no more than 11 days.
- (e) resolves to suspend the Attorney-General from the service of the house for six days, being a punishment of two days' suspension for each finding of misleading the house;
- (f) find the Attorney-General acted in a position of conflict of interest, both actual and perceived, based on the committee's factual findings, and is guilty of contempt;
- (g) find that the Attorney-General breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct, based on the committee's factual findings; and
- (h) consider the breach of the code of conduct involved conduct of sufficient severity to amount to contempt.

I know that members in this place understand the seriousness of this matter and know the importance of upholding the privileges enjoyed by this parliament and the importance of protecting the parliament from this sort of contempt.

It is bitterly disappointing that the Attorney continues to be so defiant in the face of all evidence presented to the committee that she is putting this house in this position. The job of this place now is to consider the factual findings of the select committee report and to make decisions based on those findings of fact based on the evidence, and I ask members to bear that in mind.

As to paragraph (a) of the motion, which refers to statement 1 of the committee's report, the committee considered that there was sufficient evidence to find that the Attorney misled parliament when she said:

I have no pecuniary interest in the affected property or the business of KIPT, nor any property or industry associated with or potentially impacted by the proposed wharf...

And a statement to the effect that neither the minister nor any family member or related entity owned property near or impacted by KIPT forests or the proposed port.

Dr Gray, as counsel assisting, advised that it was open to the committee to make the following factual findings, and the committee did in fact do so: that statement 1 was false in that the Attorney owned property known as Gum Valley; that the Attorney derived income from Gum Valley, as evidenced by the Attorney's own evidence; that a plantation forest is located on the opposite side of Western River Road to Gum Valley; and that KIPT had a contract over that plantation.

Timber salvage operations would cause an increase in truck movements near Gum Valley, as well as the operation of harvesting machinery for 18 months to two years during a salvage operation. Beyond the salvage operations there would be long-term forestry operations, including on land across the road from the Attorney's property, had the port been approved.

A port at Smith Bay would impact the use of all land in the west of Kangaroo Island where plantation forests are currently located. The impact of the port on the tourism industry on Kangaroo Island was one of the matters considered in the environmental impact statement and the two assessment reports, and was summarised in the letter from the State Planning Commission, dated 23 July 2021, as:

The broader impact on the Island's economy, particularly in relation to the tourism industry and its 'clean and green' image, are less clear. The Commission acknowledges the impact on the Island's character and tourism appeal is difficult to quantify. A range of mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce impacts; however, there will be unavoidable impacts from the harvesting phase of timber production.

It is clear from the evidence admitted to the committee that the Attorney did have a pecuniary interest in the tourism industry which would be impacted by the proposed wharf. Furthermore, the Attorney's

Gum Valley property would be impacted by the proposed port due to the increased truck movements and the operation of harvesting machinery and the likely use of the land on which forests are located, and the associated impacts of the lack of a substantial timber industry on Kangaroo Island, due to the lack of a port through which timber may be shipped.

Finally, it is not relevant at law whether the Attorney cared about the trucks or not; it is an objective assessment that the legal principles require. The committee made factual findings such that the house should find that the Attorney intentionally misled the parliament with this statement.

I now turn to paragraph (b) of the motion, which refers to statement 2 as set out in the committee's report. The committee considered there was sufficient evidence to find the Attorney had misled parliament when she said:

There is no proposed truck route past [Mayor Pengilly's] house for loads of trucks.

Dr Gray advised that it was open to the committee to make the following factual findings, and the committee has done so. These include that as at 22 December 2020, when KIPT submitted its second addendum containing the proposed truck route to the proposed port, the route approached Smith Bay along North Coast Road from the east.

This route would have taken trucks directly past Mayor Pengilly's residential property on North Coast Road. The truck routes were identified in not only KIPT's second addendum but also the 2021 assessment report. Mayor Pengilly is recorded in the minutes of the meeting of KI Council on 19 January 2021 as declaring a 'perceived conflict of interest...as a resident adjacent to the proposed route'.

The evidence provided by Mr John Sergeant, Mr Keith Lamb, Ms Shauna Black and Mr Lockett, all formerly KIPT employees and directors; Ms Helen Dyer, the former chair of the State Planning Commission; and Mr Tony Braxton-Smith, the Chief Executive of the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, all indicated that the route of the trucks would pass directly past the mayor's home.

The Attorney stated to this house that she had had a good read of the assessment report, suggesting that she clearly understood the contents of the assessment report. Despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, the Attorney retained throughout her evidence that the proposed truck route did not pass Mr Pengilly's house. The Attorney continued to insist that trucks would not travel by the mayor's property in the face of overwhelming objective evidence to the contrary. The committee made factual findings such that the house should find that the Attorney misled the parliament with this statement.

In relation to paragraph (c) of the motion, which refers to statement 4 of the committee's report, the final statement refers to a quote from the Attorney in this place where the government had not 'commissioned its own assessment of a best location for that port to export timber from Kangaroo Island' or to undertake a process 'to look at where an ideal port would be to get timber off Kangaroo Island'. Dr Gray advised that it was open to the committee to make the following factual findings and the committee has done so.

Mr Braxton-Smith confirmed the Wavelength report looked at where an ideal port would be to get timber off Kangaroo Island. This was also supported by the evidence of Mr Robert Kleeman of Planning and Land Use Services. The Wavelength report commissioned by DIT reviewed 20 potential locations for a port, short-listing nine locations. The Wavelength report concluded that there was no single stand-out site on the island but that Smith Bay ranked better than every other potential location and was an appropriate location for the port. It was ranked in that report as number one on the list of potential locations to be considered.

The Wavelength report was referred to in the 2020 assessment report in a minute dated 25 September 2020 provided to the Attorney, in the 2021 assessment report and in another minute provided to the Attorney dated 26 July 2021. On its face, the Wavelength report makes clear the ranking of Smith Bay against other potential port sites and that it was the best ranked site. Given the clarity of the Wavelength report and the number of documents that refer to it, the weight of evidence suggests that the Attorney knew that statement 4 was in fact false at the time she made it and intended to mislead the house. The committee made factual findings such that the house should find that the Attorney misled the parliament with this statement.

Based on the findings of the select committee, the committee offered the following options for the house to consider in regard to penalties: firstly, ordering the Attorney-General to be brought before the bar to be admonished by you, Mr Speaker; insisting that the Attorney-General issue a public and unreserved apology for her conduct; or suspending the Attorney-General from the service of the house for a period of not more than 11 days. The committee, however, recommends to the house, as set out in paragraph (d) and amended by my amendment earlier, that the house suspend the Attorney-General from the service of the house for six days, based on a punishment of two days' suspension for each finding of misleading the house.

Paragraph (f) considers the serious nature of a conflict of interest in public decision-making by a minister, and the committee recommends that the house find that the Attorney acted in a position of conflict of interest, both actual and perceived, based on the committee's factual findings and is therefore guilty of contempt.

Whilst giving his evidence to the committee, Mr Tony Braxton-Smith said that you should not teach your grandmother to suck eggs. While I commend Mr Tony Braxton-Smith's high regard for the Attorney, it is clear from the evidence that the Attorney has misunderstood the basic legal principles of what constitutes a conflict of interest or has disregarded them. I have to say I am bitterly disappointed that the chief law officer does not appreciate what a conflict of interest is and the consequences of acting with an undisclosed conflict of interest.

For the Attorney's benefit, I will provide a very brief summary. A conflict arises if a minister has a personal interest in the subject of which she is asked to determine. A personal interest is anything that can impact a minister or a person with which the minister has a relationship or association with. A relevant example of this is owning property in an area that will be impacted, either positively or negatively, by a decision that is made. It is clear from the evidence and the findings of the select committee that the Attorney had a personal interest. Once an interest is established it needs to be determined if that interest is actual, potential or perceived conflict.

In relation to perceived conflict, there have been numerous cases where judges have recused themselves from hearing matters due to a perceived conflict of interest. Their judgements on these conflicts are long and detailed and the case law is clear. A mere perception of conflict is enough to taint a legal ruling. Judges choose to have these matters heard by other judicial officers to ensure a perception of a conflict does not cause harm to the public's faith in our justice system.

Essentially the same expectations apply to members of the executive and other public officials to ensure that the public can maintain their faith in our government. When it comes to making decisions that have significant economic, environmental and financial consequences for our state, we—that is, all South Australians—expect the utmost from our elected officials. A perceived conflict arises where it would appear to a reasonable person that the Attorney's personal interest could influence her decision in an improper way.

Here we need to apply the reasonable person test. Would it appear to a reasonable, fair-minded person that the Attorney had a conflict of interest in these circumstances:

- where the Attorney had a long history with the island;
- where her family had been there for generations;
- where her family had been farmers for generations;
- where a small group of farmers on Kangaroo Island with whom she was aligned have been against the forestry industry on the island for decades;
- the Attorney and her family have significant landholdings on the island, including, critically, land directly across the road from a forest contracted to KIPT;
- the Attorney is a close family friend of the former member for Finnis and the current Mayor of Kangaroo Island, Mr Michael Pengilly; and
- Mr Pengilly has been a vocal opponent of the port proposal at Smith Bay. His property overlooks Smith Bay and the freight route to the proposed port travels directly past his home?

On the face of it, the committee was asked to consider whether a reasonable, fair-minded person would perceive that the Attorney had a conflict of interest in these circumstances. The mere perception of a conflict of interest is enough reason for the Attorney to have delegated this decision to another minister and we have all read significant commentary on this issue in recent times in the media, including from Mr Tom Richardson, who summed it up this way in an article that appeared in InDaily on Friday 12 November:

It is textbook.

It is, I'd suggest, about as clear a case of perceived conflict of interest as you are ever likely to encounter in public life.

I have no reason to doubt that Mr Richardson is a reasonable person. This is not some situation where you need a highly trained legal mind to consider the facts and reach a conclusion as to whether this is a perceived conflict of interest.

When you have ministerial advisers, chiefs of staff, the Crown Solicitor's Office and departmental heads all asking themselves whether the Attorney had a conflict of interest, I for one would and the committee in fact found that there is in fact a perception that there was a conflict of interest. And as I said earlier, a perception of conflict of interest is the type of conflict which requires the minister to have delegated her decision.

The perception of conflict was so strong within the Attorney's own office that a delegation was drafted to the Minister for Human Services. It is clear on the evidence received by the committee that the Attorney's staff and other public servants involved saw a conflict. They are reasonable people. That is a perceived conflict of interest.

Dr Gray, when discussing the nature of the Attorney's relationship with Mayor Pengilly, acknowledged that it did not reach the standard set for an actual conflict of interest. However, Dr Gray noted that the friendship between the Attorney and the mayor did contribute to a perception of a conflict of interest. Dr Gray considered:

- the close friendship between the Attorney and Mayor Pengilly;
- the meeting between KIPT executives, Mayor Pengilly and the Attorney in 2017 when, as we heard in evidence from Mr Sergeant of KIPT, the Attorney made it clear she did not believe that Smith Bay could be identified as a suitable let alone optimal site. Instead, she strongly suggested that KIPT look closely at Cape Dutton further west, using her extensive local knowledge to suggest the optimal haulage route to that location, despite Cape Dutton being a marine park;
- the truck routes on North Coast Road passed Mayor Pengilly's house; and
- Mayor Pengilly's position on the port was reflected in each of the Attorney's decisions in 2020 and 2021.

It is clear on the evidence provided to the committee that any reasonable person would perceive a conflict of interest arose in those circumstances. In relation to actual conflict of interest, Dr Gray in her report to the committee noted, and I quote:

...an actual conflict exists if it is established that the existence of the port would have, as a matter of fact, impacted the Attorney-General's interests.

Dr Gray recommended that the committee find that the Attorney had an actual, as well as a perceived, conflict of interest. Dr Gray considered two matters when discussing the Attorney's conflicts, namely, her property interests on Kangaroo Island—particularly the property known as Gum Valley—and her friendship with Mayor Pengilly that has been previously discussed. It was the Attorney's interest in Gum Valley that caused Dr Gray to recommend to the committee that it find the Attorney had an actual conflict of interest.

Gum Valley, which is located across the road from a forest contracted to KIPT, generated income for the Attorney as a short-term rental. Advertised on Facebook as Gum Valley Retreat, searches indicate that that page has been taken down but that it was advertised on Airbnb as a short-term rental and on Facebook. Gum Valley has been marketed to tourists visiting the island. The 2020 assessment report noted the impact on tourism for the island.

By the very nature of operating a tourism-based business on the island, the Attorney had a pecuniary interest in the tourism industry. The Attorney's own evidence showed that she derived income from Gum Valley when she noted that her records relating to Gum Valley were with her accountant to complete her tax return for 2021. The Attorney's property on Kangaroo Island would have, on any reasonable and objective assessment, been impacted by the proposed port at Smith Bay. This enabled the committee to make the factual finding that the Attorney was in an actual position of conflict.

The Attorney was required, pursuant to paragraph 3.3 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, to disclose this conflict to the Premier. The Attorney was requested by the code to turn her mind to the question of conflict, to which she emphatically denied a conflict. She has stated in evidence that 'there is no conflict of interest and accordingly no delegation will follow'.

As the first law officer in this state, the Attorney should, and I am sure does, have a clear understanding of what a conflict is. The denial of a conflict shows a complete disregard for proper governance processes and a disregard for the rule of law. The failure to consider the conflict again in her subsequent decision-making exacerbated the problem. A finding of conflict of interest, both perceived and actual in relation to a major project in South Australia, is reasonable ground to prompt the actual resignation of the Attorney as Attorney.

Paragraph (h) goes on to state that the house should find 'that the Attorney-General breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct, based on the committee's factual findings'. The weight of evidence that supports the findings of this committee and the Attorney's wrongdoing provide that, on the balance of probabilities, she was out of step with the rules and procedures of this house, with the standards expected by the community, and broke the black-and-white rules of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

Paragraph 3.3 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct requires the Attorney to disclose a conflict to the Premier, and the Premier has repeatedly stated that the Attorney did not notify him of conflict. The conflict caused the Attorney to prejudice her decision in relation to the port at Smith Bay. In considering all the evidence brought before the committee, it is clear that the Attorney did not come to her decision with an unbiased mind in respect of the decision-making process.

The evidence provided by Mr Sergeant of the meeting that occurred in 2017 is clear evidence that the Attorney could not consider this application without prejudice. During that meeting, as I said earlier, the Attorney made it clear she considered the port was in the wrong place.

Dr Gray noted the potential cost to the state, as the Attorney's actions expose the state to risk of litigation and significant claim for damages. The recommendations of Dr Gray were handed down on 15 November, and I tabled the committee's report to this place on the 18th. The committee's findings are clear. The Attorney-General should resign as Attorney-General, without smoke and mirrors.

The Attorney ought to have resigned her commission as Attorney the moment the committee's report was tabled in parliament and, quite frankly, when the evidence to the committee was known to her. Resigning is the honourable thing to do but, in the same manner as the Attorney has failed to acknowledge her mistakes and biases in relation to the Smith Bay port proposal, she has failed to acknowledge the findings of the committee.

Former Premier Olsen resigned from his position following the release of the Clayton report into the Motorola affair. The Clayton report found that the then Premier gave misleading, inaccurate and dishonest evidence to a judicial inquiry. The former Premier did the honourable thing and resigned. The Attorney continues to fail in her duty. Ministerial responsibility requires the Attorney to resign as Attorney. Sadly, the house is now left to consider the breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct and other breaches involved in her conduct of sufficient severity to amount to contempt.

On the basis of the select committee's findings, the house should now decide that the Attorney had misled the house on 26 May 2021, 2 August 2021 and 25 August 2021 and failed to recuse herself from an actual and perceived conflict of interest in relation to the development application for Smith Bay port on Kangaroo Island.

The house must further condemn the Attorney for breaching the Ministerial Code of Conduct in failing to declare her actual and perceived interest in the Smith Bay proposal. This house must:

(a) find that the Attorney was guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading the parliament following the factual findings of the committee that statements 1, 2 and 4 were false and were known to be false by the Attorney at the time each of those statements were made and were intended to mislead the house;

(b) find that the Attorney acted in a position of conflict of interest, both actual and perceived, based on the committee's factual findings and should be found guilty of contempt. The house should find that the Attorney-General breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct based on the committee's factual findings and consider that the breach of the code involved conduct of sufficient severity to amount to contempt; and, finally,

(c) suspend the Attorney-General from the service of the house for six days. It is a great shame and a stain on this parliament that this motion has had to be brought forward. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:26): I will be fairly brief in my contribution to this debate. Let's be very, very clear: the government opposes the motion and the government opposes the amended motion. This is an attempt to continue the kangaroo court which those others set up, and that definition is one—

The SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier, there is a point of order. Please be seated. Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The term 'kangaroo court' to a committee of this parliament is offensive and I ask that the minister withdraw it and apologise immediately.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, you being a member of the committee, I understand that you are concerned that the remark may also reflect on you. It is a subjective standard, Deputy Premier, so it may be that you reflect on whether you withdraw the statement.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I withdraw and apologise. It has not gone without notice of those outside this chamber that plenty of people outside this chamber have referred to this committee as a kangaroo court. That is a fact. It is also a fact that as to the committee's findings which we hear so much about from those opposite, it is important that we put on the record that all of those findings, all of the deliberations of the committee essentially were split 3-2 in the internal voting.

I accept the majority view of the committee, but it would be a mistake for anybody to think that the majority view of the committee was anything more than 60 per cent of the members, barely over half of the members of the committee found in that position. It is an important thing to put on the record. Another very important thing to put on the record is the fact that the committee, in its wisdom, determined that these matters should be handed over to the Ombudsman to investigate upon.

But before the Ombudsman has had the opportunity to deliberate and provide some findings and come back with a response, the committee actually wants to move on in the interim and impose penalties—completely unfairly impose penalties. Why on earth would the committee, in its 60 per cent majority, think that it was appropriate for the Ombudsman to consider these things, to actually take it to a higher authority to determine the merits of the committee's findings, and yet, before receiving that information, decide that they also want to impose penalties and punishments on the member for Bragg?

The member for Bragg is an extremely capable, extremely hardworking, extraordinary capacity person who is an absolutely outstanding South Australian. It is terribly unfortunate that those opposite want to, in the blink of an eye, transition from findings which they wanted to pass on to the Ombudsman, to actually determine whether those findings really have merit or not, to actually try a cruel, personal attack on somebody. Absolutely disgraceful.

This is not about Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers, this is not about Smith Bay, this is not about Kangaroo Island in general or any of the other things that have been raised. This is a cruel, personal attack to try to damage someone's credibility, and we will not accept that. We will not be a part of that. While I acknowledge that the amended version is essentially a very slight watering down of the original version, the government in no way agrees with this proposal.

I say as I did last sitting week: I think those opposite would be very wise to consider their own personal situations and how other members of their team—perhaps even just a 60 per cent majority of their team—would treat them if they found them in a vulnerable position that they could exploit, because that is all this is. That is all this is. This is not about Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers, not about Smith Bay, not about the things that this house should be engaging in.

I fully accept the right of members of this chamber to have views and opinions about how each and every one of us should go about our business in this chamber. I accept that. But when the committee has already publicly said that it is not confident enough in its 60 per cent findings, that it cannot rest on those and that it asks that the committee's opinions be passed on to the Ombudsman for consideration, when the committee has done that it has admitted it requires further investigation before any consideration of penalties should be put forward—and that is if the Ombudsman finds in agreement with the committee.

There is every likelihood, in my opinion, that the Ombudsman would actually have a different view from what the committee put forward, in which case what we are discussing at the moment would be entirely inappropriate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:31): It is interesting that the Deputy Premier thinks 60 per cent of a margin is not enough, given that he won the Deputy Premiership with 63 per cent of the vote. Perhaps he might want to reflect on that. It is important to note that we are not canvassing here something that the Ombudsman can. The Ombudsman has no remit at all and no jurisdiction to punish any member for misleading the parliament. That is solely our responsibility.

That is where the Deputy Premier's argument fell over. The Ombudsman is not investigating if the Deputy Premier misled the parliament because he cannot. He is a statutory officer of this parliament who reports to us. He cannot impose any penalties on the parliament for proceedings in here. Parliamentary privilege precludes that. Only we can be masters of what is said here.

If a parliamentarian can deliberately mislead this parliament and get away with it, then our representative democracy crumbles, because we rely on some conventions and principles in this place that a deliberate misleading of this parliament is a contempt. Erskine May says it and the House of Representatives says it. The committee has investigated this matter and found that the Attorney-General is guilty of a contempt, and now we are debating that matter, about what penalties we should impose.

If the parliament chooses not to impose a penalty on the Attorney-General for deliberately and intentionally misleading this parliament on three occasions—and I am not going to argue the merits again because I think it was ably done by the member for Enfield—then ministers can get up and say anything they want at any time. For the Deputy Premier to then speculate on the outcome of the Ombudsman's inquiry I think is deeply inappropriate—deeply inappropriate.

The Ombudsman should be allowed to conduct his inquiry unfettered in any way by this chamber, which is what I understood to be the reason the Attorney-General was standing aside. Because, the very point of the Ombudsman's inquiry, which is not as a result of a government referral but our committee referral, as the member opposite says, he argues that we should not vote on this because the Ombudsman is inquiring into this—well, the Ombudsman is not inquiring into this because the parliament was misled; he is inquiring into maladministration, misconduct and conflicts of interest—and he then argues that the government is supporting the Ombudsman's inquiry despite both members of the committee, I understand, not supporting the Ombudsman referral.

The government has not referred this to the Ombudsman; the committee has. If it were up to the government, there would be no penalty. The member for Bragg would still be the Deputy Premier and Attorney-General and planning and local government minister. There would be nothing. It would be business as usual. Had it not been for this parliament acting, nothing would have changed, and that is why we have to act now. You cannot mislead us. I draw your attention to the practice of the House of Representatives 'Conspiracy to deceive', and I quote:

To conspire to deceive either House or a committee of either House could be punished as a contempt. The abuse of the right of petition and forging or falsifying documents could be examples of this type of contempt.

Regarding 'Deliberately misleading the House', according to Erskine May, it states:

The Commons may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt. In 1963 the House resolved that in making a personal statement which contained words which he later admitted not to be true, a former Member had been guilty of a grave contempt.

That was the Profumo case in 1962-63. The current Attorney-General has not resigned. If the member for Bragg had resigned her commission as a member of Executive Council and as Attorney-General, this would not be occurring. There would be no other punishment imposed by the house. That is sufficient punishment. That is sufficient and that is the appropriate convention.

Since the Premier and the government refuse to have the Attorney-General stand down or sack her or compel her resignation, the house has no other option than to expel her from the services of the house. If the Attorney-General makes a statement now that she is resigning as Attorney-General, this motion will be withdrawn because there is no greater insult that any member can give their constituency than not to be here doing their job. Being named by a Speaker and then removed by the house is the greatest insult you can give your constituency.

The Deputy Premier is guilty of misleading the parliament—that is without question. It is beyond doubt. Any reasonable person would know that we were lied to deliberately and we have to act. If we do not act the parliament is a joke, and if the parliament is a joke our democracy is a joke, and it is not; it is serious. It is so serious that we now have a new Deputy Premier and we now have a new planning and local government minister, but we have the same Attorney-General. That is unacceptable.

Ministers in the house of government cannot sustain the survival of a no-confidence motion. It is unacceptable. Nowhere in the Westminster tradition would this be tolerated, and if it is tolerated by the house the people should act. The Deputy Premier is probably going to be expelled from the parliament for six days. The constituency of Bragg will go unrepresented in this chamber for six days or however long we sit. What an insult to them. What an insult to them because of pride—the pride that she will not stand down as Attorney-General.

Let's think about the position the Ombudsman is now in. He directly answers to the Attorney-General. He had to write to us to conduct his inquiry because of perceived conflict because of the position the government have put him in of maintaining the member for Bragg in that position. Why sack her then as Deputy Premier and planning and local government minister but leave her as Attorney-General? Why? If she has done nothing wrong, as the Deputy Premier says, why did she resign those positions? Because it is obvious that she has done something wrong. The committee found it. The parliament passed a no-confidence motion. It is clear.

Do not do it to the people of Bragg. They deserve better than this. Get the Attorney-General to resign her commission immediately and we will withdraw the motion. If the Attorney-General resigns after she is expelled, we will rescind this motion and return her to the parliament. One punishment is enough, not two. The member for Bragg cannot get away with this and she should not.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:39): Honourable members, the bottom line for the house is that the house cannot and should not move on the recommendations of this select committee. There is one thing that we can all agree on: this is serious subject matter indeed. I have addressed in my remarks on 18 November a view in relation to the relevant law and the process. What is for me to emphasise here today—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. Member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I seek your guidance: is it appropriate the member for Heysen makes a contribution or participates in this debate given that in his previous position as Speaker he has already ruled on this matter?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, I will reflect on that matter. I also understand that the minister is exercising powers delegated to him as Attorney-General. I will reflect on that matter in relation to standing orders.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: In my remarks on 18 November, I highlighted the two primary defects in relation to the way in which the select committee conducted its work. Those observations are matters of record. They are, firstly, that the committee's work is tainted by prejudgement—that is

evident and I will expand on that in a moment—and, secondly, in terms of the process adopted by the committee, the actual working through of the committee process was extraordinary in its one-sided approach to its inquiry in the matter.

As I said on 18 November, counsel assisting—the first time that such resort has been taken—is better characterised as a counsel for the prosecution. I ask members: where do we ever see a trial in which a counsel for the prosecution is asked to make submissions and then switch gears and quickly write the judgement? That is akin to what has occurred in this process.

It is an inadequate process; it is an unreliable process. The work of the Ombudsman has been referred to and I just submit that this is appropriate work for the Ombudsman to be doing. I note that the member for West Torrens's observations about some reference the Ombudsman might have made about whether or not to proceed is incorrect. The Ombudsman raised a question but has otherwise indicated his complete comfort with carrying on this work, and it is appropriate that we allow the Ombudsman to do that work and to produce outcomes.

In truth, the substance of the matter that underlies the committee's inquiry was a matter finely balanced and the minister, in undertaking her important work, needed to traverse work that had been done over the course of many years over multiple governments and multiple ministers. I have referred to the chronology of events set out in Frances Nelson QC's submissions at paragraph 3.

Otherwise, I have set out the relevant matters, the tests that are to be applied, particularly in relation to conflict, the mischaracterisation that has been put in the course of the select committee hearing by counsel assisting the committee. The grave conclusion, should the house move in response to this report, is that the house would be endorsing a process which is unfortunately tainted by partisan prejudgement and is extraordinary in the procedural unfairness that it has accorded to the subject of its inquiry.

We not only see that on the face of the report but we also see it in what has transpired in the course of the last sitting week. Towards the end of the day on 18 November, I rose to draw the attention of the house, to the extent that I could at that time, to remarks made by the member for West Torrens, which are evidence of not only his own prejudgement of the subject matter but also his capacity to have drawn his colleagues into the imposition of his will and not on evidence before the committee but rather on an outcome that was predetermined.

When the member for West Torrens commenced his remarks in the afternoon on 18 November, he referred to Orwell and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and he quoted from that text. I do not know if he was just rehearsing Samuel L. Jackson's work in Ezekiel 25:17 equivalent or whether he actually meant those words to apply when he said:

...if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed...then the lie passed into history and became truth.

He may have simply been rehearsing those lines. The evidence is that it is the member for West Torrens himself who has engaged in the misleading of the house in the course of this debate and relevantly has withdrawn and apologised for doing so.

The second part of the member for West Torrens' contribution in this respect was not available to me when I got on my feet at about 6.30 on 18 November. It was an hour later. I want to refer to it directly because not only is it evidence of that misleading but it shows us the evident prejudgement and persuasion of colleagues because the member for West Torrens said that there existed advice between Ingo Block and the Speaker—

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Minister, please be seated.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This matter has already been canvassed before the house. The member for Heysen at the time made a personal explanation and took exception to it, and it was withdrawn by the member for West Torrens and an apology was made. The matter has been dealt with. To raise it again only queries whether the member for Heysen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is addressing me.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —actually took offence in the first place.

The SPEAKER: Very well, member for Lee. I will listen carefully to the contribution being made by the minister. I will remind the minister that there is some force in the submission from the member for Lee, but I will continue to hear the minister.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: The words that I was unable to go to precisely because they were not available to me at the time quite properly were withdrawn and an apology given.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Where's Vickie's? Where's Vickie's apology?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: The reason for raising them in this context, other than the fact that it is no small thing, as the member for West Torrens has adverted as recently as in this debate, to mislead the house, much less deliberately, is that there is, unlike the usual rhetorical question that comes from the member for West Torrens about what might arise or 'we don't know, but this might occur and who am I to know, but this might happen', there is a positive assertion of the existence of documents that do not exist, which led to a charge that draws the Speaker's office into disrepute, so it is proper that they were withdrawn and an apology promptly given. What the video reveals—and members might reflect on this—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: We are defending Vickie, remember.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: —is that in the course of giving those remarks the member said, 'Well, hang on. If these non-existent documents were unredacted'—remember, they do not exist, it is a false statement and the whole thing had to be withdrawn. We have chiming in. He is looking for words, 'What would this constitute?' and his colleagues are chiming in, evidently convinced of the case that he is putting: 'Would it be a cover-up? Would it be conspiracy? Would it be collusion?'

The fact is that the member for West Torrens was prepared to put to this house the positive existence of documents that do not exist, in circumstances where his colleagues were convinced of the case that he was putting. The member for West Torrens is a member of the committee. The documents that the committee received were not made public in their entirety. He is the only one who on 18 November was in a position to be opining about documents that he had read that had been provided to the committee. Evidently, colleagues present in the course of his contribution are already convinced of the existence of the documents and their persuasive character, and in turn are tainted by the whole process before we even have a chance to read the outcome of the report.

I really and truly invite members opposite to consider the videorecording of those remarks. Members opposite who were chiming in and offering their amplification of those remarks might reflect on that because they are perfectly capable of drawing their own conclusions based on the evidence, and if they are drawn into the persuasion of the member for West Torrens based on these non-existent documents, then what greater insight do we have into the prejudgement that has occurred in the course of this committee's work?

We have a contribution in the house that is adverting to the existence of non-existent documents, for the purposes of extracurricular debate in the house late in the afternoon, where we see revealed what has clearly gone on on this side—what has clearly gone on on this side. To the extent that the member for West Torrens' colleagues have somehow been drawn into the Kool Aid that the member for West Torrens is providing to them, they ought to reflect on that and in turn on the reliability of any—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: —findings of this select committee that are supported by the member for West Torrens. The fact is that the outcomes of the select committee's work and its recommendations are so unreliable as to not be able to be acted on. As I said on 18 November, these recommendations simply risk drawing the house into disrepute.

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

Ms MICHAELS: As the Chair of the committee, I find it highly offensive that he says that our committee work has been unreliable, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise for that.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there has been extensive commentary in relation to the nature of the committee's work, the views that may not have been formed by members, so of course later formed part of that committee's quorum. The standard, as you are aware, is a subjective one in relation to offence, and the presiding member of the committee has taken offence. I give you an opportunity to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: I withdraw and apologise and rely on my remarks in relation to the record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:53): We are debating—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: We are debating today a motion that is born of malice and should be disregarded by this parliament. You can tell the nature of the malice if for no other reason than when they were putting forward a proposition, despite the fact that members of the government found it utterly offensive, we listened in silence, yet barely a member on that side of the chamber can restrain themselves from gleefully digging in, interjecting, shouting indeed. It is a sign of the thuggery and the bullying behaviour—

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

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that led to the introduction of the investigation in the first place.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a point of order. Please be seated.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Quite helpfully, sir, the word 'thug' is unparliamentary. I ask the member to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: To whom did I address it? The 'thuggery of—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: To the opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —the behaviour of the opposition', sir, was not addressed to an individual, and I submit that the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —has never required an apology.

The SPEAKER: Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members! The minister, I understand, is making submissions in relation to the point of order. I understand that the member for West Torrens is raising a point of order and has taken offence. I understand that it is raised on the basis that the matter, or rather the proposition, that a member is a thug was directed to him. It is a subjective standard, minister. I give you an opportunity to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, I did not address the word 'thuggery' in relation to one individual.

The SPEAKER: You may not have, minister, but as I understand it the member has, on a subjective basis, taken it as addressed to him.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, do I understand from your submission that the member, having assumed that the word 'thuggery' must have applied only to him, that the house is to hold—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that a member cannot refer to a range of people that may or may not include a member, but that member—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —thinking that maybe their behaviour draws that assertion, requires an apology?

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: this is not a matter that is open to debate by the member for Moriatta, sir. You have ruled: he either follows the ruling or you name him, sir.

The SPEAKER: I am giving him an opportunity—in fact, there is another point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order on the point of order, sir: you did not rule, you invited the member to do something.

The SPEAKER: Yes; that's quite right.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: My point of order is that there is very significant precedent in this house that, when a remark is directed specifically to a member in isolation, that member may take offence, but when a remark is directed to a group of members—or the opposition, or the government—as a whole, then that requested point of order does not apply.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Members, we are confining ourselves for the moment to minutia in the standing orders. These matters are significant; however, having listened carefully to the submission from the minister, he indicates he has not named an individual member. I have given him the opportunity to withdraw. I have not ruled in relation to that matter. I continue to give the member that opportunity. He has indicated to the house that he is not referring to an individual member. I think we can resolve the matter on that basis. Minister.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. The fact is that this motion we have before us today is the final step in what I believe to have been a planned sequence of events put forward by members of the opposition, in its first account—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The assertion by the member for Mawson is offensive. I do not take personal offence because I am absolutely certain that I didn't, and I am also certain that no-one on the government benches submitted to that behaviour—

The SPEAKER: It has not been raised, and in fact I did not hear it.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am reflecting, sir, on the behaviour of those opposite, which has been consistent throughout this debate. Those members who argued that there should be a committee in the first place had, in my strong view, and for which there is very substantial evidence, prejudged the matter. They had predetermined a position. They said that the outcome would be consistent with their view.

In putting their proposition to members of the crossbench, I submit that every single member of the crossbench who received that submission—whoever it came from—would know in their hearts, would know in their minds, that such a view had been predetermined, prejudged, and that no matter who the Labor Party put forward to be on the committee their findings, their views and their arguments would be beyond a doubt from the very beginning of the inquiry.

It is in that view that I think many people in the community, many people familiar with the material, have little regard for the findings of this committee. I submit the committee did itself no credit in relying on an approach the member for Heysen described as a counsel for the prosecution, which has no basis in the Westminster institution. It does have a basis in the American political tradition and the appointment of a special prosecutor to accumulate evidence for a political end and a political purpose.

This committee, by providing the framework within which such a special prosecutor could do their work, could find out whatever they could to make a case against the member for Bragg, did itself no credit. It brought to this house a new approach, a novel approach, a bad approach. It is an approach that I submit is very familiar in America where, all the time, whenever you have a president and a congress of different houses, you always have one looking to find a special prosecutor to find out information that could be argued against the other. It is the Rudy Giuliani approach, and it did the committee no credit.

It does the house little credit, of course, that it went on, but it is understandable that the house went along with the views of the committee because traditionally that is what houses have done. But it does not follow that, because the committee has submitted for the house's consideration recommendations in relation to punishments, even if a slim majority of the house had come to the conclusion that it would support the no-confidence motion, which of course was the third step on the predetermined case—the putting of the case of privilege, the holding of the committee and the no-confidence motion, and this is the fourth step—even if members supported that third step, there is no requirement to support the fourth step.

Indeed, the member for Enfield this morning, despite being the Chair of the committee whose reputation she has been so quick to jump up and defend despite its Giulianiesque special prosecutor approach, has disregarded the recommendations of the committee. The Chair of the committee and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The members of the opposition cannot hold themselves in. They must continue shouting—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —because that is the behaviour they bring to this house every day. The Chair of the committee, not content—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: At least we don't give up!

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The member for Mawson cannot restrain himself. The Chair of the committee, despite having relied upon the Giulianiesque special prosecutor to come up with a series of recommendations which she put to the house and which she argued be put forward and debated as a matter of priority, this morning stood up and walked away from them. She walked away from three of the recommendations, deleting two and taking one further one away.

I bring to the house's attention some of the debate that has further gone on in relation to the recommendations from this committee that had prejudged the outcomes of what it would find. It had already set in place the punishments that it was going to argue and, I would continue to argue, its findings should not be taken with the same degree of sincerity by this house as we have traditionally done.

We have absolutely to consider the merits of the case in relation to the arguments for the punishments. Three of the punishments that remain, the items in (f), (h) and (i), all relate to matters of conflict of interest, the Ministerial Code of Conduct and, indeed, (i) the breach of the code of conduct and are 'of sufficient severity to amount to contempt'.

These are matters that are being considered by the Ombudsman. Not half an hour ago, the member for West Torrens argued that no-one in this house should say anything that would get in the way of the Ombudsman's inquiry. For the house to take a position on these three items would be in

direct contravention of the member for West Torrens' argument and it would, I agree, be utterly inappropriate for this house to intervene in those matters being investigated by the Ombudsman.

For the member for West Torrens to argue that nobody should be talking about anything that might influence Ombudsman while arguing in favour of a motion that determines an outcome of what the Ombudsman is investigating is extraordinarily odd or maybe incompetent.

Mr Whetstone: Yes, he is odd.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The fact is that the members of the opposition who hang on the member for West Torrens' every word and do whatever he says for whatever reason they do should think on the fact that his very argument should preclude them from voting for the motion because (f), (h) and (i) are in direct contravention of what he has argued.

That leaves us with the first three matters: the alleged misleading of this house. Of course, it is open to members of the house to have noted the report, as we did in the last sitting week, and to have voted a vote of no confidence. If they felt that the mere fact the member for Bragg's decision had been referred to the Ombudsman, that may well have given a member or members of the crossbench, for example, reason to vote for the no-confidence motion.

But it does not necessarily follow that they agreed with every aspect of those recommendations in the report. It does not follow that they agreed necessarily that the Attorney-General, as she then was, the member for Bragg, misled the house. It does not follow, and so—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —I would submit that if a member felt there may have been a conflict—and I do not believe there was—then it only lies for them to be convinced that she not only misled the house if she did but that she intentionally did so. It has been not even argued against by those opposite some of the points put forward by Frances Nelson in the committee debate. It was not challenged, the submission put forward in relation to when the member for Bragg found out that KIPT had involvement with the timber across the road. The member for Enfield described it before as the plantation forest opposite Gum Valley contracted to KIPT. It is clear to me that, for the charge to stick, the member for Bragg would have to have known the contractual arrangements related to KIPT, but the member for Bragg—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —was not in the favourable position—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that some other members were, to be on such close terms with senior officers within KIPT or the people they employ or contract. That is not necessarily known and the case has never been put. It has certainly never been satisfactorily put that the member for Bragg said anything that she did not know to be true. Indeed, she has made it very clear that that has long been a private forest.

The fact that it had been contracted for logging or clearance, or whatever the situation is, by KIPT not having been established that she knew that—indeed, she knew that it would be logged at some point by somebody—also goes to the conflict, the fact that there was always going to be logging there. But the opposition, in their committee and in this house, have never satisfactorily established that the member for Bragg was familiar with those contractual arrangements at any point that is relevant to the matter.

The second basis, the second pillar, of the member for Enfield's prosecution based on Dr Gray's recommendations was this close personal friendship, this close family friendship, with the Mayor of Kangaroo Island. I know Michael Pengilly. Many members in the house know Michael Pengilly. The member for Bragg has known Michael Pengilly for a long time. It does not necessarily follow that, because we are former colleagues on friendly terms, it would amount to a conflict in any way.

I established in the house last sitting week that the member for Bragg has not even supported Michael Pengilly's every political attempt. The member for Bragg and Michael Pengilly are of different ages, as the committee heard. They went to different schools. The member for Bragg was at the Parndana Area School to year 11. Michael Pengilly was not. The fact is that there is not the evidence to establish a close personal friendship, relationship or financial relationship of any sort between the member for Bragg and Michael Pengilly that would sustain a conflict of interest or a misleading of the house in any way.

If anyone looks at the contributions by the member for Enfield today or two weeks ago, they can go through that. So much of this hangs on the idea that the member for Bragg and Michael Pengilly are somehow intertwined in their relationship. They are not, certainly no more than many other landholders on the island or members of parliament with interests on the island or members of parliament with friendships with people who work for KIPT. There are a range of people who own land on Kangaroo Island or have interests in this matter who have much closer relationships with key players than the member for Bragg does with Michael Pengilly.

It would be completely unjust for this house to impose a penalty based on the idea that the member for Bragg knew about contractual arrangements between a forest across the road—that had always been a private forest, or at least for as long as I am aware of, and was always going to be logged at some point—and a company that now had a contractual arrangement the member for Bragg was not aware of as one pillar, and as a second pillar the idea that Michael Pengilly and the member for Bragg have a closer personal relationship than any other number of people involved in this case.

What we are debating this morning could amount to a serious injustice should the house vote for this motion. The fact is that to establish misleading the house it is not enough to establish and put a sentence of a two-day suspension on a member for getting a fact wrong, if indeed that happened. You must also demonstrate intent, and that has not happened. Secondly, to establish a contempt of this house based on matters that are currently being considered by the Ombudsman would, as the member for West Torrens said, or as the member for West Torrens described—he did not realise he was saying it—amount to this house forming a view and making a case for something that is currently under the Ombudsman's consideration. It is utterly inappropriate.

I tell you, sir, this house has a significant choice ahead of it. It has not heard evidence to establish a firm case against the Attorney-General for a conflict—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —former Attorney-General—nor of a misleading of the house. I urge all members to oppose this motion. It remains, as was the last one, a nasty, personal, political, vindictive motion that all members should oppose.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
Noes 22
Majority 1

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Duluk, S.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.

AYES

Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER (12:14): Members, pursuant to clause 1(e) of the motion passed, as agreed to by the house, the Attorney-General has been suspended from the service of the house for six days. I direct that the Attorney-General withdraw from the chamber for six days. I fix the first day contemplated by the motion as today, Tuesday 30 November 2021. I direct that the Serjeant-at-Arms furnish the Attorney-General with a copy of the motion of the house.

*Bills***MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (FURTHER ADOPTION) AMENDMENT BILL***Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 18 November 2021.)

Clause 5.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have no further questions.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:17): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I think this is a very sensible approach. It is important to be as efficient as possible with all these types of commissions. There is a very wide range of employment and trades and industries that are potentially captured through this legislation but, of course, there is a mechanism to step them in as and when appropriate, some very quickly, some slowly, some potentially not at all if it is not quite right for those industries or trades. I thank the opposition for its support for this and on behalf of the Treasurer in another place I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CIVIL LIABILITY (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD ABUSE LIABILITY) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September 2021.)

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:20): I rise to speak on this bill and in doing so I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. In doing so, I also offer my love and support to those community members who have suffered the horror of child sexual, physical or psychological abuse, and to the many amongst them who continue to seek justice and to seek peace.

In setting out Labor's support for this bill and our absolute support for those who have suffered, I express my utter dismay and anger about the delay this government has caused in progressing this most important of bills.

This bill rightly addresses unactioned recommendations, specifically Nos 89 and 91 to 94 from the 2015 Redress and Civil Litigation Report of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Whilst it is based on these recommendations, the bill goes beyond child sexual abuse to also include serious physical abuse and psychological abuse in institutional contexts. The bill includes both prospective and retrospective provisions.

In line with recommendations 91 to 93, the first prospective change reverses the onus of proof in certain circumstances. Under current law, an action for negligence requires the complainant to prove every element. This bill rightly recognises that organisations are better placed than those who have suffered child abuse to show whether or not they had proper systems in place to deal with abuse.

The royal commission recommended, and therefore this bill proposes, that the onus of proof be reversed with regard to proving negligence. This reverse onus does not apply to proving whether abuse occurred but applies to whether negligence was present with regard to associated persons. Associated persons are defined in section 50C to include people with institutional responsibilities, such as employees and volunteers, but this definition does not include recipients of services nor visitors.

The second prospective change deals with vicarious liability in line with recommendation 89 of the royal commission report. The bill codifies the common law test for vicarious liability, and similar to associated persons discussed earlier it expands liability to include people akin to employees. There are also two retrospective elements of the bill. The first deals with identifying the proper defendant in line with recommendation 94 of the royal commission report.

This proposed change addresses historic abuse that occurred in an institution the structure of which prevented its being sued, such as an unincorporated association with complex trust structures. This bill appropriately allows action against subsequent office holders or successor institutions and for liability to be met from assets held in an associated account. The bill also holds people and organisations responsible for their actions—actions that have deeply damaged people and their lives.

The second retrospective change does not arise from the royal commission report and deals with setting aside previous settlements. This proposal arises from a 2019 reform that removed the time limit for commencing civil claims. Where a person has entered into a previous settlement, they may apply to the court to have it set aside for reasons including power imbalance, lack of legal representation or earlier conduct that was unfair or oppressive. This measure ensures that the voices of those who have tragically suffered abuse are heard.

Despite this government having had the royal commission report every single day since it was elected, this bill was first introduced to the other place only in late August this year. Labor offered its full support and declined to ask questions in committee in an effort to progress this bill through the parliament with zero delay—zero delay because ensuring that children are safe, cared for and enabled to thrive is of the highest importance and the most pressing priority, and zero delay because dealing with those who perpetrate abuse and those who refuse to deal with those in their organisations who perpetrate abuse and do not keep children safe and cared for is absolutely crucial.

Once second reading speeches were completed, the bill was passed by the other place in two minutes. Shamefully, due to this government's inaction, we find ourselves debating this bill at this point three months later in the last few sitting weeks before an election. With this inaction, this government has demonstrated its priorities. These are the most critical of reforms, and Labor welcomes them, but it is utterly bewildering why this government would let something so incredibly

important to so many in our community and particularly to those whose voices need to be urgently amplified, something with universal support, languish on the *Notice Paper* for months on end.

But we have seen this behaviour before with sentence discounts for child sex offenders. In that case, the Attorney-General sat on an expert report from a retired judge for 19 months. It was only after Labor introduced a bill to address that terrible situation that those opposite introduced a bill. The government then took so very long to pass their own bill that we had an awful, awful plethora of serious offenders lined up in the Magistrates Court to plead guilty before the new law took effect. They literally had to schedule a special court session for the 13 serious criminals who will now shamefully get out of prison earlier because those opposite failed to act—absolutely shameful.

Sadly, South Australians have seen this kind of behaviour before with too many issues where the government promised to act and had a moral obligation to act and completely failed to do so. On so many issues that our community rightly demands our leadership as a parliament on, this government has simply failed to act. This has happened on everything from their own election commitments like petrol pricing and social worker registration to Wicked Campers, toughening penalties for dealing with intervention orders right through to dealing with heinous child sex offenders.

We have seen this in millions of dollars of cuts to the Legal Services Commission in their very first budget. We have seen this in the \$780,000 that was cruelly slashed from the women's domestic violence court assistance program in their second budget. We saw this in their third budget when they jacked up the victims of crime levy by 50 per cent without boosting support for victims. We saw this again when they gutted the Victim Support Service and left so many regional towns without in-person counselling, resulting in people who had gone through the most horrendous of circumstances bereft, with nowhere to go.

Labor offers its full and unqualified support for the bill and our only question for this government is why on earth we are dealing with this today and not months or, indeed, years ago. This parliament does not need to hear the answer to that question. This government owes that explanation to those who have suffered abuse and their families.

This government also needs to explain why it moved to shut down parliament in the last sitting week. If this government had got its way, all three child sex abuse bills that are on this *Notice Paper* would have lapsed. If this government had got its way, those who have suffered horrific child sexual abuse would have had less access to justice, no peace or compensation. If this government had got its way, then serious child sex offenders would be spending less time in prison.

It was those of us on this side of the house who demanded that we stay here and do the job we are paid to do and progress bills that have for far too long languished on this *Notice Paper*. It was only those on this side of the house who stood up for the rights of victims and said that offenders should face severe punishment for harming children. This government either did not want to get these bills passed or did not have the influence or the will within their own party to get these bills prioritised.

This has all happened under the watchful eye of the Premier, who has said at every opportunity that the Attorney-General, who had responsibility for these bills, had his 100 per cent support. This government has proven what and who it prioritises. This legislation should have been one of the first items on its agenda after being elected. Instead, this government has been dragged to deal with this after it tried to shut down the parliament in the full knowledge that it would be leaving victims of child sexual abuse high and dry.

Again, we support this bill, but we are utterly appalled by the delay and, again, this government needs to explain that delay to those in our community who have suffered child sexual abuse and have been waiting for peace and for access to justice.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:32): I rise to support this bill, which is one more example of the member for Bragg's hard work and important work aimed at better supporting and gaining justice for victims of abuse in our South Australian community. It is also an outcome of years of advocacy by victims of child sexual abuse. This change will make sure the voices and experience of victims are heard.

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse released its Redress and Civil Litigation Report in September 2015. For so many years, the Labor Party did no work to give victims of sexual abuse justice. The report makes 99 recommendations aimed at

addressing or alleviating the impact of past and future child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts.

My friend Sarah Keane told me today that she knows of at least 20 people whose lives will be changed if this bill is supported. Over the past 15 years, up to 500 claims have been settled against the government, churches and other institutions. Hundreds of sexual abuse victims who have already received payouts from the state government, churches and other organisations could soon be able to launch fresh legal action in the hope of getting more compensation.

I think if the legislation is passed there will be a large number of people who will want to relitigate their matters because previous settlements were completely disproportionate to the harm suffered. The Civil Liability (Institutional Child Abuse Liability) Amendment Bill 2021 addresses the final unactioned recommendations from the report. It is also worth noting that, while the royal commission recommendations are limited to sexual abuse, following consultation the bill was extended to sexual abuse, serious physical abuse and related psychological abuse committed in an institutional context.

Key elements of the bill include the reverse onus of proof. An institution is in a better position to prove the steps it took to prevent abuse than the victim is to prove historical abuse. The institution generally should have better access to records and witnesses. Recommendations 91 to 93 of the report address this reality and recommend a reverse of the onus of proof.

Section 50F reverses the onus of proof, making institutions liable for abuse committed by associated persons, unless the institution can prove it took reasonable steps to prevent the abuse. Section 50G in the bill codifies the common law test for vicarious liability. Essentially, institutions will be vicariously liable for abuse of a child by its employee where the institution placed the employee in that role that supplies the occasion for the abuse and the employee takes advantage of that occasion.

Further, the royal commission identified an obstacle for establishing vicarious liability is that it only applies to employees. Sections 50A(2) and (3) in the bill remove this obstacle by extending vicarious liability to the persons akin to an employee of the institution. These reforms apply prospectively.

Identifying a proper defendant: the report also highlighted the difficulties that survivors have faced in identifying a proper defendant, particularly as unincorporated associations cannot sue or be sued. This is particularly concerning where the unincorporated association holds significant assets in an associated trust. Recommendation 94 of the report recommends ensuring that unincorporated associations with assets held in the form of a trust or trusts can be held liable and that liability can be satisfied from the assets of any associated trust.

Divisions 4 and 5 of part 7A of the bill give civil recourse to victims who have suffered child abuse while under the care, supervision, control or authority of an unincorporated association. It also enables action to be taken against the subsequent officeholders and successor institutions. This change will apply whether the abuse occurred before or after the commencement of the bill, so victims historically precluded due to these legal barriers will be able to sue for historical abuse.

Setting aside of previous settlements: on 1 February 2019, the time limitation for commencing a child abuse claim in South Australia was removed by the Marshall Liberal government with support in this house. As a consequence, this has prompted consideration of those victims who settled their claims prior to that date. Part 7B of the bill enables affected victims to commence proceedings and seek to have the settlement agreement set aside.

In determining whether to set aside an agreement, the court may consider (a) the extent to which the existence of the limitation period or barriers to identifying a proper defendant materially contributed to the applicant's decision to enter into the agreement; (b) the circumstances in which the agreement was negotiated and entered into, including (i) whether negotiations were affected by an imbalance of power, (ii) whether the applicant was legally represented, and (iii) whether the defendant or other parties engaged in unfair or oppressive conduct; and (c) any other matter the court considers relevant.

Most other jurisdictions, including Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania, have already implemented changes to enable previous child abuse settlements to be set aside. New South Wales is in the process of implementing changes. I say once again: shame on the Labor Party for doing nothing for so long.

These reforms will enhance social justice by removing obstacles to civil redress identified by the royal commission. Some of those obstacles have prevented victims of institutional child abuse from seeking justice based on technicalities in the operation of the law or due to the power imbalance between institutions and victims. There is often no dispute that the person is a victim of institutional sexual abuse, but the law has prevented them from being able to sue or establish liability.

In August 2020, targeted consultation was undertaken on the initial draft bill including government agencies, judiciary, legal organisations, children's advocates, community service providers, peak bodies (e.g. for schools, childcare centres, foster care agencies) and religious organisations. General support for the bill was widely expressed.

Affected institutions conveyed some concern about the impact on their ability to provide services to children, while victims' advocates tended to advocate for even stronger protections. A number of amendments were made to the bill as a result of the consultation. The most significant change is to the extension of the bill to include not just sex abuse but also serious physical abuse and related psychological abuse. Support for a broader definition of abuse strongly emerged from the stakeholder feedback.

I strongly support these recommended changes and I thank the member for Bragg for working so hard to listen to victims, to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, the Redress and Civil Litigation Report from September 2015. It is critical that this bill is supported, so the victims of abuse can seek justice for these crimes. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:41): I will be brief. I wish to thank and recognise the contribution of the member for Reynell and the member for King. I thank the Minister for Energy and Mining for giving the second reading speech on behalf of the minister in the course of this debate. I will only add, as this is the first bill for which I am responsible in this capacity, I indicate that I could not be more proud.

I wish to recognise the presence in the gallery this afternoon of Sarah Keane, who is an advocate for child victim survivors. I know that many survivors will be watching these proceedings online and otherwise following progress in this house. It is a day that will be, I hope, marked as a proud day in the course of this parliament's history. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:43): I move:

That standing orders and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the Social Workers Registration Bill set down on the *Notice Paper* as Private Members Business, Bills, Order of the Day No. 55 on Wednesday 1 December be taken into consideration as an Order of the Day, Government Business, forthwith.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In order to accept that motion, I will need to see an absolute majority in the house. There not being one, please ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

*Bills***SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL***Second Reading*

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:46): I am very pleased to stand here today and introduce this very important piece of legislation. It is reported there are now over 4,000—

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

Ms COOK: Point of order: this is a private member's bill, which I am carrying, that has been brought to the house and given government time. Correct?

The SPEAKER: Very well. Let me confer with the Clerks. I am informed that it has been moved to Orders of the Day, Government Business, and accordingly it would be the minister who moves government business.

Ms COOK: No, the will of the person who is the holder of the bill was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are submissions in relation to whether it does form government business. I will further confer with the Clerks. Member for Hurtle Vale, it may be that you confer momentarily with the minister but in the absence of any agreement, the Deputy Premier and Leader of Government Business wishes to confer with me.

If it be the will of the house, I will turn to the member for Hurtle Vale. Member for Hurtle Vale.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:47): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is with great honour that I bring the Social Workers Registration Bill 2021 to the house. This bill seeks to establish a social worker registration board and create the process for social workers in South Australia to finally be under a registration scheme. I will keep my comments brief in the hope that we can move this bill now as quickly as possible and just provide a quick summary of the chain of events.

For many years—before, in fact, this parliament—the previous Minister for Health, Jack Snelling, had attempted to create and advocate for a federal scheme with his parliamentary colleagues across all states but was unable to do so. There was a commitment by the then Liberal opposition to establish a registration process when in government. When the Liberal government was put into place, we expected to see this happen fairly quickly because that is what social workers had wanted. It is a recommendation of the royal commission.

There are many stakeholders, some of whom are here today, and I would like to acknowledge the Australian Association of Social Workers, and the South Australian branch in particular, as well as the many social workers within the sector, for their hard work. I also acknowledge Belinda Valentine, grandmother of dear Chloe, who was the subject of the inquiry that has recommended this to happen. She has lobbied and fought and done some great work in the community in Chloe's name and I thank her personally and deeply for that. I also acknowledge the Hon. Tammy Franks for then taking this initiative. Without her, this bill would not be here today.

More than three years ago, the Hon. Tammy Franks tabled a bill in the other place and it then went to committee. The committee, including myself, the now minister but then member for Heysen, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos, the Hon. Connie Bonaros—I am going to miss someone—and the minister, Rachael Sanderson, worked very hard to get a bill that suited everybody—social workers and stakeholders. This was then created. That bill was sitting in waiting. Minister Sanderson has had a year to bring a bill to this house and has not done so.

Without the determination of the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Labor Party and other members of the crossbench, this would not be happening today, because the Hon. Tammy Franks brought this into the upper house. In the end, it was supported in the upper house by all members, but in the interim there was in fact a chaotic tabling at the last minute—five minutes before midnight—of some

25 amendments, only days before the bill was to be voted on, most of which were not supported or suitable for the stakeholders, including the Australian Association of Social Workers.

I would like to mention the hard work done by Malwina Wyra in the Hon. Tammy Franks' office and Katherine Baldock in my office, who, along with others, did some fantastic work with all those amendments to make sure that we were going to not be forced into some kind of position that was not workable for the sector at the heart of this bill.

That chaos then saw another set of amendments tabled at around 4.30pm on the day that the bill was to be debated, which again created more work over a period of a couple of hours to work out that most of these amendments were actually similar to the ones that had been tabled before. To be frank, we had a night filled with duelling amendments.

At the end of the day, the work was done by the Greens, Labor, the crossbench and the stakeholders. In spite of the minister's staff saying to us that they had only just seen a bill, we know the Liberal government had this bill for 12 months when it could have been tabled. Sadly, even the minister's own staff were not aware that they had that bill.

Now we have a bill with some amendments, which we have accepted. I understand there is one more amendment that has been tabled, which in advance I will say that we will support. We hope today to see this bill passed and that social worker registration will become a thing in the very near future and that we, the sector and Belinda Valentine can get some satisfaction and some peace with this. I commend the bill.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:54): It certainly was my intention to bring this through. In 2014, when I first became the shadow minister for child protection, I was made aware that the Australian Association of Social Workers had been advocating for two decades for the registration of social workers. It was then that I had the parliamentary library do research that compared the registration schemes of countries around the world, and even the library staff were quite astounded to find that Australia was the only English-speaking country in the world that did not have a registration scheme.

The Layton report in 2003, under the then Labor government, recommended the registration of social workers and the then Labor government ignored it. It was also raised in 2015 by the state Coroner, Mark Johns, in his inquest into the horrible death of Chloe Valentine. I acknowledge that her grandmother, Belinda Valentine, is here with us today.

The same measure was also recommended by the Deputy Coroner in 2016 following the baby Ebony case. It was also recommended by the South Australian parliamentary committee in 2015—again ignored by the then Labor government—and again in 2008 by Justice Mullighan, whose relative—I think grandson—is here with us in parliament, yet the Labor government still ignored the registration of social workers.

For many years—16 years—the former Labor government could have brought through this legislation through parliament and they failed to do so. I acted swiftly as soon as I was the shadow minister to research, to meet with stakeholders, to look at ways that we could improve the child protection system. In 2016 in fact, I was the guest speaker at the Australian Association of Social Workers' annual dinner celebrating World Social Work Day and I announced then that this was the then Liberal opposition's policy to advocate for the national scheme.

We also then released a press release on 7 April 2016 stating that, although the then Labor government of 13 years had ignored the calls for decades from the Association of Social Workers, we would commit, if elected, to doing something about it. And we have. What happened was we got elected in 2018 and, yes, this is one of our election commitments. In 2018—as a new minister, there is a lot to learn and a lot to do and even more to fix than I could have ever imagined that had been left by the former Labor government.

The first orders of business were to implement foster and kinship carer payments to 21. We audited children in residential care to find those who had been there for many, many years who should not have been. We broadened the qualifications of staff so that we could fill the long-held vacancies—274 vacancies—in staff to take the pressure off our staff so that they could do the work that a social worker should be doing under a less stressful situation and conditions. We did that. We acted very swiftly.

We also found in 2018, coming to government, that the Children and Young People (Safety) Act from 2016 had not actually been enacted. It was enacted in two phases, and phase 2 was not due until 22 October 2018, which was under the new government. Not only had it been delayed, there were fatal flaws in the legislation that had to be my urgent, first, most important thing to do or I would have a piece of legislation that could not be enacted.

My focus went on to fixing that bill. In doing that, I had to get the agreement of the crossbench and opposition to bring through the amendments very quickly, ignoring the amendments that I was passionate about as a member in opposition that I wanted to change. I had to put that aside because we needed to fix the poorly drafted legislation of the former government.

We did that, and I made an agreement that I would then do a review in a year where the opposition, as well as myself—the amendments that I wanted when I was in opposition and was unsuccessful to bring through—that we would wait a year, do follow-up, do more consultation, and bring that through. That bill sits in the upper house. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (ELECTRICITY SUPPLY EMERGENCIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

FIREARMS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

UNCLAIMED MONEY BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SENTENCING (HATE CRIMES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SPIT HOOD PROHIBITION) BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

CROSS ROAD

Mr DULUK (Waite): Presented a petition signed by 141 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to not allow Cross Road to become a major freight route and to investigate alternatives to transporting freight throughout South Australia, including northern bypass options.

BLACKWOOD PRIMARY AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr DULUK (Waite): Presented a petition signed by 28 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to install a pedestrian crossing west of Northcote Street to allow pedestrians, particularly students approaching Blackwood primary and high schools and Karinya Reserve, to safely cross Shepherds Hill Road.

LIVE MUSIC SECTOR

Mr DULUK (Waite): Presented a petition signed by 777 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the Government to ensure that live music gigs, events and venues are

no longer targeted with singing and dancing bans and venue capacity restrictions and receive the same capacity limits as sporting events.

OLD REYNELLA INTERCHANGE

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale): Presented a petition signed by 106 residents of Hurtle Vale and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to consider upgrades to the safety and aesthetics of the Old Reynella Interchange and make arrangements for toilet facilities to be installed for the convenience of both commuters and bus drivers.

SA WATER

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 1,788 residents of Eyre Peninsula and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reconsider the proposal from SA Water to construct a desalination plant at Billy Light's Point, Port Lincoln, and identify an alternative site with greater current flows and water exchange.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr DULUK (Waite): Presented a petition signed by 3,625 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004 to prohibit any further extension of the declaration of major emergency in respect of the outbreak of COVID-19.

SCHOOL FUNDING

Mr BOYER (Wright): Presented a petition signed by 11,164 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to increase funding to schools and preschools to provide immediate support and intervention for children and students with additional learning needs through the employment of more support staff, specialists, allied health (including mental health) professionals and teachers.

HAMPSTEAD HYDROTHERAPY POOL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 818 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to reopening the Hampstead Pool to the public and open discussions with the City of Port Adelaide Enfield with the intention of gifting land to the council in the new Oakden and Gilles Plains structure plan development for a public swimming facility.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

The SPEAKER: The Premier, on indulgence.

Condolence

DALAITHNGU, MR DAVID

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): I rise today to speak on the passing of an iconic, once-in-a-generation artist who helped shape the history of Australian film and Aboriginal representation on screen: David Dalaithngu AM. I note that now he has passed into the Dreamtime, the family has asked that he be referred to by David Dalaithngu rather than the name that he used in life.

David Dalaithngu was from the Mandhalpuyngu clan of the Yolngu people and was raised in the traditional ways in Arnhem Land. In his later years, he was a resident of Murray Bridge. He was a brother, son, father, grandfather and husband, an actor, dancer, singer and painter, and one of the greatest Australian artists of all time.

His breakout role in *Walkabout*, released by British filmmaker Nicolas Roeg in 1971, was the first time that many in Australia and internationally had seen an Aboriginal character portrayed on screen. His haunting, moving performance was equal parts devastating as it was electric. Critics described him as the 'emotional centre of the film', a performance that was so warm and affecting it catapulted him to instant stardom.

He was only 16 years old when he caught the eye of Roeg, who was scouting for locations in Maningrida. His traditional dancing, wide smile and charisma saw him cast in the pivotal role. His performance, at a time when blackface and mockery of our First Nations people were still common, changed the industry and our nation for the better.

David Dalaithngu's star was on the ascendance. He went on to star in two of the highest grossing Australian films of all time: Baz Luhrmann's *Australia* and the hugely successful *Crocodile Dundee* franchise. It was his stand-up performance in *Crocodile Dundee* in 1986 that saw Dalaithngu recognised for his services to the arts in the 1987 Queen's Birthday Honours List, being awarded a Member of the Order of Australia. But the film he described as his favourite movie was *Storm Boy*. Made in 1976 by Henri Safran and based upon the book by local author Colin Thiele, *Storm Boy* has a special place in the heart of all South Australians.

David Dalaithngu went on to collaborate on a trilogy of films with renowned Dutch Australian auteur Rolf de Heer. He was a muse and a collaborator to de Heer, starring in *Ten Canoes*, *The Tracker* and *Charlie's Country*. The 2002 film *The Tracker* is the one Dalaithngu believed was his best film, which was proved after it screened in competition at the Venice Film Festival and awarded the Special Jury Prize at the Valladolid Film Festival. Dalaithngu himself won every significant Australian best actor award for his portrayal of the titular tracker.

In a 2019 interview with Rolf de Heer, the director touched on his collaboration with Dalaithngu, stating that he considered him a brother and a friend and saying, and I quote:

...in this world I cannot think of a more complete actor...the perfect combination between instinct and intelligence.

David Dalaithngu himself was slightly more wry. In an interview with NITV, he reflected on his life that, and I quote:

I thought I was going to be a big movie star... but I just ended up being a big movie star.

A movie star he certainly was. He rubbed shoulders with Bob Dylan, John Lennon and Bob Marley. He partied with Muhammed Ali, and he even danced for Her Majesty The Queen at the Sydney Opera House, but he never forgot who he was. He carried his people and his country with him always.

David Dalaithngu's life was not without its struggles. He encountered racism and discrimination and lived with the pressures of the divide between his traditional lifestyle and his huge public profile. I was fortunate enough to meet David Dalaithngu on a number of occasions, most recently in March this year at the Adelaide Festival's premier of his last film, *My Name is Gulpilil*, in which he tells his own story directed by the wonderful Molly Reynolds.

His final film, 50 years after his breakthrough on screen, saw Dalaithngu credited for the first time in his career as a producer, alongside Reynolds, filmmaker Rolf de Heer and Yolngu filmmaker Peter Djigirr.

Diagnosed with lung cancer in 2017, he was never expected to survive until the end of shooting, let alone the premiere, yet it was no surprise to anyone that he was front and centre in black tie looking resplendent on opening, night where he would receive his final standing ovation. In 2002, Marcia Langton said:

David has been absolutely critical to both representing Aboriginal people in modern Australia in the cinema...and also, in his own ironic and charismatic way, undermining the stereotypes that were forced on him. He's a tremendously important person to us culturally.

What always struck me about David was his humour and just how unassuming he was. He was a giant of the cinema but he was also a gentleman. He was a man who loved his land and his culture, and he was a man who took it to the world. As he said in his 2014 one-man stage show, also at the wonderful Adelaide Festival:

...acting came natural to me...I know how to walk across the land in front of a camera, because I belong there.

And belong there he did. My thoughts are with his family, his huge group of friends and supporters, and in particular to his dear friend and carer, Mary Hood. Vale, David Dalaithngu.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): I rise on indulgence to acknowledge the death of Australia's greatest Aboriginal actor David Dalaithngu after a long battle with cancer at his home in Murray Bridge.

David Dalaithngu was a Yolngu man from Arnhem Land in the Northern Territory. In his later years, of course, he was a resident of our own Murray Bridge. David was a father, a grandfather, a brother, an actor, an artist, a ceremonial dancer, a hunter and a tracker. He revolutionised the way the world saw Aboriginal people by bringing traditional culture to our screens.

Growing up in the bush of Arnhem land, David spent his childhood submerged in the customs and the traditions of his people. At 15, he was already an accomplished hunter and tracker and ceremonial dancer, and in 1969, when English film director Nicolas Roeg toured Arnhem Land scouting for locations for a forthcoming film, he asked elders who was their best young dancer. According to Dalaithngu, they all pointed to him. He was 16 when *Walkabout* was released, his first film, which remains one of his most compelling performances of all time. David became an instant global celebrity.

As a fresh-faced young man, he went from Arnhem Land to London, where, as the Premier mentioned, he met the Queen. Then he went to Paris and beyond. He mingled with John Lennon and Muhammed Ali. He hung out with Bruce Lee. He played the didgeridoo with Jimi Hendrix and Bob Marley. His role in *Walkabout* is credited with helping bring an end to the use of blackface in Australian cinema.

As an artist, David has made an outstanding contribution to the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people nationally and internationally, introducing audiences to traditional practices and Aboriginal forms of interpersonal communication. With a career spanning 50 years, David acted in some of the most renowned works in Australian cinema history, including, as the Premier mentioned, *Storm Boy*, *The Last Wave*, *Mad Dog*, *Crocodile Dundee*, *The Tracker*, *The Proposition*, *Australia*, *Ten Canoes* and *Rabbit-Proof Fence*.

Beyond the screen, David was a highly respected elder. He was a highly respected dancer, mentor, leader and advocate for homeland, teaching the Yolngu culture. David lived his life across the many worlds that make up our community, a balancing act that he performed with great grace and poise.

The shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs, the Hon. Kyam Maher—who is, I understand, the only initiated Aboriginal man ever elected to this parliament—as did the Premier, had the great pleasure of spending time with David and visited David's country in East Arnhem Land on more than one occasion.

David will be remembered as an international superstar. He was a truly extraordinary talent. His life, his work and his triumphs uplift us all. His death is too young and too soon. Our heartfelt condolences to his family, his dear friend and carer, Mary Hood, and all those who loved him. May he rest in peace. He has certainly done our nation and his people proud.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Ombudsman SA—Annual Report 2020-21—Corrigendum [Ordered to be published]

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

AHPRA and National Boards—Annual Report 2020-21

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies)—Commissioner for
Aboriginal Children and Young People

Controlled Substances—

Fees Notice—Youth Treatment Orders

Youth Treatment Orders—General

Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)—Telepharmacy

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Landscape South Australia—
 Transitional Provisions—Water Register
 Water Register—Operation of Provisions

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Community Based Sentences (Interstate Transfer)—General

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

Review of 2014 Management Plan for the South Australian Commercial Marine Scalefish
 Fishery—Part B Management Arrangements for the Taking of Sardines—
 Outcomes

By the Minister for Planning and Local Government (Hon. J.B. Teague)—

Review of the Major Indictable Offences Reforms pursuant to section 191A of the Criminal
 Procedure Act 1921—8 October 2021
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Burial and Cremation—Surrender of Interment Rights
 Oaths—General
 Planning, Development and Infrastructure—Fees Notice (No. 2)
 Rules made under the following Acts—
 Youth Court—Youth Treatment Orders

Question Time

CLIMATE CHANGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree that the Swedish climate change activist Greta Thunberg is a powerful voice for action on climate change?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19): I am not familiar with all of the work of the person that you refer to. I know that she's got a high public profile, but I am not quite sure how this has anything to do with my portfolios.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CLIMATE CHANGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister tell an audience at a Liberal fundraising event last night that he was sick of being hounded by the Greta Thunbergs of South Australia? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Dr CLOSE: The opposition has been advised that the minister told an audience at the FutureSA event at Rydges hotel that as environment minister he was sick of being hounded by the Greta Thunbergs of South Australia.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:20): I may have said something like that, absolutely—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —but I believe I was making a comparison between the practical response to the great challenges of climate change and the poster-waving activism which doesn't lead to outcomes, such as gluing oneself to Flinders Street outside the headquarters of Santos or stringing oneself up in Victoria Square, as some activists did recently. I also, I think, made the point that practical action and adaptation and—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —reduction of emissions and taking that action in a serious way was so much more important than simply posting a video on YouTube or liking a Twitter post or a Facebook post. My comparison actually included saying in my contribution last night how South Australians should be proud of the bipartisan policy platform that had been forged since around about 2005. I talked about how John Howard and Mike Rann worked together to really set up the framework for our significant transition towards renewables in this state. I talked about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I talked about how upon coming to government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in 2018, our government took many of the policy settings that the previous government had forged ahead with and had built upon them—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —not because of political differences but because innovation and the passage of time led us to be able to take many of the foundations that the previous government had set up to the next levels. So, absolutely—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Ramsay!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I often draw the distinction between activism and poster waving and virtue signalling and icons and slogans—which the deputy leader is very familiar with—and practical outcomes such as not only the transition to renewable energy production, the transition and innovation we are seeing in our transport system, the significant transition that we are seeing, led largely by the Minister for Primary Industries, around the agricultural sector, moving towards different land use and the like, but also adaptation to our city: the organisation Green Adelaide is setting up Adelaide with a more resilient canopy, greener streets, looking at ways to cool our city, using water in smart and efficient ways to create livability in this city.

We know that the climate is changing, and we have to, I guess, admit to that, and then while doing our bit in terms of global leadership and innovation we also need to build success around how our city adapts, not just Adelaide but our regional cities as well. I make no apology for saying that activism is not something that I have a great deal of interest in. I am much more focused on this government's practical approach to climate change and building on what the previous government did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I think there is a fairly bipartisan approach to this policy agenda in South Australia and I am proud of it.

ADELAIDE PARKLANDS

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier regard the Parklands as elitist and not of interest to people living in the outer suburbs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): I love the Parklands here. They are a very special attribute to the city that we have, the most livable city in the world. They are certainly something that we need to protect and something that we need to look after, but there are also times when we need to make sure that we have appropriate development on them—for example, Lot Fourteen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite when they were in government sold off that property there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —effectively sold it off, entering into a very long-term lease on that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, those opposite effectively sold off Lot Fourteen for an extended period of time. They wanted to put 1,300 apartments—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on the Parklands. By contrast, what we are doing with that fabulous seven-hectare parcel, previously the site of the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is of course to develop I think one of the most exciting urban renewal precincts in the entire country, which has already created more than 1,500 jobs on that site. So I think there are practical things that we can do, but the Parklands are a unique feature of Adelaide and they have served purposes in the past. For example, the Parklands house a school, a cemetery. They house, of course, our—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —current Royal Adelaide Hospital, our former Royal Adelaide Hospital and soon they will house the new Women's and Children's Hospital, so practical uses while still preserving the beautiful parklands environment—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that we have in Adelaide.

ADELAIDE PARKLANDS

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister tell an audience at a Liberal fundraising event last night that he considered the Parklands as elitist and that the people of Sheidow Park and Hallett Cove don't care about the Parklands?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:26): I'm afraid the deputy leader's source is taking me somewhat out of context because what I said last night was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and, again, I have actually said on the record a number of times and I think it has been reported in the past, that we have to be very careful to ensure that the Parklands don't become seen as an elitist area of our city and that they can appeal to everyone; that there are opportunities for everyone to interact with the Parklands, to access the Parklands; and that they are not held up as some sort of untouchable place which ordinary people in South Australia cannot relate to.

Last night, I discussed the great importance of protecting the Parklands. In fact, on Friday, in an interview on David Bevan's show on ABC Radio Adelaide I talked about this very thing, the importance of protecting the Parklands and my belief as environment minister that there had to be a compromise reached on rezoning, which is currently in the public domain. I talked about that. That might actually be at odds with some of my cabinet colleagues in the past, but I put it out there very clearly that we needed to invest in the Parklands. I talked about the wetlands program that we are developing along the edges of the River Torrens, which is in the Parklands. I talked about rewilding the Parklands around butterfly meadows.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In fact, I met just a couple of weeks ago with Doug McEvoy, a leading Adelaide medical officer, who has a real interest in creating a meadow or an urban forest in the Victoria Park area. Last night, at the function that the deputy leader refers to, I stood looking out at the Parklands and talked about how the area between Greenhill Road and South Terrace could actually be rewilded. I think we talked about 2,000 more trees going in there and a proposal around that.

Then I talked about the work that had been done around the Victoria Park wetlands and with the Keswick Brownhill Creek project up there, which has actually been criticised by some Parklands activists as illegally dumping stormwater in the Parklands when actually what that will do is create not only a place to go and create opportunities to connect with the Parklands but will create habitat as well.

My message was very clear. We talk too much and we finger wave when we talk about the Parklands instead of trying to create opportunities to help people engage with the Parklands. The deputy leader's source is well out of context with this because my view of the Parklands—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —has been consistently that we must find ways to connect people with the Parklands—spiritually, psychologically, culturally—and we can't let the Parklands drift into a place of elitism where people are shut out of them. I think the Parklands have opportunities for biodiversity, which I don't think are there at the moment. I talked about that last night. I talked about how the biodiversity in the Parklands was actually very poor compared to what it could be. That was a specific comment that I made.

I talked about opportunities for sport in the Parklands, entertainment in the Parklands and cultural institutions in the Parklands. I have been very proud of the cultural burn that Green Adelaide, an organisation under my department, worked to pull together with the Green Adelaide board—multiple uses for the Parklands. Rather than shutting people out, creating pathways for people from

all walks of life and all across our city so that they are not just for the elite few, but they are for many, many people.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Has the Minister for Environment and Water told you that he would like another ministry following his defeat in the party room to be elected Deputy Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30): No.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister ask business leaders last night to lobby the Premier for a new job? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Dr CLOSE: The opposition has been advised that the minister told the audience at the FutureSA event at Rydges last night, and I quote, 'If you want to have a chat with the Premier about other opportunities, then please do. The problem with this portfolio are the crazy leftist activists and what they do.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members to my left!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:30): This is the calibre—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I was asked a question from the floor at this event last night as to whether I saw myself being in this portfolio well into the future or whether I had interests or ambitions in other portfolios, and I said this was a portfolio that I enjoyed.

I had actually asked the Premier back in 2017, and I recounted this story to the audience. I said I had asked the Premier to be the environment minister. I had studied environmental studies at university and this was a long-term passion of mine. I remember when the Premier called me in January 2017 and asked me if I was interested in going into shadow cabinet and which portfolios I might be interested in, I specifically said environment and water. I recounted that story last night.

I also recounted the story of how, sadly, under Labor there had been a 60 per cent reduction in my department, a complete diminishment of the National Parks and Wildlife Service—ranger numbers from 300 to 93—and I saw there was an opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I saw a phenomenal opportunity to rebuild his portfolio, and that is exactly—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —what I went about doing: rebuilding this portfolio. When I was asked from the floor last night did I foresee myself in any other portfolio in the future, I said there's always going to be interest in other portfolios, but because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I'm always very up-front with these things. I don't see the point of saying you're going to go on and on and on forever, so I said if people thought that there was another portfolio I should be doing perhaps they should talk to the Premier about that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I don't know how they do things over on that side. We know it's all carved up behind the scenes with the faceless unions. They are told what to do, but we actually have a merit-based conversation—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —on this side of the house. I'm not seeing any great—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens, member for Elizabeth, member for Wright!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —revelation in these comments today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, deputy leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I serve at the pleasure of the Premier. I have enjoyed this portfolio and I have achieved far more than anyone on that side of the house—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —did in this portfolio. They always gave it to the weakest minister in the weakest faction and, should we be unfortunate enough that they form government in the future, it will probably go to the weakest minister in the weakest faction again. I have delivered a huge amount for this portfolio. I am proud of what this government has achieved for this environment. If people want to take comments made at a function last night out of context, that's fine, but I have provided much more content in what I said last night to the house here than those people have recounted to you.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Minister, can you please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters in creating jobs thanks to the Torrens to Darlington project?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:34): I thank the member for this very important question and note how important this project is not only for metropolitan South Australia but for regional South Australia as well—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and particularly to travel along the 78-kilometre stretch, heading on out through Gawler and go on to the Riverland is just so inviting to the people of South Australia as we go forward. It was my great pleasure to be with the Premier and also Minister Fletcher releasing the reference design for the Torrens to Darlington project.

Mr Malinauskas: I live closer to the Riverland than you, mate.

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: They don't care about this project over there. They just want to make a whole heap of noise.

The SPEAKER: Minister, don't respond to interjections. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What we want to do is get on with delivering this project—the last 10.5-kilometre stretch of the north-south corridor, a \$9.9 billion project, the largest this state has ever seen, a factor of around four if you're talking about the cost, and 4,900 jobs, let's talk about those. That's how many jobs we're going to create with this project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is going to supply the construction sector for the next decade. To put that in perspective, it is 10 times the size of the Northern Connector, about 28 times the size of Regency to Pym. Of course, that's another part of the north-south corridor that the Marshall Liberal government finished and opened earlier this year. It is more than 100 times bigger than the Portrush-Magill intersection upgrade. This is the quantum of this project.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How much bigger is it than the highway?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is going to be a game changer. We do know that it was the section that was too hard for those opposite. They put it in the too-hard basket. They didn't want to touch it—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —but that's not what we're about. We're about getting on with the job. We're not scared like they were. They were scared of this project, didn't want to touch it, didn't want to go near it, but we are getting on—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and getting our hands dirty and building what matters for the people of South Australia. This community has been waiting decades and decades for this project, ignored by those opposite, but we are moving on with it.

Anyone who has actually driven from the River Torrens down through to Castle Plaza on the other side will know the delays that go with that, through Henley Beach Road and that section. This twin-tunnel solution is going to cut that down to 20 minutes, take out 21 sets of traffic lights along the way. We will not know ourselves.

In fact, from the Torrens River through to Darlington it is going to take nine minutes—nine minutes—that is light speed. I think the Premier said on the weekend, 'Enough time to boil up some pasta.' That's how long it's going to take. We will not know ourselves. Right now, if you were to do it now—30 to 40 minutes down to nine minutes.

I mentioned the reference design that is out there for the community to see and to put some feedback into and we do appreciate that. What we do know with this project is that by not adopting Labor's open-cut design that they were looking at right through this community we have saved 480 properties—480 properties have been saved—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —by going with the twin-tunnel solution. It was a pleasure to actually get a briefing for the member for West Torrens and the member for Badcoe yesterday and take them through this project.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thankfully, the member for Badcoe didn't cancel her appointment this time. She did that the first time around, but we were actually able to outline for her the facts of what is going on. Anyone who has any questions can go to the website—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Badcoe!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —because that is where the information is, and you can—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —get all you need to know there or you can contact the department, and we encourage people to do that.

That is why also wrapped around this project \$125 million has been set aside for the City Shaping projects to make greener our community: trees, parks, community spaces, playgrounds and bike paths, the list goes on. We are out consulting with the community, listening to what they would like to see to wrap around.

Actually, as the Minister for Environment has said, a 20 per cent uplift in the green canopy around this project is what we are going for, and I know he is over the moon with that. We are again building what matters for the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next question, I remind the house of standing order 131, which prohibits interruptions in the course of members making a contribution except to call attention to a breach of the standing orders, to call attention to the lack of a quorum or to move a motion.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Who actually officially is currently the Attorney-General of South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38): The member for Bragg is the Attorney-General. She stood aside pending the Ombudsman's inquiry, and so all of the powers and authorities that she has are currently being administered by the Minister for Planning and Local Government, the member for Heysen.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Why did the member for Bragg resign her Deputy Premiership, her Minister for Local Government and Minister for Planning portfolios, but not resign the Attorney-General portfolio? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Both the member for Bragg and the Premier throughout the course of last week told South Australians that the Attorney-General was conflicted as a consequence of having oversight of the Ombudsman, yet she has resigned all her other positions but retained the very position she supposedly has a conflict in, namely, the Attorney-General's portfolio.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:39): I think this has been pretty well covered. The reason that she resigned as the Deputy Premier is we need to have a permanent Deputy Premier. That's the advice that we have received, so when she resigned from that role, pending the Ombudsman's inquiry, then we held a ballot in our Liberal party room and we now have the member for Stuart as the Deputy Premier for South Australia.

The reason why that had to occur was because it was determined that she would stand aside during the Ombudsman's inquiry. We don't know what length of time that is going to take. Is it going to be three days? Is it going to be three months? Is it going to be six months? So that's the reason to the first part of your question, why she resigned from that position. In terms of—

Mr Malinauskas: Why resign Local Government and keep the Attorney-General's portfolio?

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To bring the member for Heysen into the cabinet, he needed to have a portfolio. He took the Planning and Local Government portfolio.

Mr Malinauskas: Why not just take the Attorney-General's portfolio?

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For all the reasons that we have outlined in plenty of detail—
Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for a long period of time over the last 10 days, there was no reason for the Attorney-General to resign from that position. She provided me with the advice, the very strong advice—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that she would step aside pending the Ombudsman's inquiry, and that's exactly and precisely—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —what she did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the leader, the member for Chaffey and members to my left will cease their exchange.

DEPUTY PREMIER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please advise the house what legislation requires the state to have a Deputy Premier at all times? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier is quoted in last Friday's edition of InDaily as saying the only reason why he appointed the Minister for Energy and Mining as Deputy Premier before his party room meeting last Thursday was because 'under the legislation in South Australia, we need to have a deputy premier at all times'. What is the legislation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:41): The Administrative Arrangements Act.

DEPUTY PREMIER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier instruct MPs in his moderate faction to vote for the Minister for Energy and Mining for the position of deputy leader of the Liberal Party? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: ABC 891 presenter David Bevan told listeners last Friday morning, 'So they hold a vote, Dan gets elected, David Speirs loses. I get a text later in the evening and it says, "Feel free to use this quote tomorrow" from a 'senior Liberal' and it was sent to me from a senior Liberal in the South Australian parliament.' The quote is this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members to my right and to my left!

Members interjecting:

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

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The quote is this, and this person wants this read out today: 'The decision from the Premier's office to whip the moderates to vote for Dan van Holst Pellekaan has ended any chance for factional healing. They've blown it.'

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): No.

DEPUTY PREMIER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. Has the other candidate for the deputy's position, the Minister for Environment and Water, expressed his disappointment about the decision to whip the moderate faction to vote for the Minister for Energy and Mining?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: that question is out of order under standing order 97. It contains argument.

The SPEAKER: I perhaps will hear the question again. In fact, I am not certain that it does, but it may be that there is an opportunity to rephrase the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is to the Premier. Has the Minister for Environment and Water expressed any disappointment about the lack of support coming from the Premier for his candidacy for the Deputy Premiership?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): I thank the leader for his question. I do note that in the middle of a global pandemic with the emergence of a new variant of concern—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which, quite frankly, every single person—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in this state is concerned about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The only thing those opposite are concerned about is hearsay—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, please be seated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —from a Liberal Party function. We presume it's hearsay, sir.

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated. The member for Chaffey and the member for Playford can leave under 137A for 15 minutes to ensure that they return in time for crossbench questions.

The honourable members for Chaffey and Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do think it is noteworthy that here we are, quite a way into question time, and the biggest issue confronting the state, the nation and the world at the moment is the new variant of concern, which has been identified by the World Health Organization, and we as a government are moving very quickly to protect the people of South Australia, and all we have from those opposite are questions about hearsay from an event.

We presume it's hearsay. Maybe they were tapping somebody. This is something that we understand that the Leader of the Opposition has some expertise in. Maybe that's the way they got their information; I don't know. Then they ask questions about politics in the deputy leader's role. It beggars belief that this opposition has completely and utterly lost the focus on the people of South Australia.

Now, to the question, of course. The Minister for Environment and Water, I don't go into private conversations with him, but it's fair to say he has expressed disappointment to me, disappointment in the hopeless questions that are coming from those opposite. He says that they are the laziest opposition in the history of the state. He says that as a party they are hypocritical when it comes to the environment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is called to order. The member for West Torrens is called to order. Member for Elizabeth! Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —because of the position that they took to dismantle so many good parts of the department while they were in government, constantly undermining the spending of that department and really responding with greenwash rather than substantive policy decisions. By contrast, of course, the minister himself has been doing an outstanding job.

DEPUTY PREMIER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:46): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier mislead the house when he said that the Deputy Premier's position was mentioned in the Administrative Arrangements Act 1994? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier, in an answer to a question by the Leader of the Opposition, claimed that the Deputy Premier's position was legislated under the Administrative Arrangements Act 1994. It is not.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:47): I'm happy to come back with a detailed explanation for the member for West Torrens.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Section—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Do your job!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You can't lie to parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: What are you smiling at?

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He's got a very big temper, sir.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated. Member for West Torrens, I direct you to leave the chamber under 137A for 15 minutes so that you can return in time for crossbench questions. The Premier has the call.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying before, the legal advice that we received was that, under section 7 of the Administrative Arrangements Act, it was important for us to have a permanent deputy in place. That was the advice that I received. I'm happy to come back to the house with a more detailed explanation.

RENEWABLE HYDROGEN

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on what the Marshall Liberal government has achieved in positioning South Australia as a world-class supplier of renewal hydrogen, and is the minister aware of any alternate plans?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: the question itself contains debate and is out of order.

The SPEAKER: I think it's a matter of fine judgement. I will allow the member for King to ask the question again. I will listen carefully. The member for King may wish to rephrase the question.

Ms LUETHEN: Can the minister update the house on what the Marshal Liberal government has achieved in plans to become a supplier of renewable hydrogen?

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow the question.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:48): Thank you to the member for King, a very sensible, focused question on one of the key issues confronting our state at the moment and certainly key opportunities as well.

It should not have escaped the attention of this house that last financial year our state achieved 3.9 per cent gross state product, leading in the nation, the highest annual gross state product growth in the entire nation. That is no accident. We are focused on the things that matter in this state, the things that matter to South Australians, and one of them is the potential for a world-class hydrogen economy here in South Australia.

When we came to government in 2018, with regard to hydrogen there was a bit of a glossy brochure with not much in it—lots of pictures and no substance—that the previous government had left behind as their pathway forward for hydrogen. Since then we have been incredibly busy turning an opportunity into reality.

In 2019, we released the Hydrogen Action Plan, as we hosted the International Conference on Hydrogen Safety here in Adelaide. We joined the Green Ammonia Consortium and struck numerous MOUs, including with the largest port in Europe, the Port of Rotterdam. We developed our Hydrogen Export Modelling Tool and Prospectus to accelerate projects to market.

Off the back of this, we outlined a new ambition of 500 per cent of current grid demand in renewable energy by 2050 in our Climate Action Plan. The Premier introduced the H2U company to Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, who have taken an equity stake in their Eyre Peninsula Gateway Project. We delivered and opened HyP SA at Tonsley, the largest green hydrogen facility in the country, which is delivering hydrogen blended into natural gas to households in Mitchell Park.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We have industrial users like BOC using green hydrogen made in South Australia in their facility at Whyalla. We seed funded the H2H cluster, which is connecting local businesses together to build the hydrogen ecosystem. We supported the HILT CRC, which secured significant federal funding and which is working with industrial users in South Australia to plan the decarbonisation of industry, including through hydrogen.

We launched the Port Bonython EOI to seek parties for a hydrogen hub, and have recently provided an update that we have shortlisted seven parties of huge stature locally and internationally. They are proposing a globally significant export hub with projects worth tens of billions of dollars. At COP26 in Glasgow, another project was put in lights as Marubeni won Japanese environment department support for hydrogen exports from South Australia to the Indo-Pacific.

Just recently, another project was announced for hydrogen for South Australia, with Kallis Energy developing a gigawatt-scale, renewable hydrogen project that would push us closer to our ambition for 500 per cent renewable energy by 2050.

Compared to that insubstantial glossy brochure that was handed across to us by the Labor Party when we came into government, we have been getting on and doing the job. We are making sure that we grow jobs in South Australia, we are making sure we are reducing the cost of living in South Australia and we are making sure that students have better learning outcomes in South Australia. We are funding health infrastructure all over the state. We are focused on every single part of our economy, whether it be services or whether it be economic benefit—and hydrogen will be a huge part of economic development in our state.

We have already reduced the cost of electricity, through the smart adoption of renewable energy, by over \$300 per year per household in South Australia, and hydrogen exports allow us to push further and further into this, including achieving net 100 per cent renewable energy generation by 2030.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:52): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier rule out the risk of successful legal challenges to the COVID emergency directions following the end of extensions to the Emergency Management Act powers of the State Coordinator that end tomorrow. With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: Tomorrow, the powers of the State Coordinator, Grant Stevens, extended under the COVID-19 act that would apply directions made by the State Coordinator under section 25 of the Emergency Management Act to people generally throughout the state, will end.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:53): We have considered the issues associated with the extension of that bill and have formed the opinion that they wouldn't be necessary. You would appreciate that in the early days we didn't know precisely where this disease would end up, and we put some extraordinary powers in place with the support of the parliament.

Some of those we have been able to keep and make permanent rather than temporary—for example, the taking of oaths not being done in person—and we have been able to do that under regulation.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I'm just trying to explain to you that some of the things that were incorporated into that COVID policy we have been able to deliver with other types of instruments without keeping that in place. Of course, other powers that were put in place were never actually utilised. So, on balance, we have looked at all these issues and formed the opinion that we do not need to extend that further.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the member for Bragg—still the Attorney-General—who informed the house in August that the extension of the Emergency Management Act powers of the State Coordinator were, quote, 'necessary for the ongoing management of COVID', and in particular areas such as 'quarantine, contact tracing and border closures'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54): I refer the member to my previous answer.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. Was the member for Bragg, the Attorney-General, wrong when she informed the house that these powers under the Emergency Management Act were necessary for quarantine, contact tracing and border closures? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: In August this year the Attorney-General, the member for Bragg, informed the house that the extension to the Emergency Management Act provisions, quote:

...clarify the scope of powers given to the State Coordinator and authorised officers to issue directions under section 25, such as for quarantine, contact tracing and border closures. Extending these provisions is necessary for the ongoing management of the risk of COVID-19 in South Australia.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I have already given, I think, a comprehensive answer, but what I would also like to add—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that I think the parliament should be aware of is that it is our belief that we do need to go back and look at the Emergency Management Act after this major emergency declaration is finished.

We did consider whether or not we should do it in the midst of this major emergency, but we formed the opinion that it would be better to wait until the end of the major emergency declaration, have our review and then make any necessary changes to the Emergency Management Act here in the parliament.

When that act was drafted, we really contemplated mainly fires and floods and other short-term events. I don't think we ever contemplated that it would be necessary to have it in place for 18 or 19 months. In fact, it is of course only in place in 28-day increments. This is something that comes back to cabinet every month, and then ultimately we form an opinion as to whether or not it should continue. When we have, of course, we inform Her Excellency and she signs that further extension to the major emergency declaration. I hope that clarifies the situation.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:57): My question is to the Premier. From tomorrow, will there be a sound legal basis for the COVID-19 directions that apply to people generally across the state, including for quarantine, contact tracing and border closures, as well as for vaccine mandates?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57): As I previously said, we have looked at all of these issues, and we have formed the opinion that it is not necessary.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:57): My question is to the Premier. On what basis has the Premier received advice that extension of the emergency management powers of the State Coordinator is not necessary, and will the Premier release all the advice he has received in relation to that extension?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57): We sought advice. Cabinet considered that advice. I think it would be very unorthodox for the cabinet to provide their deliberations to this house. However, as I said, we are satisfied with the way that we have been able to take elements of the original bill and put them into place—or elements of that bill and put them into place—more permanently with other mechanisms. There are many powers that we simply don't require anymore.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is keeping South Australians safe and strong by investing in our emergency services?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:58): It is a real privilege to be the minister in this particular area, and I have enjoyed every second of it, let me say, and it has been a real privilege to be able to visit brigades in the member for Newland's electorate. Only recently, in fact, we visited the Tea Tree Gully CFS, and he is much adored in that brigade, let me tell you.

Whether it be Gladstone in the member for Stuart's electorate, Bridgewater in the member for Heysen's electorate, Tailem Bend in the member for Hammond's electorate, or even Penola in the beautiful South-East, it is a real privilege to have been able to talk to many of these volunteers who work tirelessly giving their hard work and dedication all to keep South Australians safe. It has been an absolute privilege. That's why we as a government are working as hard as possible to make sure that we continue to give them the tools that they need to keep themselves and also South Australians safe.

We know that 2019-20 was one of the worst bushfire seasons on record, and that's why we responded with a \$97.5 million package to address the Keelty review, including 25 new appliances, but also made sure that we continued the retrofit of CFS appliances with burnover protection systems. As well as that, we are doing things like upgrading our MFS fleet, with \$11.5 million to deliver new state-of-the-art appliances to MFS stations right across the state. We have committed over \$68 million in additional funding for the MFS since coming to government to make sure that MFS personnel have the capabilities they need.

Recently, we turned the first sod at the MFS station in Noarlunga, in the great south, which I know is very close to the hearts of the member for Reynell and the member for Kurna. That new station is going to be an absolute cracker. It's going to deliver approximately 50 jobs for South Australians during construction and also provide better protection especially for the southern suburbs that are growing. Of course, we are investing over \$9 million in that crucial infrastructure project.

By the end of 2022, a brand-new major emergency services hub will be fully operational for the southern suburbs. It will be capable of accommodating a major incident management team as well as a community engagement room—and I am sure it will be used by the local community—and also training facilities. Once that is complete, the personnel from Christie Downs Fire Station will transition to Noarlunga.

Then, of course, we have Project Renew. Project Renew has been utilised throughout the state. It was begun by my predecessor and has been continued by me. This government has altogether delivered 223 projects across 140 stations, delivering \$5 million worth of upgrades, from bitumising to a lick of paint to better bathroom facilities. These have been really appreciated, and it has been a delight to be able to see the difference that it has made, improving the amenity of these stations for many of the brigades across the state.

Since we began expanding the program, there has also been \$4 million as a result of the Keelty review's continued CFS Project Renewal and also expanding the program to the SES, which has its own \$4 million funding program. We have also made sure that we continue to invest in our volunteers. The SES, in the most recent budget, was allocated funding to make sure that we continue to not only recruit but also retain our volunteers because we know in this state we depend heavily on our emergency services volunteers. We are coming into bushfire season and we are certainly going to need them during this season, and that's why we have to continue to do everything we can to keep them safe.

Today, I spoke to the media about Operation Nomad. We know that we have 88 persons of interest out there, and SAPOL are going to be monitoring them over the bushfire season. I encourage the public if they do see anything suspicious, to please call 131 444 or call Crime Stoppers.

COVID-19 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT POWERS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:02): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received any advice raising concerns in relation to the extension of Emergency Management Act provisions in relation to the State Coordinator's powers, creating legal risks over COVID-19 directions in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:02): I think I addressed this in the last question, but I am happy to go over it again. Of course, cabinet sought advice in the lead-up to making this decision. You would have seen in the last week or so we have made some other arrangements with regard to the taking of oaths and also telepharmacy, which were previously covered under that piece of legislation, so we have been progressively working through the things

that we have needed to keep in place. To answer the member's question again, we received that advice and, on balance, we formed the opinion that we didn't require it going forward.

COVID-19 TESTING

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:03): My question is to the Premier. How many interstate travellers from moderate-risk LGAs have failed to comply with the COVID-19 testing requirements since the opening of the borders last week? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms Bedford: Well, I want to hear the answer.

Mr PICTON: Thank you, member for Florey. Travellers from moderate risk LGAs, like Sydney and Melbourne, are required to get a COVID-19 test within 24 hours of their arrival in South Australia.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:03): I don't have that statistic and I am not sure whether we keep that exact statistic. As people would know, from Tuesday last week we moved into a different phase of managing COVID here in South Australia. Prior to getting to that 80 per cent fully vaccinated status for those 16 and over, we were very concerned about getting a single case here in South Australia because we knew that this potentially could set off the requirement for putting our state into lockdown.

Much of the rest of the country has been in lockdown for months, some of them for many, many months due to the Delta spread, prior to getting that vaccination rate up to a higher level. But new cases here in South Australia are inevitable. In fact, I think the border has now been open for eight days—I don't think there are any new cases today—and we have had 10 cases with no examples of community transmission here in South Australia yet. So we are moving to a different level of managing and living with COVID-19 which does have a lower threshold in terms of that surveillance of people coming across the borders.

COVID-19 TESTING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): Supplementary question to the Premier: for clarity, did the Premier say that he is not aware if we collect statistics on the number of people complying with the testing requirements having returned from moderate risk LGAs interstate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:05): What I received this morning was an update that 115,000 people had used the entry check portal here in South Australia. There are requirements. They are at a much lower level than they were previously. We are asking people to have a PCR test and get a negative response within 72 hours of their departure if they are coming from New South Wales, Victoria or the ACT. We are asking people who are coming in from any other place to also be fully vaccinated.

There is a requirement in those lower risk LGAs where they are between 80 per cent and 90 per cent to have a test on arrival, but we do not go through every single one of those transactions because we have a much lower threshold in terms of surveillance that we need now that we have got to 80 per cent. In fact, we have gone well past 80 per cent and we are now at more than 90 per cent of South Australians over the age of 16 who have had at least some vaccination and, of course, we are well on the way to getting to 90 per cent of all South Australians over the age of 12 fully vaccinated in South Australia.

That provides us with a much higher level of protection, but we formed the opinion, based upon the advice from the Doherty Institute to the national cabinet, that at 80 per cent we would be opening up to those people interstate. We have put some speed humps in the way of the disease so that it doesn't spread through very quickly, and the longer we delay significant numbers coming into South Australia the more protected we are going to be.

COVID-19 TESTING

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:06): My question is to the Premier. Is there any follow-up for people who arrive in South Australia from moderate risk LGAs who are required to get tested under the emergency management directions who do not do so, or is this an honesty policy that the government has?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:07): I am happy to get a detailed answer for the member, but I did talk about this in the last sitting week as well. We are moving from a 100 per cent compliance to a less onerous level of surveillance. For example, previously we had border checkpoints and now we are not stopping every vehicle that comes across and we're not stopping every traveller who comes into South Australia. There are situations where we still will be checking people. We reserve the right potentially to put in high levels of surveillance, but we're satisfied that the surveillance regime that we have in place at the moment is commensurate with the risk at this stage of the disease.

COVID-19 TESTING

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:07): My question is to the Premier. Why has the government decided to no longer follow up people who have been required to get a COVID-19 test for coming into South Australia and have not done so, and is there specific health advice that the Premier is relying upon for not following up these people who have not complied with the emergency management direction that is legally in force in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:08): I think I have answered that question already, but I am happy to go back to the question and provide a more fulsome answer. There is a much lower level risk at the moment. We are not concerned about single cases. There is an inevitability of cases in South Australia that is going to occur.

Our role is to get the balance right between the health risks and also the health risks associated with economic lockdown, and so we have formed the opinion, based upon the advice that the Doherty Institute provided to the national cabinet, that at 80 per cent fully vaccinated for those 16 and over it was time to lift those state borders. That means that cases will be coming in, and so a lower level of surveillance is required. We will continue to have some surveillance in place and we will continue to put roadblocks along the way for this disease coming in, in big numbers, in a very short period of that. That is because every day that we continue down this path the higher the vaccination rate is in South Australia, which further reduces the transmission potential here in our state.

I do also bring the house's attention to the fact that there will be a national cabinet meeting this afternoon. Omicron is the latest variant of concern that has been identified by the World Health Organization. The federal government has moved very promptly to close the international borders to people who are coming in from high-risk situations. We do that to buy ourselves some time as a nation because we really need to understand what the specific transmissibility of this disease is, the severity of this disease, and also we need to understand the efficacy of the current vaccines to this new strain. We don't have that information at the moment. We are gathering that information.

We have high level cooperation from other jurisdictions around the world. Certainly, the AHPPC has been meeting very regularly over the last 24, 48, 72 hours—I think many, many meetings. The health ministers have had a meeting today, and of course at 4 o'clock Adelaide time I will be on the national cabinet agenda, so I will be able to provide further information to South Australia following that meeting.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government has provided grain farmers with choice on what they would like to grow?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:10): I thank the member for Flinders for his question and also thank him for the update from his area earlier this morning in relation to the grain growers on Eyre Peninsula and the wonderful season they are having, firstly, by just the sheer volume of grain that has been grown but also by the opportunity of great prices here in South Australia being taken advantage of. Even though there has been some rain damage to some parts, they are still able to get good prices even for feed grain this year.

For the first time, after 16 years of a Labor moratorium on genetically modified crops in South Australia, our farmers are now able to harvest GM canola and safflower. The first truckloads

of GM canola have been delivered to the Viterra sites, mostly on Eyre Peninsula at this stage, with about 5,000 tonnes coming into Edillilie and Port Neill.

The following data has been provided to me about how much has been planted in South Australia this year: on Eyre Peninsula, there was over 14,000 hectares; on the Limestone Coast, down in the member for MacKillop's area, 2,000 hectares have been planted; in the Murray and Riverland areas, about 600 hectares have been planted; and over on Yorke Peninsula and in the Mid North about 6,500 hectares have been planted. So a total of about 23,500 hectares have been planted.

The seed that was available in South Australia was all consumed and planted this year, and this has been a perfect year for the use of the GM canola opportunity. With a late break in the season, most of the crops were planted dry, which meant they did not have the opportunity to do any weed preparation prior to seeding. They had to respond after germination. The way GM canola operates is that it allows that response to occur without affecting the plant itself. There was a great opportunity this year to actually take advantage of this.

The review of the moratorium in South Australia found that grain farmers were missing out or had missed out on at least \$33 million since 2004 and were expected to miss out on another \$5 million if it was extended right through to the 2025 date of the moratorium due to be completed. I think also it is really important to recognise that right now the latest bid prices for canola show there is very little difference between GM canola here in South Australia and normal canola. It's about \$10 or \$15 difference. Certainly, the production costs, and the output of GM canola, are better and so the returns to the farmers will be better overall.

Also, intriguingly, the price of GM canola here in South Australia is the highest in the country. The bids that are out there at the moment are \$23 a tonne more than Victoria and \$85 a tonne more than WA for GM canola. These are the opportunities that have been missing for South Australian farmers in the past. This is giving them the opportunity to actually grow a product; it has given them the opportunity to take advantage of this, get those returns and meet the markets for the GM canola that operate here in South Australia.

I wish the rest of the harvest luck with the seasonal conditions that we are experiencing. We are having difficulties getting that harvest off but, as always, our farmers are doing what our state needs and delivering for this state.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:15): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with his SA Health chief executive that we have 'about the right number of ambulances and ambos in this town'? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: This morning on ABC radio, Chris McGowan, the Chief Executive of SA Health, said he believes South Australia has 'about the right number of ambulances and ambos in this town'.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:15): What I provided to the house last time remains accurate; that is, since coming to government we have put on the equivalent of another 180 full-time employees into the South Australian Ambulance Service, and we are now recruiting a further 74 full-time equivalents courtesy of the most recent negotiation and also the budget. We do have a significant increase on the numbers that we inherited from those opposite, but in answer to the question of do we have enough—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the reality is we are currently recruiting more as we speak.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:16): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier take responsibility for the first-ever ramping seen at the Women's and Children's Hospital last Tuesday evening?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:16): I do recall this story being in the media, and I remember the outrage that was expressed by those opposite. I took the time to make inquiries via my office. In fact, there were a large number of people who went to that emergency department on that day—in fact, I think in the order of 30 to 35, which is an unusually large number. All but one were seen within the clinical accepted time, and that person was outside by 10 minutes. I know that those opposite would like to undermine the confidence that people have in the health system in South Australia. I, by contrast, believe we should be very proud of what has occurred here in South Australia right throughout COVID-19.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have been investing very significantly in upgrading the facilities at the Women's and Children's Hospital, pending the building of a brand-new purpose-built Women's and Children's Hospital. Those opposite spoke about a dedicated Women's and Children's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Trade! Order, member for Chaffey! Order, member for West Torrens! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite talk about the Women's and Children's Hospital. In fact, whilst they were in government they promised that they would build a new Women's and Children's Hospital, then they cancelled it, and then they said, 'Well, we will just build the women's only'—or maybe it was the children's only—it was very hard to actually discern what their position was; it flip-flopped around quite a bit. One minute they are out there telling people that they would never ever close the Repat. They had a pledge card that said that it was signed by the leader of the Labor Party at the time, and of course then they went ahead and closed it.

It's very difficult to discern exactly and precisely what their health strategy is for South Australia. What I know is that our focus in South Australia—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is on providing the very best health service for our state. Primarily, at the moment our focus is on getting through this coronavirus global pandemic, and I think on any independent analysis every South Australian should feel proud that they live in the safest state on the safest continent on this earth.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Notwithstanding our focus on that issue, we are also simultaneously unwinding the mess that we inherited from those opposite with Transforming Health. They downgraded hospitals; they closed hospitals. The Leader of the Opposition himself was the Minister for Health when they closed the Repat and broke the heart of so many South Australians.

What we have done by contrast is to massively increase the operational expenditure of the health department. We have gone from \$5.8 billion—that was the budget that we inherited from those opposite—and we have grown it now to \$7.4 billion. More than that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Trade! The leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we've put more than \$1 billion into upgrading our facilities, whether it be that urgent maintenance required for our Country Health or important upgrades to emergency departments across metropolitan and country SA. Much of this has been delivered, some of it is still remaining to be delivered. But those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —left South Australia in a perilous state in terms of health. I would love to have—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —delivered a full, complete transformation. We have been held back to some extent—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Well, I tell you what: why don't you have a debate with the leader about it?

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of course, with dealing with the most pressing issue—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Why don't you have a debate?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of the coronavirus. But that is what we still remain committed to doing: making sure that we can provide the very best health response to the coronavirus and then unwind the mess that we were left by those opposite.

AUGUSTA HIGHWAY

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the progress of any designs and any provisions of any land that may be required for the duplication of the Augusta Highway or National Highway 1 between Crystal Brook and Port Pirie? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain a bit further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: In the last state budget, there were allocations for funds for the design and provision of that to be done in the next 12 months in this financial year. In the township of Warnertown, which is located on the current route of the highway, there are people who are interested in expanding their businesses, and they are very concerned about the opportunity for their progress, what plans or designs are in place and what time frame that will be.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:20): I thank the member for his question and his interest in the Augusta Highway. It's another one of the great projects that our government is delivering, of course. We have a \$17.9 billion infrastructure spend and the work on the Augusta Highway is incredibly important. In that budget that you talk about is the expansion to Lochiel as well. The duplication to there is another step that we are doing, and that business case is being done for the further extension of that highway.

It is not the only road that we have had to put money into since coming into government: of course, the Eyre Highway—plenty of money going in there—the Barrier Highway, and the Horrocks Highway. I was down in the South-East as well just last week again, where we are putting more money into roads in that region and that community. We know that when those opposite were in government they did neglect our regional roads. We are very conscious of that and that's why we are putting lots of money back into regional roads—billions and billions of dollars going into those projects.

So the business case is underway. Where it is actually at, I am happy to get that detail and report back to the member, but we understand that these regional roads are really important to South Australia from a productivity point of view, to help generate jobs in our state, and also from a road safety perspective in making our roads safer. So the investment is there, the money is there, and that body of work is underway. I will get an update for the member and return to him with that detail.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:21): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house, or myself in particular, regarding two questions I asked here just recently, one on 21 September and also in the last sitting week of parliament regarding services for Dean Marshall of Clare who had to have cancer treatment, and he had to pick up his tablets from Clare Hospital and go to Gawler? You were going to come back to me with an answer on that.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:22): I thank the member for the question. I will take it on notice and bring back an answer.

STATE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:22): My question is to the Premier as the minister representing the Treasurer. When will steps be implemented to ensure the procurement process for government requisites does not see local suppliers disadvantaged? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: I refer to *The Advertiser* article on Friday 24 September headlined, 'Local push in supply chain—new measures to protect industry', which may not really give the full picture, and ask how will the new procurement framework due to take effect from 1 February next year help if government agencies are able to split existing contracts into individual categories, thereby both increasing their regulatory burden for local businesses and decreasing their prospects for success in the overall process?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:23): I thank the member for her question. We have had a Productivity Commission inquiry into procurement. Some of the elements of that are being rolled out at the moment. We do want to make it easier for small business to sell their products and their services into the state government. We have had particular success since coming to government in getting contracts to Aboriginal-owned organisations, something that we feel very proud about, but there is more work to be done.

We obviously have the Office of the Industry Advocate in South Australia. Ian Nightingale is in that team and he leads a great team who are there constantly working with smaller businesses in South Australia, helping them to access state government procurement.

Sometimes the very best thing that you can do for a business is to be able to provide them with an order. Some governments focus on grants and others tell us that the best thing that we could do is to make it easier for small business to be able to sell, because an order from the state government is worth far more than just simply a grant. We have heard that message, and we are looking for opportunities to do just that.

With regard to the specific questions asked by the member for Florey, I am happy to get a further detailed answer from the Treasurer in the other place and come back to the house.

STATE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24): Supplementary, Mr Speaker: what is being done to close potential loopholes in the procurement tests that may allow interstate companies or competitors to establish short-term operations here in South Australia that temporarily fulfil the government's requirements without a long-term commitment to the state?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:24): I thank the member for Florey for her question. It's a good question. I will go and find out whether there are any elements within the contract that require people to actually set up their offices in South Australia permanently. I am not sure whether that would be contractually possible and I don't know to the extent to which this is a concern where people might set up for short periods of time.

But, as I said, we are looking for ways to get South Australian companies to sell in to the South Australian government. One of the areas that we are particularly interested in is on the tech side, so we have established I think it's called Go2Gov, which is a program administered by the

Minister for Innovation and Skills in South Australia where we are providing opportunities for businesses to pitch in to government where they might be able to have a product or a service which would address something important to the people of South Australia or could improve the overall productivity of the Public Service in South Australia.

We are looking for all and every way to try to advantage the companies here in South Australia, but we also have a responsibility to the taxpayers to make sure that we've got good value for money. So we are balancing those two issues. That was essentially the theme that came out of the Productivity Commission's report and, as I said, we are now working through the implementation of that report.

COVID-19 VACCINATION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:26): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise Philip from my electorate, who is unvaccinated, why he cannot access a medical service? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: Philip has a pre-existing heart condition and has been advised by his doctor to undertake a stress test on his heart before considering the COVID vaccine. However, he cannot book an appointment at the Mount Gambier Medical Consulting Suites because they are refusing anybody who is unvaccinated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:27): We have avoided making anything mandatory here in South Australia over and above those elements on which we have received specific advice from our Chief Public Health Officer or have gone through the national cabinet. But many businesses are making full vaccination mandatory to access their business, whether it be a restaurant or a sporting venue or indeed a hospital, so this is posing some issues.

I am happy to take the specific issue raised by the member for Mount Gambier and see if there is an alternative service. But he is right. This is why we are very strongly recommending to every single South Australian that they become fully vaccinated. What I am very pleased with is that the rate of vaccine hesitancy is plummeting.

If we go back four or five months, there were probably 35 to 45 per cent of people who were not going to have the vaccine. We now know that 90 per cent, so nine in every 10 South Australians over the age of 16, have already had at least one shot, and this is very encouraging. I am hopeful that not only will we get to 90 per cent fully vaccinated for those 12 and over by the end of this year but I am hoping that in January next year we get to 95 per cent.

My strong message to every single person who is unvaccinated is: please consider having that vaccination. We are trying to minimise those areas within government that we make mandatory, but private companies are very likely to increase their requirements because they know the consequences should a positive case come into their business.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Florey, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Nicky Irons and Karen Steindorf, friends to us all.

Question Time

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:28): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. How many apprentices stand to lose their jobs as Coles phases out its onsite butchers for the prepackaging of meat?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (15:29): There has been a complete turnaround in the number of commencements of apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia, and we are also leading in completions of apprenticeships and traineeships. We are seeing a 51 per cent increase in the first three years of our Skilling South Australia program. This compares with a 48 per cent decrease in the last four years of the previous government.

My advice is to support the government in supporting young people to have opportunities to get the skills they need that industry needs, which we are seeing deliver lower youth unemployment rates here in South Australia at the moment. Because what is the key thing that employers say when they are looking for staff? They want skills and they want experience. We have given those employers the ability to deliver those skills and that experience themselves by supporting on-the-job training.

Ms BEDFORD: Point of order: I have to ask about relevance for apprentices doing butchery in Coles and hope that the minister will get back to that specific point at some point in his answer.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Florey. There is some substance in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I turn to the question in relation to the standing orders. The point of order has been raised under standing order 134 and the procedure is quite clear. Minister, you are of course well aware of standing order 98, rules in relation to answers, and I draw you to the substance of the question. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The member for Florey will be very pleased to hear that we have a Skilling South Australia program with Master Butchers, and Master Butchers are saying they can't get enough people to be apprentice butchers—they cannot get enough. I am sure that Master Butchers are doing everything they can to ensure that those apprentices who may be losing their jobs through the changes at Coles have opportunities to continue their apprenticeships at those members of Master Butchers. Butchering is a terrific trade. It is one of those trades where there's a very low-cost pathway into self-employment.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Once you've got that skill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —you can of course start your own business. There is no doubt that people prefer the extra service they get from the friendly family butcher. I know that when I regularly buy a full chicken from Unley butchers I get it boned and butterflied completely free of charge—completely free of charge for the service I get from the butcher. I get that from a small business that is hungry for business and is giving people the service they want, and that's why I keep going every time we want a chicken.

Saturday, we decided to have roast lamb and the legs were too big for just my wife and I because we are empty nesters. I presented this problem to the butcher and the butcher said, 'I have a solution. Why don't I cut a leg in half and debone it for you?' And I took him up on his offer!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is an arresting answer, but there is a point of order.

Ms BEDFORD: Point of order: we are hoping that will have something to do with my apprentices who are evidently all opening small businesses.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is quite right. I uphold the point of order. Minister, I bring you to the substance of the question under standing order 98.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have answered the question, sir. I advise each and every one of those—

The SPEAKER: You have done much more—much, much more—than answer the question, minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —apprentices who may be losing their jobs under the changes at Coles to contact Master Butchers. There are jobs waiting for them. There are jobs waiting for them through the Master Butchers association.

WAITE ROAD-CROSS ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:33): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Minister, can you please update the house on how the government will improve the safety of the intersection of Waite Road and Cross Road in Urrbrae?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:34): I thank the member for his question and note the work that we are doing with the planning study at Cross Road and a number of key roads right around Adelaide, metropolitan Adelaide in particular, and the work we are doing around road safety.

I mentioned before our partnerships with the federal government and the investments they have made towards a number of our regional roads, as far as road safety is concerned, but it's something that we are always taking into consideration. That Cross Road corridor, along with the Brighton Road corridor and a number of others across metropolitan Adelaide are all being considered and looked at.

We will get that advice from the department, have a look at what some of the solutions might be and implement them accordingly. All that work will be taken into consideration and decisions made in the fullness of time.

*Matter of Privilege***MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:34): I rise on a matter of privilege. The Premier, in answer to a question during question time, claimed that the position of Deputy Premier was legislated within the Administrative Arrangements Act, a statute of this house. Sir, that is not the case. I ask whether you could inquire into whether or not a matter of privilege exists, and a prima facie case, and give precedence to a motion to establish a privileges committee to investigate the Premier for deliberately and intentionally misleading the parliament.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has raised a matter of privilege. I invite the member for West Torrens and other members to furnish me with any materials relating to the matter raised and I will return to the house with my ruling.

*Grievance Debate***ATTORNEY-GENERAL**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:35): There can be no denying the fact that at the very moment that South Australians are looking for certainty in their government they are witnessing an unmitigated circus. There is no state parliament around our great country right now that is in more turmoil than the one the government has provided in this house, the house of the people, during the midst of a declared emergency that is being felt by every last citizen of the state.

At the very time that South Australians want to have confidence that this government and its ministers of the Crown are walking into the house telling the truth, giving them guidance, we have a Premier who is more than comfortable with having an Attorney-General of the state, the first law officer of the state, knowingly mislead the people of South Australia in none other than their own parliament.

It is worth contemplating the significance of this. It is worth contemplating the counterfactual to the parliament not acting today by suspending the Attorney-General. We now have a Premier who has sent a message to the entirety of his front bench that they should feel comfortable with walking into this house and misleading it with impunity because as far as he is concerned there will be no consequence for that action.

How can South Australians tuning in to question time today or their parliament's proceedings at any point into the future have any confidence that the words coming out of the mouths of the executive branch of the government are truthful if the Premier will not admonish those who knowingly mislead the house?

Mr Speaker, I invite you and every other South Australian to contemplate if, 12 months ago, we foresaw a circumstance where the Attorney-General of the state would make a substantial

decision in regard to a substantial investment decision, have a direct pecuniary interest associated with the outcome of that decision, then not declare the conflict associated with that decision, then come into this place and mislead it about her pecuniary interest and the lack of declaration of a conflict and then be found by a committee to have misled the house on that exact fact.

Then the Premier decides that the Deputy Premier was 'going nowhere', and then, days later the South Australian public turn on their television set and find out that the Deputy Premier is indeed going somewhere—that is, losing that position. Why? Because she was conflicted as the Attorney-General having oversight of the Ombudsman.

We then find out that she was resigning the Deputy Premiership and her other associated portfolios, but not the very portfolio in which the Premier said she had a conflict; then he fails to admonish the Attorney-General—the still Attorney-General, if you are not following—who is conflicted for not knowingly misleading the house; and then the parliament has to suspend the Attorney-General for six days in a largely unprecedented manner.

If I told you 12 months ago that this was going to occur this year, you would have told me I was delusional. You would have said, 'That is farcical'. You could not script something so implausible, yet here we are.

Only months away from a state election, we are now witnessing the dark ages of the Liberal Party coming back to haunt every last South Australian—the full division, the full chaos on total display. This is a Liberal Party that is culturally incapable of providing stable government, utterly incapable of providing stable government, and this is all happening live, in technicolour, on everyone's television sets at the very time that we are in a declared emergency.

This is no laughing matter. This is an incredibly serious situation, and those opposite are hoping that a virus will cover up all their sins. Well, I have news for them: it will not. South Australians still place a value on truth. South Australians still expect governments to be united and South Australians expect the government of the day to be focusing on their future rather than on who the Deputy Premier is.

They are paying attention and so are we, and we very much look forward to the option being presented before the people of this state in a few months' time between division and chaos and stable government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time has expired.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:41): The challenge for governments is to focus on the things that matter to the wellbeing of its people, the business and the economy of its state, and at the coming election there is an extraordinary choice—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —between a government that has—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, take your seat for a moment, please. The entire house listened quietly and patiently while the Leader of the Opposition delivered his grievance. The Minister for Education will be afforded the same privilege.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, it is very difficult for them. They are very angry and they display all sorts of behaviours on a regular basis, and the casual viewer of the parliamentary *Hansard* service can just see it again. Discipline in the parliament, control of emotions and behaviour in the chamber—these are hallmarks of this government alongside delivery of a program of works to support the people of South Australia. The opposition walking around, shouting, that is what they do and that is what they enjoy doing.

At any rate, delivering for businesses and a workforce that is capable of delivering prosperity for South Australia and, indeed, providing opportunities and wellbeing for young people seeking training and education opportunities are key hallmarks of what we are seeking to do in this

government. Reforms that have already been delivered and are continuing to be delivered by the Marshall Liberal government in supporting vocational education and training are significant.

Since the last election, we have turned around 16 years of the Labor government's dismal record in vocational education and training, of declining rates of engagements between schools and businesses, of work experience programs that were almost non-existent and of apprenticeships and traineeships at nation-plummeting depths. Today, South Australia is number one for increases in school-based apprenticeships and traineeships, and not just since we have come to government, but year on year.

There has been a 37 per cent increase in school-based apprenticeships and traineeships just in the 2019-20 period. We have developed 26 Flexible Industry Pathways that are capable of being delivered across all our schools. Each one of our schools is able to deliver an outstanding program of vocational education and training that will put students on a pathway to a job. These have been designed in collaboration with our Industry Skills Councils. These have been designed with quality VET in mind and quality that is suitable for the delivery to school students and a pathway to a job.

I am very pleased to provide the house with the information that next year 270 Flexible Industry Pathways will be offered across our public schools in South Australia alone. Many of those 26 Flexible Industry Pathways are being delivered by upwards of a dozen schools across South Australia, each one of them forming a fantastic hub for that vocational education and training. It is a comprehensive approach. It will see all students across South Australia given quality VET.

This contrasts dramatically with the absolutely ramshackle policy delivered by the opposition, where they are going to build new classrooms at five schools, call them technical colleges and expect all the businesses and all the RTOs to come and deliver their programs there, uprooting the work that has already been done to get students out of the school and into the workplace in areas where that can work.

Labor has promised \$35 million worth of new classrooms for schools. They are calling them technical colleges. What business and industry have told us is that it is not the model they want. What RTOs have told us, including RTOs named in Labor's policy, is that Labor never spoke to them about this policy because, if they had asked them, they would have told them, 'That's not how we deliver the vocational education training that is needed. It is a focus group policy. It sounds good. It will actually not deliver results.'

What will it mean for the schools, the 270 Flexible Industry Pathways across the public school system in South Australia, when Labor removes support for the approach that we have delivered? What will it mean for the \$25 million a year in funding that we have invested in VET in schools in South Australia, to take that away and instead invest it in the five schools that Labor wants to invest in? It would be disastrous.

What will happen to the additional \$3.2 million a year that we have invested to support government schools to implement Flexible Industry Pathways? Has Labor considered the impact on how they will deliver VET without the \$600 this government has paid for each eligible student with a School Card pursuing VET as part of a Flexible Industry Pathway?

We know that Labor's record on vocational education training is dismal—nation-leading plummets in commencements in apprenticeships and traineeships. We have seen their record on TAFE, where, as a result of the 2017 disasters, they sacked the chair of the board, they accepted the resignation of the chief executive but, indeed, promoted the minister to deputy leader. Labor has a long way to go to understand even the basics of training policy in South Australia. The policy they released for the next election demonstrates they have no interest in the matter.

Sir, I submit to you that this is a government that is achieving results, that this is a government that has delivered already for South Australia and will continue to do so. Labor's alternative policy offers nothing more than sound bites and an unwieldy framework which will fail the people of South Australia, fail our students and fail our businesses.

TOURISM INDUSTRY

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:46): Today, as we come to possibly the last week of parliament for this term, I want to dedicate my comments to the tourism industry. Prior to the

pandemic, the tourism industry employed more than 40,000 South Australians, many of whom live and work in our region. It was the fifth most important part of our economy in Australia. Internationally recognised as a growth industry, it is a highly competitive sector, as we compete not only within Australia but also overseas.

I have been very clear in my advocacy for the industry. Primarily, my focus has been that tourism equals jobs. It came to the fore when we saw cuts from this government straight up in their first budget and followed with ongoing cuts as well. What has probably shocked me more than ever is the SATC annual report. Before the pandemic—40,000 jobs. It was estimated that the decline in direct employment could be as low as 26,700 people by June 2021. That was a prediction. As I believe it, it probably has not gone quite that low.

But let's think about this industry, a huge employer, an important employer. Do you know what? They have felt forgotten by this government. While many industries have actually done quite well, we know that tourism, hospitality and the arts continue to be punished time and time again. At its worst, we saw a top of \$8.1 billion in December 2019 to a low of \$4.4 billion in March 2021. That is a huge drop in the value of our visitor economy.

What else has happened? We know that 11 of the 12 South Australian regions had decreases in spend of up to 45 per cent between 2019 and 2020 and a 61 per cent decrease in interstate overnight trips in 2019-20. We are expecting this decrease will be seen again, given the border closures we saw with New South Wales and Victoria, which provide about 60 per cent of our tourists. The borders were closed in July, August, September and October.

We know that South Australians have been holidaying at home, and that has provided some relief, but it has been patchy. Tourism Research Australia data shows that some regions have fared better than others. Clare Valley remained relatively stable, with less than 1 per cent decrease; however, Adelaide had an impact of 54 per cent; Eyre Peninsula had an impact of 48 per cent; and the Murray River, Lakes and Coorong, 51 per cent. They have all seen significant impacts. Of course, the Flinders Ranges and outback region, which Port Augusta falls within, have seen a drop of 32 per cent in visitor expenditure from 2019 to 2020.

Knowing this, what have we done as an opposition? We have gone out and very early called for a hospitality policy, an immediate \$200 million support fund for businesses suffering revenue losses caused by ongoing restrictions. We proposed an extension of the JobSaver wage subsidy program to South Australians losing hours as a result of restrictions. We advocated for the tourism voucher. We advocated on behalf of tourism operators who were fighting for their survival. We called for a dedicated tourism minister.

What has this government done? It continues the cuts to this very, very important industry. We have \$24 million worth of cuts in the forward estimates. This government does not believe in tourism. It does not support tourism. People have had the hardest time, the most difficult time, and yet it has been the opposition's advocacy that has made the difference to call it out. It is a shame on this government and you should not be getting the Premier to continue in this portfolio.

WEEROONA ISLAND FISHING CLUB

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:51): It is my pleasure to rise today to share with the chamber an outstanding event that was held on the weekend in Port Pirie: the Weeroona Island Fishing Club's annual Christmas gathering. We all came together in Sporties, or the Sportsman Tavern, at Port Pirie and had a fantastic evening.

But what I really want to talk about is the Weeroona Island Fishing Club itself. Now in its 10th year, I have been very fortunate to be a member of the Weeroona Island Fishing Club every year since its inception, and I really want to pay tribute to the people who run the club and the people who participate. Mr Robin Skirrey is a very well-organised person, a former Navy man and a former policeman, who knows how to keep to a schedule, knows how to be organised, knows how to rally the troops and knows how to make sure that good things happen.

Mr Robin Skirrey, the captain of the Weeroona Island Fishing Club, could not have said it better in his short speech at our dinner gathering on Saturday night in Port Pirie when he said—and

I am paraphrasing—'Ostensibly we are a fishing club, but actually we do a lot, lot more than that. We probably have more members who don't fish than members who do fish.'

While we have fishing competitions and a range of different fishing activities, it is really about the people of Weeroona Island and others, such as myself from Wilmington and other members who are from Port Pirie and another couple who are members from Georgetown. It is actually really about us coming together to enjoy ourselves in a constructive, fun and sociable way on and around the island, and getting out and about and socialising, when some people might otherwise just be at home on their own, and that is a very positive contribution.

I cannot speak highly enough of this very small but very effective club. The club has a lot of fun events. There are annual events where people have to catch one of a range of different species of fish throughout the year. They can do it anywhere around Australia, and that supports people who are in their retired years and able to travel around Australia; you might be able to catch a fish in New South Wales or Queensland or Western Australia or Tasmania, and it can contribute to this fun competition.

Of course, there are crabbing competitions and there are one-day competitions where certain species are set as essentially a target or a goal, to go and catch these fish on these days. Some of them are 24-hour competitions. That is the very active side of this club, but the social side is incredibly important as well.

A community like Weeroona Island does not have any commercial services at all. It certainly does have an active progress association, which does a wonderful job, but it does not have any commercial services at all. The closest thing is a playground, a picnic ground, a public toilet and a boat ramp. Essentially, they are the facilities on the island, so it is fantastic to be able to get people together.

Another role that the club plays is one of advocacy and one of trying to provide greater opportunities for the Weeroona Island community, and they do this respectfully in partnership with the Weeroona Island Progress Association. They advocated for the boat ramp. There is a history about the boat ramp, which I will not go into in this opportunity in the limited amount of time that I have left, but certainly they advocate for improvements and upgrades, including to the existing boat ramp and to the picnic shelter and the barbecue that are there, and they work very well in that regard. I know there is a request out for some support for a shed for the club to utilise.

This is an outstanding grassroots club that started out of nothing, just started out of a group of people saying, 'Why don't we get together for all of these very positive reasons?' They could not be more welcoming and engaging with people from the island or, as I said, members from Port Pirie, from Wilmington, from Georgetown and no doubt some other places that I am not aware of that non-Weeroona Island members come from. Mr Robin Skirrey does an outstanding job leading it and all members, whether they be committee members or just members at large like me, make a fantastic contribution to the Weeroona Island community through this club.

LIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:56): Today, I would like to talk about the Light Electorate Community Recovery Committee, which I helped facilitate back in May 2020. The purpose of setting up this committee was to bring a whole range of people together and to set out a plan for economic and social recovery, or strategy, and to act as an advocate to governments at all levels.

The Light Electorate Community Recovery Committee comprised membership leaders from local government, business, education, health and community organisations all around the one table. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those members who have sat on that committee from time to time. I will quickly go through them just so members of this house can get an understanding of the breadth and depth of that committee.

There was Dr Naomi Rutten, a general practitioner who specialises in mental health; Ethan White, a year 12 student from Xavier College and also very active in the community; Caren Brougham, the Executive Officer of the Gawler Business Development Group; Katherine Krolling, the DES Employment Consultant at Job Prospects Gawler; Major Darren Cox from the Salvation Army; Barry Neylon, President of the Gawler Broadcasting Association; Liz Heavey from the Light Regional Council, who is involved in tourism development; Lorinda Bayley, a community

development officer also from the Light Regional Council; and Danny Deptula, Principal of St Patrick's Technical College.

There was also Andrew Culley, a managing partner at Deloitte Private, who provided good economic analysis and insights; Greg Pattison, the Executive Strategic Adviser from the City of Playford; David Barrett, Manager Business Enterprises and Communications at the Town of Gawler; Darryl Matthews, a member of the Rotary Club of Gawler Light; Matt Clemow, Deputy Chair of the Committee for Adelaide; Angie Michaels, Principal from Gawler and District College; Michael Holmes, Principal of Trinity College Senior; Leah Blankendaal, who is with RDA Barossa specialising in the creative arts; and Simon Carpenter, Vice President of the Barossa Light & Gawler Football Association.

As you can see, the idea was to bring together a whole range of people to see what we could do as a community to help the community of Gawler to recover from the pandemic and also the changing circumstances in our local economy and community as a result of the pandemic. I would now like to bring to the house's attention some of the matters we discussed and some of the resourcing issues and constraints this committee identified that need to be addressed.

In terms of education and training, the committee noted that the teachers, who are normally really hardworking, had even more work to do during the pandemic trying to teach young people, online in many cases, but there were also cases when they had to have students both in school and at home. Certainly, the teachers have had a hard time and will require some ongoing support and professional development to assist them.

In terms of local small businesses and some of the issues that were raised, one thing the pandemic accelerated to some extent was online sales. Certainly, online sales increased during that time, and small business people are telling us that they now need to better understand how they can make their own small business more digitally friendly—in other words, sales that are not only face to face but also online. There is an important role for government and other organisations to provide those small businesses with the training and support to help their businesses evolve into the online marketing area.

In terms of health, sadly the pandemic showed the utter chaos in our health system, particularly when it comes to ambulance ramping. That was mentioned on a number of occasions. Dr Naomi Rutten also identified that the mental health issues that have arisen from this pandemic will have a long tail and that we need to be ready to make sure we have the necessary professionals to undertake that work.

In agriculture, food and wine, we need to work out how we can better sell and market our green products. In terms of other infrastructure, there is obviously the need for the duplication of Curtis Road. That came high on the list of infrastructure for our community and, in terms of the Gawler River and the Northern Floodway, works need to be done to protect our Virginia market gardeners. This pandemic has shown that we also need to support our volunteers so they can support our community.

HAMMOND ELECTORATE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:01): I rise today to speak about all the magnificent funding that has come to the seat of Hammond since winning government in 2018. After spending 12 years in opposition and some of my friends spending 16 years in opposition, it is so nice to see some money focused in the regions and in my seat of Hammond, and I want to go through some of those funding commitments.

We had the Milang butter factory facade restoration of \$20,000. Bremerton Wines recently received \$400,000 for their beautiful upgrade. Lake Breeze Wines is just the same, with \$300,000 on their barrel room upgrade, which is a fantastic venue, and I was there recently. The Eastern Fleurieu School, Langhorne Creek, had a \$3 million upgrade that will bring vastly improved school rooms, new school rooms, to update the school, and those rooms are much needed for the school in that beautiful area of Langhorne Creek.

The Callington Recreation Community Centre received \$197,500. Monarto Safari Park received \$4.55 million, alongside around \$10 million of federal money, with \$40 million coming in by

private investment from Gerry Ryan, the head of Jayco, and a hotel is being built as we speak. The Old Murray Bridge upgrade is receiving \$36 million so that the bridge that was built and finished in 1879 can go on well into the decades.

We have infrastructure funding of \$14 million surrounding the upgrade of Thomas Foods, which is vital community infrastructure, to assist putting in road train access, gas access, power access and water access. The Gifford Hill racecourse at Murray Bridge receives \$7.5 million for upgrades to get them into the training stalls and the uphill sand track.

The Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital emergency department received \$7 million, with \$3 million for the operating theatre upgrade, which are fantastic upgrades for health at Murray Bridge. The \$20 million Murray Bridge High School upgrade will open in the near future, bringing that year 7 upgrade into Murray Bridge High School.

Murray Bridge North Primary School, just opposite my office, has received \$5 million; Murray Bridge Regional Rowing Centre, fantastic for everyone involved in the rowing club, \$360,000; Murray Bridge swimming pool upgrade, \$1 million; Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass Planning Study, \$5 million; and Murray Bridge to South East Links business case, which includes looking at the duplication of the Swanport Bridge, \$5 million.

In addition, the Beston Foods' Jervois plant upgrade has received \$2.5 million to assist with the development of the lactoferrin plant; Tailem Bend netball courts, \$99,350; Tailem Bend CFS station, over \$1 million; Karoonda swimming pool, \$1.6 million; Karoonda Districts Football Club upgrade, \$258,000; Lameroo swimming pool regeneration, \$850,000; Zerella Fresh Parilla Potatoes new packing facility, \$2 million; and the Browns Well Highway and Ngarkat Highway upgrade to bring it back to 110 kilometres an hour, \$42 million.

The Kalimna Hostel redevelopment at Strathalbyn received \$3 million; Strathalbyn and District Aged Care Facility upgrade, \$16 million; Mannum Community College new STEM building, CAD lab and senior school upgrade, \$3.9 million; and the Eastern Fleurieu School Strathalbyn Campus upgrade, \$1.8 million. There has been \$350,000 for the new underground electricity line into the town of Bowhill, and this also assisted Bowhill Engineering, which makes those great overpasses, apart from other great engineering feats, for the Darlington interchange and other areas, especially the South Road upgrade.

All these works go alongside around a billion dollars' worth of private investment going on in Hammond as we speak. The place is booming. We have seen \$45 million of private investment go into the new Bridgeport Hotel; Costa Mushrooms, \$90 million; and Ingham's chickens, \$50 million for their feed mill and over a million dollars for every shed that goes in. The list goes on and on. It is just fantastic to see this co-investment, and Thomas Foods, one of the big ones, with \$300 million to ensure food processing well into the future.

FLOREY ELECTORATE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:07): Doing your best is something I am sure everyone here does and we all encourage everybody else to do, especially our young people. Every job and task is important and deserves our best effort, if for no other reason than to ensure things do not deteriorate and we do not have to do the same thing again.

I often find myself apologising to constituents who need to contact my office because they have called on a government department or service or a private business or enterprise for reasonable assistance or with a reasonable request to be fobbed off or told simply things like, 'The computer says no.'

More worryingly, something that seems to have crept in lately is to be told completely untrue things which are being delivered to them as facts. The Florey electorate office has always striven to treat every person as family, meaning if you would do it for your family you would certainly do it for everyone else, and I thank my staff for sharing this belief with me. We also present constituent positions as true until we have proof or cause to believe they are not true.

Our whole system of society operates on truth, and in this place we can only enjoy privilege as long as we can believe what we are saying is true. Parliament can only operate when we know each of us is being honest, and I believe this to be the single most important element underpinning my work here in this place and out in the community.

On behalf of my constituents, I have always been fearless in my advocacy based on facts and strong in my representation, putting my constituents and electorate first. The issues concerning my electorate concern me, and with no other allegiance my choice will always be to defend the services and amenity of my community.

Soon, the most pressing issue will be the retention of acute adult mental health services at Modbury Hospital. Announcements of decommissioning and moving the 20 beds from Woodleigh House will not be accepted. There are any number of people ready to stand with me on this issue—consumers or family members of those who rely on this local service close to home and vital further support for those who most need it.

A new build is mooted, and it can only happen behind Woodleigh House which, although in need of replacement should be left operational until another treatment space is ready, which could include amongst other things a veteran-specific area.

We should also mention the need for young people's mental health support, which brings me back to my starting point: young people doing their best. In the past few weeks, I have been able to attend graduation and valedictory ceremonies for schools all over the north-eastern suburbs.

Modbury High School had its usual marvellous assembly with amazing music; the Heights School, another strong school in our area; Torrens Valley Christian School last night had a wonderful ceremony; and last Thursday, I was able to attend the ceremony for Banksia Park International High School at the Adelaide Town Hall. Their music program is obviously exceptional. We were treated to a marvellous choral piece and some terrific musical pieces as well.

It was my pleasure to present the inaugural Arts Prize. I was also fortunate enough to co-present with the Premier their inaugural Muriel Matters Award for Activism. I thank the Premier for the honour of joining him on the stage, the same stage where Muriel Matters appeared in Adelaide in 1910, some 111 years earlier than the night I stood there.

Teachers and families do their very best to support students and, by doing their very best and taking every advantage and opportunity given them, students can actually achieve whatever they wish to do. I saw in these latest graduating classes of all the schools in my area great hope. Young people truly are ready to take on the world with great confidence. Obviously, some have not made up their mind about where they want to go in life but others are very determined and already very set on the path they wish to take.

I think it is incredibly heartening to see that confidence and young hope as they venture off into the world supported by their families. There were a great many families at each of the events, and I think it goes to show how much every person wants to see their child succeed and how I know every family member does their best to give their children the best opportunity and best start in life.

While so many of our children do not have a good start in life, it is beholden on us through our education system, our public education system which offers the same opportunities to all, and again for others who are able or perhaps lucky enough to win scholarships to private education, to see those young children who may not have had the best start in life to actually know that they can go on to achieve and contribute back to our society to make the world a better place.

PARLIAMENTARY SITTING PROGRAM

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:11): Today, I would like to talk about the many uncertainties that the people of South Australia and we as members of parliament here face. As we approach the end of the parliamentary session, it is still uncertain whether this parliament will set the extra sitting periods or even if we are sitting tomorrow and Thursday of this week.

Two attempts have already been made to adjourn the house until Tuesday 3 May 2022. No sitting periods for five months is far too long, in my opinion, and I am very disappointed with the Minister for Energy and Mining in his role as Leader of Government Business that he has not arranged and set further sitting days.

People outside this house, and in my region in particular, were dumbfounded when they heard the minister in charge of government business last sitting week had attempted to cease any more parliamentary sitting days until after the next state election. I repeat: that was after the next

state election and to return in May 2022, over five months with no representation in this house for our communities.

There are many important bills still on the *Notice Paper*—32 under Government Business and another 59 under Private Members Business, and still many more to be introduced. Even today, I introduced two more bills to be debated. These issues and concerns with members introducing new bills or amending existing bills are very important, not only for the members introducing the bills but also for the people of South Australia.

I have heard comments from the government side that we have sat many more days this year than last year. Well, we are in very trying times, with lots of uncertainty out there, lots of pressure, and those involved deserve to have us represent them in this house. I have also heard, unsubstantiated, that some members have made arrangements for overseas holidays. That is unsubstantiated, but we are here to represent people. I ask members: who are we here for? Are we here to represent ourselves or to represent people?

These bills that I mentioned a bit earlier need to be addressed and important decisions must be made. Mr Deputy Speaker, you are aware that we just opened our borders on the 23rd of this month. With that came great joy from people from interstate being able to come in to see loved ones and vice versa. I saw very emotional reunions on the TV between people who had not seen each other for months and months. It was really terrific to see that, but we have increased the uncertainty about the effects of COVID-19 on the South Australian community leading up to Christmas. Whilst it is very heartwarming to have people coming into our community from other states, we also have the new variant moving across the world from Africa, and that is something we have to be really careful about.

I have had several people inquiring at my electorate office, as have other members, about the latest movement in the requirements that we need to abide by. The regulations and requirements change on a regular basis. South Australia has already faced its own potential setback since opening the borders as the new omicron COVID-19 variant was confirmed in Australia on Sunday 28 November. New South Wales confirmed the first known case of the new variant and since that time Australia has confirmed six cases, as I understand it, of this particular variant, one being in the Northern Territory.

Our border directions for international travel have already been changed, and I am sure further changes to directions will increase confusion and misunderstanding of information. Local and small businesses need guidance on managing their business and greater certainty as we head towards our busy Christmas season.

However, it appears that those concerns and issues are not really important. We, as representatives of the people, are here to represent them and to ask questions and get answers for them in these trying times. To the general public, we appear not to be here to serve them but only here to serve ourselves. I know members in this house are here to serve the people.

I ask that this house makes it quite clear what the sitting days for this week are. In my view, parliament should sit for one or two sessions before we go to the writs in the new year because we are in trying times and we need to be here to reassure the people of South Australia that we have their wellbeing at the front of our concerns. I ask the house to make that decision today.

Time expired.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 28 October 2021.)

The CHAIR: I declare the examination of the Report of the Auditor-General 2021 open, and remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions have to be asked by members on their feet—I am going to allow you to sit down, member for Elizabeth—and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2020-21 report and Agency Statements for the year ending 2020-21, as published on the Auditor-General's website. We have half an hour. I invite questions.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will start with SAFECOM, as we agreed, minister. I will begin in the agency report. I cannot remember the number of the volume, I beg your pardon, but page 415 of the agency report. We will start at the beginning, Significant events and transactions. We will start with the Emergency Services Command Centre. When this was first announced and then reannounced there were some delays, and I will not re prosecute that as that was well canvassed at the time in the media.

I do note, though, that on 11 March, minister, you assured the public that this centre would be ready by the fire season, noting that the fire season in metropolitan Adelaide and Kangaroo Island and so on starts tomorrow. Fire seasons have indeed already started, as you know, around the state. Then again in the Auditor-General's Report, practical completion and occupation is scheduled for November 2021. Does that mean then that the command centre is now complete and occupied?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I can advise the member for Elizabeth that the move into the emergency services headquarters will occur on 10 December for the CFS, and for the SES and SAFECOM it will occur on 17 December. Of course, there is still the contingency of the Waymouth Street building in the case of a bushfire, if those facilities are still required. So there is a contingency in place. We have had some slight delays, but it is all systems go in December.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can you explain those delays?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I can advise the member for Elizabeth that there have been some slight COVID-related delays, just like any bill that may have contributed to the slight slippage. However, it is a slight slippage. We have always said that it was scheduled for mid to late November and, given that the moves are happening in December, the slippage is only slight. Obviously we cannot wait to open it, and I will make sure the member for Elizabeth is invited to the opening barbecue as well.

Mr ODENWALDER: I appreciate that, minister. However, you would recognise that there is a practical difference between opening, as you stated, before the start of the fire season and opening during the fire season. Things are heating up very quickly, and I am sure there are people here who would rather be out there preparing to fight fires. There is a practical difference between moving in in November and moving in on 10 December.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: There has been some slight slippage, which is COVID-related, but, as I said, there are contingencies in place to make sure we are able to fully operate and be fully resilient and ready for the fire season. As I pointed out, the move into the ES headquarters will occur on 10 December for the CFS, and for the SES and SAFECOM it will be 17 December. There has been some slight slippage, but it has not been too much in the scheme of things. Obviously, we want to make that move as soon as possible.

Mr ODENWALDER: Has anyone within the CFS particularly raised any concerns about the delays in this project?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: We are constantly meeting with the CFS. We meet with the chief and other stakeholders regularly. There is obviously a dedicated project officer who works with DIT and also liaises with the developer. We are confident that those moves will happen this month. As I said, there are contingencies in place to enable other facilities to ensure that the bushfire season is well managed.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will move on to the next paragraph, which starts to introduce the Keilty review. Given the time constraints, there will be some questions on the Keilty review. I refer to the same page, page 415.

Obviously, the Keilty review made many recommendations. The government listed some interim actions and some longer term actions, and according to the Auditor-General's Report and public statements by the minister all the actions that the minister said would be complete by the beginning of the fire season have been completed. Is this the case?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: In total, the government has committed \$97.5 million to create a safer and more bushfire-resilient community. There was a comprehensive action plan, which identified 69 actions to address the findings—some of them immediate, some of them long term. I can advise the house that the 27 immediate actions have all been completed before the bushfire

season. Of course, work continues to implement 42 longer-term actions, many of which require further engagement across agencies with volunteers and with the community.

Whilst the steering committee is now closed, lead agencies continue to report progress to SAFECOM to inform summary reporting to the Strategic Advice and Coordination Subcommittee. That mechanism provides consolidated reporting also to the State Emergency Management Committee on actions to address recommendations from both the review and the royal commission into natural disaster arrangements.

If I can pre-empt that the next question from the member for Elizabeth will be about the long-term actions, I can advise the house that, from 1 November 2021, 14 out of the 42 longer term actions are actually complete. A further 18 are on track and forward planning is in place for the remaining 10 actions.

Completed actions have delivered benefits across five target areas: new trucks; support equipment for volunteers; better protection of critical assets; enhanced communications, improved information before, during and after the fires; and also institutional and capability improvements.

Mr ODENWALDER: I appreciate that answer, minister. You said that some 14 more have been completed now since the last announcement?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: As at 1 November, 14 out of the 42 longer term actions are complete, and 18 are on track and forward planning is in place for the remaining 10.

Mr ODENWALDER: This is expanded upon on pages 229 and 230 where it has an update on the recommended actions. It goes through the immediate action plans. Work has started on implementing longer term actions. Some of those are also aligned to recommendations of the royal commission, as I think you might have just said. What longer-term actions from the Keelty review align with the recommendations of the royal commission?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I thank the member for the question. I know he has an interest in the royal commission. If we are able to take that on notice, what we might be able to do for the member is present a chart of the state and federal action items and how they align. Do we have the short answer in front of us? No, we do not. I am happy to take that on notice. I think the agencies will be able to prepare that for the member.

Mr ODENWALDER: Did the government make a formal response to the findings of the royal commission as well? Perhaps I missed it. Is there a publicly available formal response in the same sense that you responded to Keelty?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: We will take that on notice. If there is something that is appropriate to be distributed to the member, we are happy to make it available.

Mr ODENWALDER: In formulating your response back in July last year, when you decided on some interim actions and longer term actions, how were those decisions made? Were any requests made of the minister or the government by any of the agencies to act upon recommendations immediately, but those actions were not addressed in the interim actions?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: In terms of all the immediate action items, as I said, 27 have been implemented. They were obviously taken not only from the review but also after discussion between the agencies. We are happy they have been done. Certainly, none of them are outstanding. We continue to work with the agencies to address the remaining longer term action items. Given that 40 out of 42 are long-term action items and the fire season was 2019-20, I am very confident about what is on track, but we are still forward planning for the remaining 10 to be delivered.

Mr ODENWALDER: I acknowledge my question was rather convoluted, but my question was: were any requests made to bring any of those actions forward by any agencies rejected by the government?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Member for Elizabeth, not that I am aware of. Do not forget that I was sworn in in late July, so there is certainly nothing that I am aware of. Saying that, as minister I am always advocating for more resources for all my relevant areas.

Mr ODENWALDER: Still on page 230, on the financial activity and still on Keelty, it details that some \$17½ million was provided in funding but that only \$6.8 million was expended. I just want

to understand this shortfall. Can you expand on why that would be the case? There is some mention of COVID again.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am able to provide some information to the member for Elizabeth, and I hope that will answer part of his query. A lot of these issues certainly were COVID-related, and I will give you an example. In relation to MFS trucks, for example, at one point I do believe that one may have been stuck in the Suez Canal. We were able to get it, but that was a real-life situation

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: You're telling me! That was an issue, and I know that from time to time when trucks had to come over from New Zealand I recall that there were some transport issues. Nonetheless, we keep pushing on. There have also been some slight delays because of COVID to some of the grant programs. There was a slight delay in AVL, but that continues to be rolled out well. There was also a slight delay with safety systems.

I think it should balance out in the scheme of things, but no doubt this 12 to 18 months has been quite a challenging period with COVID and also in terms of recruiting some of the people in the country. That has presented some issues as well because of COVID-related issues. I hope that provides some insight. If you had a specific query, I could look into that.

Mr ODENWALDER: What is the status of the AVL?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: In July 2020, there was the announcement of a \$5 million commitment. Following a comprehensive procurement process, Netstar was selected as the AVL supplier. The first pilot installation is planned for late in 2021, and the deployment across CFS, SES and also MFS fleets will occur between January and June 2022.

Multiple reviews over a considerable period obviously have highlighted the critical need for AVL technology. Former governments were well aware of this technology. There was a comprehensive procurement process, and we are confident that Netstar will do an outstanding job. They were selected as the AVL supplier. There has been detailed implementation and rollout planning is progressing with Netstar in consultation with each agency and volunteer groups to ensure prioritisation of the most critical assets.

I believe the first pilot has occurred; if it has not, it will be happening shortly. Deployment across CFS, SES and MFS fleets will occur between January and June 2022. The original capped expenditure of \$5 million was provided in 2020-21 over three years to SAFECOM to establish the AVL system on behalf of the sector. An additional \$1.5 million was provided in 2021-22, increasing to \$1.8 million, which was indexed across the forward estimates, and \$625,000 in capital expenditure for AVL system devices in 2022-23. The total AVL funding across the forward estimates is \$12.7 million, slightly higher than we anticipated but worth every cent, in my humble opinion, especially if it saves lives on the fireground.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will go to page 424, aerial firefighting. I note there is an \$8 million decrease on the previous year in the costs or the expense of aerial firefighting. Can you detail what aerial firefighting assets were contracted in the previous year as compared with what was contracted in the year the report covers? Why was there a decrease of \$8 million?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Are you referring to the \$7.8 million, 2020-21?

Mr ODENWALDER: No, I am on page 424. I am referring to the cost of aerial firefighting. We do not have a great deal of time, so could you provide to the committee an itemised breakdown that details the assets and explains the \$8 million difference in the two years?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I will try to be as helpful as I can to the member for Elizabeth. CFS currently has a contracted fleet of 26 aircraft, 14 fixed single-engine air tankers, one high-volume helicopter, the Erickson air crane, three fixed-wing surveillance aircraft and eight rotary wing air attack observation platforms. In terms of the \$1920 million figure and what seems to be a decrease the year after, it is more a case that since 2020 was such an outlier year it obviously dramatically increased for that year, but we are happy to provide that itemised list for you.

Mr ODENWALDER: Would that extra cost have been incurred during the fire season, procuring or sourcing other aircraft from other states? Does that incur a cost at the time?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: How it has been explained, member for Elizabeth, is that there is obviously a standard charge and then an extra flying charge. So the higher the flying charge the higher the charge overall, and that is what has happened for that year.

Mr ODENWALDER: That was very helpful. One of the criticisms that came up during the evidence given to the royal commission is that a lot of nationally contracted assets cannot operate in the dark. The Black Hawk you announced—which I think is Protec, the Black Hawk out at Parafield—is that accredited to fly at night? Are any of our contracted fleet?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I thank the member for Elizabeth for the question. Obviously the Black Hawks—and I am happy to invite the member for Elizabeth to have a look at these wonderful aircraft when they are down here—have been procured as part of the national tender. In terms of individual specs, though, I will take those questions on notice and come back to the member.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can we go to police now, please, as time is marching on. Page 407 details income, and the report details an increase of appropriation income, from \$839 million in 2020 to \$943 million, a \$104 million increase. Clearly that is largely due to COVID. Is there anything else other than COVID that contributes to that \$104 million increase?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The increase mainly reflects an increase in revenues from the South Australian government appropriation received for COVID-19, and that is to the tune of \$64.4 million. There is also a return of surplus cash impact of \$12.6 million, and then the indexation of expenses of \$19.6 million, and then there is some other to the value of \$7.4 million.

Mr ODENWALDER: So, apart from COVID, no further capability in terms of police operations?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The indexation would go to operations, I am reliably informed.

Mr ODENWALDER: The intention of the government was to achieve in the last financial year \$13.8 million in savings in what was referred to as back office activities in the 2018 budget. Can you detail where those cuts were made in that last financial year?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am advised that SAPOL is making all its savings measures. In terms of where, I will just seek some advice. Member for Elizabeth, what I might do is take that on notice. I just do not have that information in front of me at the moment.

Mr ODENWALDER: Could you also take on notice to detail the same savings to be made in the current financial year. I cannot remember, but the figures are approximately the same.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I can do that.

Mr ODENWALDER: I refer to page 409, income. The report identifies a \$1.1 million decrease in income due to the suspension of a joint task force between SAPOL, the AFP and the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission. Can you tell me what the nature of that task force was and why it was suspended?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Member for Elizabeth, I might have to be cautious in providing a level of detail, as it could be quite sensitive. I am happy to take it on notice and provide the member with as much information about any task force as I am reasonably able to do, giving regard to those sensitivities that may be operational in nature. I am happy to come back to the member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: On the same page, the report identifies a decrease in employee benefit expenses of \$9.8 million related to police service leave expenses. Does this mean that this \$9.8 million is a decrease in expenditure due to police officers not taking leave through the COVID period; is that what I am reading?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I thank the member for Elizabeth for the question:

A \$9.8 million decrease in police service leave expense. 2020 expenses included a lump sum accrual of 28 days leave for a large number of eligible employees.

The CHAIR: One further question, member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: The report notes that a number of capital projects were delayed because of staff relocation to COVID-19 duties. What were those projects? Can you list them? When were they due? When will each now be complete?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am happy to take that one on notice, member for Elizabeth, and provide an elaborate answer to the member as soon as possible.

Mr ODENWALDER: I apologise for dragging you people over, especially the people from Corrections. I apologise.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Thanks to all the agency staff.

The CHAIR: I am sure they have all enjoyed their time. Thank you, minister, and to your advisers from me, and the member for Elizabeth, of course, for asking questions. That concludes this examination. The committee has further considered the Auditor-General's Report 2020-21 and completed its examination of ministers on matters contained therein.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (16:50): I make the following statement concerning the matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens in the house on 16 November. Before doing so, I wish to briefly outline the significance of privilege as it relates to the house and members. Privilege is not a device by which members or any other person may seek to pursue matters that could be better addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion.

In *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, McGee expressed the view that the test for whether a matter is a matter of privilege might be determined by asking whether it could, given its proper construction, genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties. That test has been adopted by other Speakers. I adopt that test.

I turn to the matter raised by the member for West Torrens that relates to a ministerial statement tabled by the Deputy Premier on 16 November concerning the Select Committee on Conduct of the Hon. Vickie Chapman MP regarding Kangaroo Island Port Application.

The member for West Torrens claims that the ministerial statement contains reflections on members that breach standing orders. Further, the member for West Torrens indicates that the tabling of the ministerial statement as opposed to it being read by the Deputy Premier was a device to prevent members from exercising their right to withdraw leave to not allow the alleged breach of standing orders to occur.

The standing orders as they apply to debate are not applicable to ministerial statements and ministers are also entitled by the standing orders to table ministerial statements, something, of course, they also do on a regular basis for ministerial statements made in another place. Accordingly, there is nothing in the claims made by the member for West Torrens that touches on matters of privilege as the standing orders are presently promulgated. In the Chair's view, the matter could not genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties.

I therefore decline to give the matter precedence. However, my opinion does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion in the usual manner. I also emphasise earlier comments made in relation to the promulgation of the orders.

Members

VALEDICTORY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:52): I rise on indulgence and I thank the house for this opportunity to rise on indulgence and give what I am going to call my valedictory speech. It will be short and sharp. I am very pleased that some of my family and staff have been able to join me here today, and I am also appreciative of the fact that some members have chosen to be in the chamber now.

I have chosen not to contest the election in 2022. I was first elected in March 2010, and through a little bit of research I discovered that I was just the sixth member for Flinders since World War II. It has often been termed a safe seat. I refuse to accept that term. You are only ever as good as your last election, but there have been very few members for Flinders over the years.

The electorate of Flinders keeps its original name. Since the first legislature was set up in 1857, the bulk of Eyre Peninsula has been known as Flinders, and it still retains that name today. I believe it is the only electorate in the state that has done that. Prior to being elected, I spent 30 years as a farmer and I literally walked straight from the paddock into the House of Assembly. I still had dust on my boots, and I was not familiar with the nuances and machinations of this place at all. It was a place like no other. It is a workplace like no other. We all know that.

When I was first elected, we went into opposition in March 2010 under Isobel Redmond, who was a very driven and ferocious leader. We nearly won in 2010. We nearly won again in 2014 under Steven Marshall. Finally, after 16 years in opposition, we were elected to government with Steven Marshall taking his place as Premier.

I did take the time to look back over my maiden speech and much time was spent on the nature of my electorate, as is the case for all of us when we speak, and I talked very much about agriculture and seafood being the economic drivers of Eyre Peninsula. Twelve years on, that remains the same of course. We have good seasons, dry seasons, wet seasons—I have farmed for long enough to know that every year is different and I suspect it is the same in the sea as on the land.

Service industries and, of course, tourism are of growing importance and I think we have seen during these COVID times particularly that once upon a time people who lived in metropolitan Adelaide could take holidays overseas or go to the snow or whatever they wanted to do. Obviously during COVID times that has been much more difficult. The upside of that was that in our rural and regional areas we saw far more visitors to such places as the coastline of South Australia, that beautiful West Coast and all the landscape around it.

I also talked about mining and mining exploration in my maiden speech. I can tell the house today that after 12 years, despite much exploration and numerous mining proposals on Eyre Peninsula, not one has actually got up. I think this is an issue, and I have spent a little bit of time on the select committee with the member for Frome as Chair. The report will be tabled and recommendations made, but the real issue for me is that it is not about the land. It is rather about the people and their businesses and the fact that any landowner anywhere can have a mining proposal hanging over their head and that of their business for so many years—12 or more, it would seem.

In my maiden speech, I also highlighted the Tod Highway and water security. My plan was to have both of those fixed by the time I left parliament. I have managed to do one. I am very pleased and proud that this government has been able to complete shoulder sealing on the Tod Highway. For those of you who are not familiar with it, the stretch of the Tod Highway from Karkoo to Kyancutta particularly was a very narrow road, and it is a state highway and a very important freight route. Just recently, in the last few months, we have managed to finish the shoulder sealing on that stretch of road. We have turned it into a magnificent highway and a much safer stretch of road than it was previously.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: A wide road is a safe road.

Mr TRELOAR: Yes, a wide road is a safe road; thank you, minister. I think that is my line. As far as water goes, there was a proposal, an announcement from this government some 18 months to two years ago, minister—he is nodding, yes, thereabouts—that we would build a desal plant to supplement the water supply on Eyre Peninsula to help preserve our southern basins that have been depleted due to overextraction. I was absolutely delighted with that announcement. I could not have been happier. I figured I was going to get two ticks—both my ticks—by the time I left.

After much searching and consideration by SA Water, they have announced a preferred site that is within Boston Bay in very close proximity to the City of Port Lincoln. Those of you who were paying attention today would have noted that I tabled a petition with I think 1,700 signatures acknowledging the need for a supplementary water supply but bringing concern to this house about the siting. So it is a work in progress. I am sure we will finish up with a solution that is acceptable to all parties that will finally supplement our water supply that we need so much.

The Premier is busy in national cabinet. Both the Premier and I were elected in 2010, and I have the utmost admiration for him as a person, as a politician and as a Premier. He has an enormous work ethic, and nobody could argue that. He has an enormous work ethic, and his leadership style is something that I believe has really been quite an example. I am going to thank him for that and I am also going to thank him for his friendship to me over these last 12 years.

These are the things I have discovered in my time here: ministers change, governments change but bureaucracies do not. Bureaucracies are the constant and unfortunately, I think, whether you are in opposition or in government, dealing with bureaucracies often seems like walking through wet cement. I am sure they have a job to do, but we seem to have certainly entrenched bureaucracy in our governments to a point we have not seen before.

I have said already that this is a workplace like no other. I walked from the farm into the House of Assembly, and what I was surprised about—I should not have been really—was that politics can be a brutal game, and it will be always. However, as a simple country boy, it surprised me that it was almost acceptable to pull somebody else down in order to get up yourself, and you see that in politics here and probably in every jurisdiction around the world. It is not something we see very often anywhere else, so I think we need to consider actions such as that as we go forward.

I have had various roles while in this place. I was elected as deputy whip way back in 2010. I spent time as Opposition Whip in 2014 to 2018, and the current Opposition Whip and I have been comparing notes today. Of course, in this last session of parliament, I have held the roles of Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees, which I have thoroughly enjoyed—I like the power.

In fact, I had a rather brutal first week in estimates, my first week ever as Chair of Committees, and I managed to get the member for West Torrens, who was really on his game that day. I have had a discussion with him since and said, 'Mate, it was a baptism of fire for a new Chair of Committees,' but that was all part of it.

Lots of things go on in this place outside the chamber itself. I have been really quite thrilled to be involved with such groups as Friends of the Library—and one of the real treasures this state has is the Parliamentary Research Library in this building—and also the Australasian Study of Parliament Group, which we have reinvigorated and reinvented and have had a number of very successful events.

I will touch briefly on the role of a country member because I am a country member. I live further from Adelaide, by road at least, than probably anyone else in this place. The challenges around the travel are significant, not just the travel to and from Adelaide but also the travel around a very large electorate. I have 20-something schools, eight hospitals and 11 district council areas. These are vast areas, and although the population is not dense I would argue it is fairly evenly spread across Eyre Peninsula.

All of us as members try to service our community as best we can, but certainly for country members it involves a lot of time away from home, so much so that my youngest son, Max—and I know we are not supposed to do this, but he is present today in the gallery. Stand up, Max!

My wife and I have four children. When the older three were teenagers, one evening Max was at home with his mother, just the two of them. It was cold and dark outside, and they were sitting down having tea. Max said, 'Mum, has dad left us?' As far as I can understand, Annette said something like, 'Well, he might have.' Those are the sorts of things we all know when we all spend time away from home.

You meet many wonderful people touring the electorates. I particularly enjoy the interactions I have had with schoolchildren, having schools from Eyre Peninsula visit Parliament House or me visiting schools on Eyre Peninsula for their end of year events or just simply talking about parliament, how it evolved and what it does and all the rest of it.

A young man from Wirrulla was here one day, from the Miltaburra Area School, I think. They were undergoing a mouse plague at the time, and this young man, who was about 11, was very concerned because he could see all these places where the mice would get into Parliament House. He kept asking about that and was very concerned.

While I am talking about the challenges and opportunities of being a country member, I am going to briefly talk about country media. We actually have it pretty good in the country. We do not fight for space, we do not fight for print space or for air time, we have ABC regional radio broadcasting out of Port Lincoln and we have local commercial radio 5CC, 5 Coast and Country.

For a good part of my 12 years, I had a weekly spot on 5CC, and we would chat about this, that and the other, and at the end I got to request a song. People would text me about the song I had

chosen; they would not remember what I had said, but they would text me about the song I had chosen, so that was interesting. There are the local papers, of course: the *Port Lincoln Times*, *The West Coast Sentinel*, and *Eyre's Peninsula Tribune*. The Sentinel and Tribune have gone into recess and been replaced by a new paper called the *Eyre Peninsula Advocate*.

We even have our local television, and Southern Cross News has a reporter in Port Lincoln. Usually, they get picked up and taken away by Channel 7, but that is a good thing. They are young, just out of uni having done media, and they find work in places like Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Broken Hill. All those towns feed into Southern Cross News. We are very fortunate in that respect.

To my parliamentary colleagues, I acknowledge you all; certainly those who sit in the same party room as me but also those on the other side. Having had two terms in opposition, I decided fairly quickly that the only way to get a result for my electorate from opposition was to build relationships on both sides and build relationships with relevant ministers. I think that often all people see of parliament is question time, and of course question time is both the best and the worst of these places. They do not see all the work that goes on for the rest of the day in making this place work and the state function.

To the people of Eyre Peninsula, I am going to say thank you. They have elected me three times: 2010, 2014 and 2018. I have come to the conclusion that it is a big thing for any of us to ask someone to vote for us; it is almost as much as you can ask. But they have, and they have supported me, as they have all the people in here.

To the party members, the Liberal Party branch members in the seat of Flinders, we still have a relatively good membership. It is not as good as it once was, but that is the way of the world. I attended the Ceduna branch Christmas dinner last Saturday night, and it was wonderful to sit down with people of like mind who support me and appreciate the work I have tried to do. They are the ones who are out on election day. Other parties have the same support, I am sure, but for me it is particularly about Liberal Party branch members.

I would like to thank my parents. My father is actually here today—I will not ask him to stand up! When I first went to Wudinna for preselection in October 2008—and my dad will not mind my saying that he remained a loyal Liberal branch member right the way through those dark days when the National Party held Flinders—he rounded up two car loads to go to Wudinna to support me. That was great, so I thank him for that.

My mother, who sadly passed just last week, was never really comfortable with my going into politics. She did not want me to. I do not mean to make light of this, but she died knowing that I was retiring, and that made her kind of happy.

I want to thank my staff: Jacqui, Aimee, Di and Myriam, particularly. I do not want to talk about them individually, other than to say that they have all been with me all the way through. I have had capable, conscientious and loyal staff who have stayed with me for the distance—and, boy, what a team we have been. Obviously, my decision will mean changes for them, but I really did want to take the opportunity to thank them publicly for all they have done.

We are only as good as our staff make us look, aren't we? I do not now how that has worked for me, but anyway I do appreciate you. We all do as much as we can. We deal with the constituent inquiries. We have been dealing with COVID for most of the last 18 months, trying to make people happy who will never be happy, and that just goes with the job, so thank you one and all.

To my wife, Annette, thank you for your support and love all the way through. Thank you to my children, who in the time that I have been in this place have grown from being teenagers to young adults. They are all finding their place in the world and settling down with partners. In fact, our daughter, who is not here today, has now become a mother, which means of course that Annette and I are grandparents. I am not shying away from the fact that that is one of the reasons I am going home. I just do not want to miss that. Our grandchildren are coming along, and I do not want to miss that.

I have always viewed my time in this place not as a career. Politics is not a career for me. I know it is for some and I have no criticism of that, but it has not been that for me. As I said, I have been 30 years a farmer, and I intend to go back to the farm. I have about 10 years' worth of fencing

to do, and I am going to make a start on that. I am going to spend more time in Coffin Bay, and I am going to tell my grandchildren stories about the olden days, which is anything before about 2010.

As I said, I have never viewed politics as a career. It sounds a bit altruistic, I guess, but I have viewed it as something I can do, some service I can give to the community I was born and grew up in. I will miss this place, but it is time to go home. We will see what happens in the future, but, as I said, I have all that fencing, as well as time in Coffins and the grandies to look after. Thank you for your indulgence, Mr Speaker.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens on indulgence.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (17:13): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My deepest condolences to the Treloar family on the loss of the member for Flinders' mother. She would have been very proud of the man he became and the service he has given to this parliament. It is not often I praise Liberals, but Peter Treloar is the very best of gentlemen I have ever met in this place.

I have been here since 1997 and I have seen people come and go. I have to say that he carries himself with an air of dignity that is rare air around this place. He is someone who is respected universally throughout the parliament because he is honest, he is hardworking, he is loyal, he is diligent, he thinks about what he says, he thinks about the votes he makes and, most importantly, he is a loyal servant of Eyre Peninsula. They have sent us their very best and now we are losing him.

I suspect, Peter, you would have been re-elected again and again and again. The people of Eyre Peninsula would have been quite happy to give you their most precious franchise, which is their vote, because you have earned it. You have earned it in Port Lincoln, you have earned on Eyre Peninsula and you have earned the respect of this parliament. I am exceptionally impressed that your father drives people around to polling booths to vote for you in preselections, an excellent trait which I have encouraged within the Labor Party for a long period of time.

To your wife, Annette, who I met for the first time today, a very patient woman who has given up probably more than most—most of our partners give up so much to have us in this parliament—is getting you home. After all the hard work has been finished and the kids have been raised, it is good of you to return home now, Peter. I am sure that the example that you have set for your family, especially in your public service, is something that your grandchildren and your children are very proud of. They can reflect on it and say, 'That's my pa, that's my grandfather, that's my dad.' I think that you should be very proud of the example you have set all of us in this chamber.

You leave very big shoes to fill. Whoever replaces you in Flinders in the upcoming election will be walking in the shadow of a giant. Without there being any motive behind this statement, I think your career could have gone almost anywhere. I think you would have been an excellent minister. I think you would have been an excellent shadow minister. I think everything you have done you have done exceptionally well. I have to say that it is very hard to get angry at Peter, even when you are trying to pretend that you are angry, because he is such a gentleman and he does know the rules so well and he has done his due diligence.

So we will miss you. I will miss the attentiveness you have in the chair. Mr Speaker, without making any reflections on people who have held your office, many a Speaker does not pay attention to the remarks made in this parliament. Peter always gave the courtesy of his attention to whoever was speaking. I cannot tell you how much that means to people who are speaking, to know that someone is actually listening, and Peter did that. If he disagreed with you, you could tell by looking at his face. If he agreed with you, but he did not want anyone to know, you could also tell. He was a very, very good judge. You could tell when you had bad day or a good day by what was on Peter's face.

I served on committees with him and he always asked the very best of questions, questions no-one had thought of. The point that he raised about exploration in Eyre Peninsula is absolutely right. We have been exploring Eyre Peninsula since God knows when—and no new mines. Peter's point, I think, without presuming, is that could have caused a lot of angst, that could have caused a lot of anxiety, yet the mines still are not there. As a local member, he walked that line between

promoting job growth and alternative employments while protecting family businesses, and that was a very difficult line to walk, and he did it exceptionally well.

I am very lucky. I live two kilometres from here. My electorate abuts the Parklands, so I can drop the kids off to school every day, I can get to parliament on time and I go home to my bed every night with my family. Peter does not have that luxury; in fact, most country members do not have that luxury, and that must be very difficult. It must cause a lot of frustration and make it very difficult, which means the sacrifice he has made to come here is even more telling. He has had to give up that life on the farm that obviously he enjoys so much to be here, to do what he said, which is to serve—and, sir, you have served your constituency well.

I do not think there is a person who has served with you who could not say that you gave everything you had to the people you represent and your political party. Godspeed and good luck with the next chapter of your life, and I hope you get that fencing done. I look forward to seeing you in Coffin Bay, and maybe I will buy you a beer.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:19): I also rise seeking the chamber's indulgence to speak briefly about my very good friend the member for Flinders, Peter Treloar; and I know I am not the only person who would use those words.

Peter, if I may say, was actually typically self-deprecating when he talked of himself as a farmer who just walked out of the paddock, dusted off his boots and found himself here somehow—a nice and quite in character way to describe things—but he certainly is not one to blow his own trumpet. Peter was a Nuffield scholar and, for those who understand, that is an extraordinarily significant achievement in Australia. Peter was a member of GRDC and many other things, as well as being a farmer for 30 years. Of course, that is true; Peter was a person renowned throughout South Australia and other parts of Australia as an expert in cropping—genuinely an expert, a go-to person for that industry.

Yes, he was, of course, a farmer but much more before he came in as well. I remember going to Peter's preselection at Wudinna. I had been incredibly narrowly preselected myself shortly before and I turned up in an even narrower preselection, the narrowest of possible margins, so who knows how things might have gone? Full credit to the person who also wanted to be a candidate for that election but, with no disrespect to the other person, I am so glad it worked out that way. Our chamber, our parliament, our state, our government and the previous government have all benefited from having Peter here in this chamber.

You have heard from the leader of opposition business an outstandingly accurate and genuine description of how people here think about Peter, and I concur. I will not go over all that again but I appreciate the fact that the member for West Torrens has said those things.

Shortly after Peter's preselection I called him and asked, 'Can I come and visit you?' I think he thought, 'Well, who are you, a new candidate for Stuart?' I thought, 'Let's just get to know to each other and let's just see where this goes.' I know we have other members, like the member for Chaffey and other country MPs, the member for Morialta and other city members, who were elected at the same time and who formed quite a bond. I am not suggesting for a second that I am the only one who has developed that sort of relationship.

At the end of the day, we can talk about what a person has done in the past, what they do now and what they will do in the future, but the bottom line is that it comes down to character. The bottom line is that it comes down to character and effort and the way you go about your business. You have got character, you have got capacity, you put the work in and you get the results, and Peter is an outstanding example of exactly that.

The member for West Torrens said that he could have been anything in government in parliament. Peter still could actually be anything in his next phase of life, as well as fishing at his shack at Coffin Bay, hanging out with the grandkids, doing the fencing, and talking to his grandkids about what things used to be like before 2010. I believe there is still a lot left in Peter to serve and it will be primarily serving the community.

Peter is a person I have gone to for fun, for friendship, for mateship and also for advice. I do not think I have ever once gone to Peter for factual advice. I do not think I have ever asked for details or said, 'I missed this. How does this work? What were the nuts and bolts of it?' I have always gone

to Peter for judgement advice, because that is where you go to get that sort of thing from a person of character. Sure, we all go and ask, 'Can you tell me how this works?' etc., but I always went to Peter for judgement advice: 'My gut is telling me this, what do you think? I am concerned,' or 'I believe this is right or wrong,' or whatever. I am pretty comfy making those decisions for myself, but when I was not or I wanted confirmation or, as has happened, an alternate opinion, I went to Peter.

I do not think, in my mind at least, that you could have a higher judge of a person's quality of character than that person being one of the people that you regularly go to to seek advice on matters of judgement, so I thank you, Peter, for that. I wish you and Annette and Thomas and Henry and Maddie and Max, and your two brothers and the growing family or potential family—I do not want to make too many assumptions: stand up, Max—and particularly Brian, all the best.

I was not going to raise it, but it has been raised. We all offer you our deep and genuine condolences for your family's loss. I particularly wish you many, many more years of being as proud as possible of your three sons, particularly the one we know. I wish you all very well, and thank you, Peter.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (17:25): I also rise on indulgence to talk about the member for Flinders. I first met Brian Treloar back in 2005, the day after the Wangary bushfires when he was the chair of the Lower Eyre Peninsula Council and a true leader of that community. I flew in with Mike Rann and Pat Conlon; I was Pat's Chief of Staff and he was the emergency services minister. What I saw in Brian Treloar was a great leader in his community, someone who didn't care what political party you came from. If you came to help, then he was all ears and he wanted the best from the government to look after the people and the area that he represented.

A few years later, I saw Brian again in parliament. He was in here the day that his son Peter made his first speech in this place. I saw in Peter that day that same sense of commitment to the people he represented and the area where he had grown up, and I think it is a great trait to have—people who put their community first and make sacrifices on behalf of their community, for the betterment of their community.

When I had time, as a minister, one of my favourite people to deal with was the member for Flinders because I had a few portfolios that he was a little bit interested in: agriculture, food, fisheries, forests, tourism, recreation, sport and racing. So all of those things pretty much crossed over things that the member for Flinders and the people he represented required. I think we built up a very good relationship. I cannot remember us ever having a bad word.

In fact, when something was going on over there, Peter would ring me or one of the advisers direct and we gave him direct access to anyone in the Public Service he needed to have access to. When the POMS outbreak happened in Port Lincoln, I got on a plane with some of the top PIRSA and SARDI people and we went over, but we made sure that we had Peter in the room with the oyster growers because we knew that the people over there trusted Peter. He was their elected representative. I think parliament and elected governments would work a lot better that way.

It is certainly something that Graham Gunn, the former member for Stuart, did very well. You should actually work with the government of the day, but it is a two-way street. Ministers also have to give up their time and trust in the local members of parliament because a local member is a very important person in terms of their knowledge and also being able to disseminate the information from government.

Again, it does not matter what side of politics you are on, when you all work together for the betterment of individuals, businesses and for the greater community, wherever it is in South Australia, then that is what it should all be about—the parliament and the government all working together. Peter, thank you very much for everything that you have done to represent your community.

I would also really like to pay tribute to two things that you have done in here in this past 12 months and that was as Chair of Committees. To chair sessions when we were debating the abortion bill and the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill, I do not think I have ever seen anyone cover themselves in so much glory as you did. You did not do it in an egotistical way; you did it in a calm, measured way. I am not too sure that too many people who have ever been in this place could have done it with the dignity that you did it with.

Both of those were very emotional topics, and you were so respectful to both sides and you brought a calm and a sense of mutual respect to the chamber. Despite the very different, very passionate views that people held in here, you sat here until two in the morning to make sure that the South Australian public got the legislation that the majority of representatives, whatever the decision was, were going to agree to. I think that will be your greatest achievement in here in terms of a political achievement. With regard to the things you have done in your electorate, the seat of Flinders, Eyre Peninsula, is a much better place for having you in here for the past 12 years.

I would also like to pay tribute to Jacqui, who works in your office. Jacqui has always been terrific. She worked in Pat Conlon's office before heading back over to Eyre Peninsula. Jacqui is a great person to ring up to find out what is happening in your office or in the seat of Flinders, or if you ever need some tips on where the best coffee is, the latest tourist attraction or a kennel to put your dog in while you are over there. Dusty enjoyed his time at EP kennels, so thank you, Jacqui. Those are the sorts of relationships we build as fellow members of parliament, and we remember that staff and family members give up so much in their devotion to us to look after the people that we look after.

So to Peter, to Annette, to your family, and to Brian—it is great to see you again, mate—all the very best for the future.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:30): On indulgence, I want to speak about the man Peter Treloar. It is about honesty, integrity and recognition and it is about the distance he had to travel as a candidate and as a member of parliament. Not long before the 2010 election, I was very privileged to be a shadow minister and I needed to go over to the West Coast. I had to go to Ceduna to pick up Peter, and we were going to do a drive through the electorate. I hope he forgives me for what I am about to say.

Mr Treloar: I will.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, so he knows where I am going. Not that long before that, and as a candidate—and you do get a bit targeted, whether you are a political candidate or a member—Peter had a great distance to go to open one of the holes on the Nullarbor golf course. He was running a little bit late, his foot must have slipped on the throttle and the police decided that he was a couple of kilometres over the speed limit.

The editor of the local media rang him up and said, 'Such and such a man of a certain age from Cummins has been picked up,' and that was how the report had come to the editor, 'Is that you Peter?' To his credit, he did not try to dodge the question but just said, 'Yes, that was me.' So Peter needed a ride and that was fine. I got over there, and we had a fantastic V8 LandCruiser turbo wagon—and I took it very easy of course.

We did a big trip driving down from Ceduna; I think it is 400 kilometres down to Port Lincoln, and it was a fantastic time. Peter can correct me if I get the pub wrong, but in the afternoon we blew into the Wirrulla pub, and three blokes were sitting at the bar having a light refreshment. We walked in and one of them, dry as you like, turned around on his barstool when he saw Peter and said, 'Are you still driving fast, mate?' I said to Peter straightaway, 'You've got it. You've got the recognition factor, you're going to win this election and you're going to win the seat hands down.'

That is what it is about: it is about recognition in your electorate. It may not be the way all of us want it, as some of us on the other side may reflect—and I am not going to name any names. Occasionally, in the country the foot does sometimes slip on the throttle, and I must admit it has happened to me before. I saw that moment, that pivotal moment, as dry as you like: 'Are you still driving fast, mate?'

I have had a great time in here with the member for Flinders, Peter Treloar. I have absolutely enjoyed every single moment and every way he operates. He is a great friend and a great confidant, and those chats we have had will stay between us. My sincere condolences on the loss of Wendy and all the best into the future.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (17:34): On indulgence, if I may, and on behalf of, I suppose, the crossbench, to cover the words of so many, the member for Flinders has been a great parliamentarian; we all know that. To touch on the closing words of the member for Hammond, he has been a great confidant. Peter has been one of those great confidants for me now for many years, and he probably started those little mentoring sessions when we went to ANSTO in Sydney. It was

probably one of the first interstate trips I undertook as a member for parliament when I first got elected.

It is interesting that just this week, with what we were looking at and touching and pointing to in those big storage sheds in the shire in Sydney, finally a place has been decided on in Kimba on Eyre Peninsula. That was almost a seven-year process and that was being discussed then. I think it was after that trip that for me we developed quite a bond. Of course, we were only a couple of offices down on level 2 when I first entered the parliament, and it has been fantastic to learn from you about how to be a good MP.

I have been on the West Coast with you and I have been to the Cummins Liberal Party branch meeting, which I think is the Treloar branch in Flinders. I remember you telling me on one of those long drives we took to Ceduna that not only did you win your preselection by a vote but I think there was someone in the car who was picked up by your father, who probably did not vote for you, who scabbed a lift. So not only did you luckily win by one but someone who scabbed a lift did not vote for you as well, but that just shows—

Mr Treloar interjecting:

Mr DULUK: You could have won by two votes, Peter, but I think that is a testament to the man you are—that you are well loved by everyone in your community and that you are well loved by everyone in this parliament. I think you have been a great servant of this place and of this house. I know you are well loved by your family, and you are going back to them, and I think Annette will be happy that you are home a little bit more, and I know I will miss you deeply in this place. Thank you, Peter.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:36): Also on indulgence, I will add a few words. Of course, the member for Flinders is my neighbour. We have a long boundary that we share, and we have parts of Eyre Peninsula that are sometimes in Giles and sometimes in Flinders, so we have a little bit in common. I remember the first time I met Peter, I think it was at the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association and it was a meeting down at Coffin Bay. We met at Cummins—I think it was on a doorstopper somewhere—and we just started having a bit of a yarn.

I had never met Peter before. I think it was before 2010, and I do not think you were a member at the time. You sometimes just instinctively warm to a person because there is just something about them and you think, 'This is a decent man.' Sometimes you get that wrong, and sometimes that first judgement is wrong, but in this case it was clearly spot on.

There is something about Peter that we all relate to in a warm way. There is something about Peter when he is on a select committee with you—and I have been on a couple with Peter, the member for Flinders—and it is always that incredibly reasonable voice, that moderate voice, that voice that had thought the issue through that you always ended up listening to. There was this quiet gravitas about Peter, not the usual gravitas, but there was gravitas there. He was someone it would always stand you in good stead to listen to—an incredibly reasonable and decent human being.

The fact that you came off a farm after 30 years in that mode of life and came into this parliament only enriched this parliament. For a short time, I was the shadow minister for primary industries, and sometimes you would give speeches about the history of farming on Eyre Peninsula and the changes that had occurred over time, going from what was a very physically demanding pursuit to one that became more technologically sophisticated. It was always incredibly worthwhile listening to those stories, to listen to that history, to listen to that lived experience.

This is something that this parliament needs so that we are far richer—and it is people from a whole variety of backgrounds. As the member for Flinders said, without disparaging those people for whom it is careerlike—and this is not to disparage anyone from the metropolitan area—but those of us who have lived either all of our life or a lot of our life in country areas have this incredibly deep sense of place. Peter clearly has that deep sense of place and it is reflected in the way that he has operated in this parliament. Eyre Peninsula has been incredibly lucky to have you as its member to represent them in the way that you have over the last 12 years, so you will be deeply missed. I will miss you.

I will leave you with these few words. You have to invite me down to go fishing in Coffin Bay because I love fishing on the West Coast. The one thing that I am jealous of about you—and I love my electorate, I have a little bit of coast—is that I am incredibly jealous about your long coastline and all that fantastic fishing. All the best for the future. I know that whatever you do, you are going to do exceedingly well.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (17:41): I will keep my words relatively brief because I think other members have made extraordinarily fine contributions to reflect the character of the member for Flinders. A couple of members have pointed out that politics is a tough business. I think it is the toughest; it can be a brutal environment to work in. The member for Flinders has held himself in incredibly high honour and regard to the place, particularly in his role as Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees.

I would simply reflect on this. I think if one as a local MP is able to genuinely earn the respect of their constituents, then that is something that every member should be proud of, and there can be absolutely no doubt about the fact that the member for Flinders has won the respect and earned the respect of his local constituency. Earning and winning the respect of parliamentary colleagues amongst their allies and amongst their own political party is also something that is worthy of regard and admiration. It is a legitimate pursuit that I think the member for Flinders has undoubtedly attained, as evidenced by the words already said by the member for Flinders' own colleagues.

But, in politics, to win the praise of your political adversaries is truly unique. Winning the unqualified respect of those people who sit across the aisle is not something that is regularly achieved, yet the member for Flinders has undoubtedly done precisely that. There is not a person in this place who does not speak about the member for Flinders in utterly high regard—in fact, I cannot recall a bad word being said about the man—and that is from those people who are his political opponents. I think that is a great testament to the member for Flinders and his character and something that he and his family should be incredibly proud of.

We thank you for your service, we thank you for the way you have conducted yourself in your advocacy of your local constituents and we thank you for, in your own way, lifting all of us up just that little bit. Your presence and your style in this chamber are things that I think most South Australians aspire to see in all of their political representatives. Often we let them down in that regard, but you have not, and for that you have made us all better, and we thank you for your contribution over your time in this parliament.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (17:44): I also rise to pay recognition to a wonderful MP for Eyre Peninsula, the member for Flinders. As a first-term MP, of course, you come into this place not knowing quite what to expect, and certainly the member for Flinders has left a big impression on me on all manner of parliamentary issues. Specifically, I refer to those really complex issues, especially when you are in the early months of being an MP, and the way that the member for Flinders was able to distil them down and simplify them and also draw on past experience in terms of what the pressure points are, that this has been considered before, and I thank him for that.

He was also very giving of his time to me whenever I went over to Eyre Peninsula to take me around. As he said, it is a massive electorate, Port Lincoln being the heart of it, and he was generous with his time with his family meeting up with my family just after Christmas. We had a wonderful lunch at Coffin Bay. It was very interesting going down there where all the oysters were. I was in Pete's hood and I was thinking that he would introduce me to many of the locals and, being Christmas, there were many Glenelg locals at Coffin Bay and so many more people were saying hello to me than to Pete. That was quite interesting.

Then he was able to take us for lunch with his family and I can see why he does want to spend time with his family. He has a young family who are starting to have grandchildren, as he says, and you can just see the admiration he has for his family as well.

When I talk about him taking me around the electorate, that is at the southern end of the Eyre Peninsula electorate. At the northern end, he was able to take me on a tour around Ceduna, Koonibba and Port Thevenard in my role as Minister for Trade and Investment. We were in Koonibba for the first commercial space-capable test launch. That was very exciting and all the locals were there and it really enlivened many of the local schools around the opportunities there are in space for those kids and to see the news cameras come and pay attention to their town.

In terms of Port Thevenard and Ceduna, it was wonderful for him, as he said, to be able to sit down with a minister and have the local member of parliament's perspective and to be able to talk through the issues and give you advice, and I also thank the member for Flinders for that advice.

The other thing that is worth noting about the member for Flinders is that in the early days he came up to me and said that we had one thing in common and that was that we both barracked for Norwood and both barracked for Collingwood. I will miss that support here in parliament. I wish you all the best in your future endeavours. I certainly think that you have left Eyre Peninsula in a better place than when you came here 12 years ago.

Mr BROWN (Playford) (17:47): Very briefly, I felt that as a former whip he could not retire without me making a contribution. As the member for Hammond knows, the former whips' club is very tight.

A lot of things have been said about the member for Flinders, the man, and although I agree with all the sentiments that have been expressed I just wanted to make a quick observation about the member for Flinders, the Chair. Obviously, this is my first term, but in a former life as a staffer and also as an official for the party, I have had occasion to spend some time here in the galleries watching legislation get passed in this place.

Particularly when you are dealing with the committee stage of bills you notice that a large number of people occupy the chair down there. I am quite confident that I will not be contradicted in saying this: when you get Treloar in the chair, you get the gold standard. You do not play games, you are happy to say when you do not know exactly what the ruling should be and you are happy to take advice. You are often very firm and I know you have been firm with me from time to time—always when it is deserved—but you are always fair. I know that no-one on our side of the chamber would say that you are not fair.

You learn things in this place mostly by observing others do it. There are rules and there is the way that things actually work in practice. The way you learn things is by observing others. You are probably not aware of this, but I think you have actually taught a whole generation of MPs about how things should be done while they are sitting in that chair. Thank you for your fairness and best of luck in the endeavours that you have post politics.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:49): I will be similarly brief. Firstly, I extend my condolences to the member for Flinders and his family on the loss the member for Flinders' mother. Very briefly, I want to say that I hope the contributions this afternoon have made the member for Flinders realise what a profound impact he has had not just on this place since 2010 but on many of us in this place because he has been a member of parliament.

I was more recently elected to this place in 2014, and one of the first intrastate trips I took was to Eyre Peninsula and Port Lincoln, where I met with the member for Flinders. I am sure members all now have the common understanding of the hospitality and the warmth with which I was received by him and his office. Perhaps somewhat naively I extended an invitation not just to him but to his office for anything in his electorate that might need to be fixed up in the transport portfolio, and I got quite a few on a regular basis. So thank you very much for those.

I have always had a great deal of time and affection for the member for Flinders because, as he rightly points out—and as others have as well—this is a business that gets quite willing at times, particularly in here. I do not think there has been a session of parliament that has been quite as willing as the current one but, regardless of what has happened during the day, there has always been a kind word from the member for Flinders to me or anyone else who crosses his path—on the stairs, downstairs in the Blue Room, or anywhere else in the building.

I cannot think of anyone else who goes out of their way to ensure there are good, strong relations between us as members of parliament like the member for Flinders does. He is what I have now come to understand is one of the typical country Liberal Party MPs: very warm, very genuine, down to earth, and always with time to give to those who might return that courtesy as well.

I am also particularly fond of the member for Flinders because, of course, he wears his clan colours, importantly, for the chamber. He can: I cannot. I am a Campbell, and I would get lynched by any other Scot these days if I wore mine, but I am proud to see he maintains the tradition.

I say to him, 'You will really be missed in this place.' All of us, of all political persuasions, will seek out the opportunity to catch up with you, whether it is over in your territory on Eyre Peninsula or whether it is back here, should the time arise. Thank you for being such an extraordinary colleague and Chair of Committees. You set a standard that the rest of us can only aspire to. I wish you all the best.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Planning and Local Government) (17:53): I will be brief. I feel it is important to get on the record that the member for Flinders and I were a duo, we were a team, and we worked as a very close partnership for the last year or so in particular. We have become not only close friends, but I regard the member for Flinders as a mentor in all sorts of important ways and, as has been spoken of by others, a source of counsel, a source of judgement and calm.

Just a couple of months ago he literally had my back when my neck was out. He stepped in in every sense, and so I have seen up close and firsthand what a wonderful colleague the member for Flinders is in this place. As another one of the newcomers, can I say to you, sir, speaking personally, and I think on behalf of all of us, that we can only endeavour to emulate the example you have set, and I will certainly do my best to do that. I look forward to seeing a lot more of you in the future, in all directions.

The SPEAKER: The member for Flinders, I believe it is the sentiment of the house that you will be deeply missed and that your service of course is sincerely appreciated. The remarks that have been made are significant and meaningful. The standard you have set is high. It will be seldom equalled.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan.

Bills

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (17:56): I table the remainder of my comments in the interests of saving time.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (17:57): I rise to make just a few brief remarks about the passage of this bill. In doing so, I want to start by thanking the Hon. Tammy Franks for her work to progress the bill and her staff who are here with us in the gallery. I know that she took the lead in making sure that this bill was brought to the house, as it should have been some time ago, and I thank her for that.

I also thank the member for Hurtle Vale, who has taken carriage of the bill in this house for Labor. I thank her for her remarks, and I also thank those who have supported her in that process. Really importantly, I want to thank those who have advocated over decades for this Social Workers Registration Bill to progress.

In thinking about this bill, my mind and my heart were immediately drawn to my many years at the ASU, where I had the pleasure of representing social workers—incredible people who worked in domestic violence shelters, youth organisations, homeless shelters, health, education, schools, and a range of other settings in small and large charitable organisations—and I was thinking about a number of those people when I was contemplating this bill.

I think they are characterised by an absolutely united, shared sense of wanting not just to support people in our community but to empower and walk alongside the most vulnerable people in our community, to help them often walk new paths to build new journeys and to contemplate safer, brighter futures, often after contemplating and going through some of the most difficult moments in their life.

When I was thinking about those people—whose work I take another opportunity in this parliament to absolutely pay tribute to—I was thinking about the equal pay case and campaign that I was part of running together with 200,000 community workers across Australia, many of them social workers, 85 per cent of whom, amongst that cohort of workers, were women.

I distinctly remember going to workplaces all over South Australia, and indeed across the Northern Territory as well, and talking with social workers about why they do the work that they do. Every single one of those workers, every single one of those social workers I spoke to never spoke about the money—and that is why we were running an equal pay case—but always about their deep commitment to ensuring that the most vulnerable members of our community were supported, were empowered, that their voices were amplified and that they always knew that they were never ever alone.

In speaking in support of this bill today, I want to absolutely pay tribute to those workers. I also wanted to reflect on a group of workers that I met with just last week, together with the Hon. Tammy Franks, and a representative of the Hon. Connie Bonaros's office. They were workers who worked at the Department for Child Protection and a number of them were also social workers. My goodness, the issues that they raised with me and with the other members of parliament present were utterly alarming.

At the same time, again, I heard from those workers that deep commitment to wanting to work with and for the most vulnerable people and the most vulnerable children, in this case, in our state. They were absolutely extraordinary and it was a privilege to hear from them. It was alarming to hear from them and to hear about the issues that they were confronting but, as always, I felt deeply privileged to sit with them and to listen to them and to be inspired by their commitment to the people with whom they worked and worked for—and, again, that deep commitment to make a difference in people's lives. I found it utterly inspiring.

Unfortunately, there was another invitee to that particular forum, and that was the Minister for Child Protection, who was not present. I wish that she had been there to hear from those workers. I wish that she had shown up. I also really wish that she would show up on the issues that she spoke about when she started her speech before lunchtime today. We heard from the minister in relation to this bill a series of—I am not quite sure how to describe them—statements about what was happening in the Department for Child Protection.

As I said, I wish she would show up on those issues that are actually happening in the Department for Child Protection that those social workers and other workers in the Department for Child Protection have to front up and show up and deal with every single day, day in, day out, week after week, often in some cases decade after decade, and they continue to do so with that passion in their hearts to make a difference with and for the most vulnerable South Australian children.

What we heard from the minister before lunch was in stark and utter contrast to the sorts of issues that we know about, the systemic issues that continue to plague child protection: the fact that since coming into government, since this minister has been the Minister for Child Protection, around an additional 1,000 children are now in care in South Australia; the fact that two budgets ago, despite the fact that in a three-month period there were around 1,200 shifts in residential care that simply went uncovered, staff are absolutely crying out not to have to do the excessive overtime, crying out not to have to look after children on their laps in offices, crying out not to have to feel compromised in the way that they so desperately want to provide really great care but are so stretched in terms of the resources. I wish that the minister would show up on those issues also.

Despite all those issues, two budgets ago the budget showed that there was a \$10 million underspend in staffing. I know that in the minister's remarks she spoke about recruitment of staff into the Department for Child Protection. The sad fact, and one the minister just refuses to show up on, is that around 1,000 additional vulnerable children are now in care in South Australia and the recruitment of staff is absolutely nowhere near commensurate with what is required to enable those big-hearted staff to provide the best possible care that they can.

Another issue that was not mentioned in the minister's speech was that just last year around 10,000 missing person reports in relation to children in care were notified. Just last year, in a 12-month period 14,500 calls to the Child Abuse Report Line simply went unanswered. I think every South Australian would shudder to think what might have been missed when that phone just simply rang out, when it just simply went off to a voicemail or wherever it goes when it is just not answered.

I fervently wish that the minister had shown up and heard from these workers. I am not sure what her other commitments were, but I do wish that she could have been there. Most importantly, I

wish she would show up on these issues that are absolutely plaguing the child protection system. All those figures I just talked about represent vulnerable children who absolutely deserve better. I wish also that this minister would have shown up on this bill much, much earlier.

I think the member for Hurtle Vale has articulated very well the journey to get to this bill. She spoke about the committee, and she spoke about the length of time since the committee concluded its findings before we get to this point that we have a bill in front of us. That is because of other members of this house and absolutely the Hon. Tammy Franks and others who supported her in the upper house. I wish the minister also had shown up much earlier on this bill because I have many more things to say about it.

I have been committed to supporting social workers for a very long time. They do deserve for issues to be thoroughly explored in this place and for this bill to have progressed much earlier. I am glad it is here now. As the member for Hurtle Vale has spoken about, we will support the bill, but I think that these incredible South Australians deserve much better, both in terms of what they are dealing with in child protection and in terms of how this bill was actually progressed. With those remarks, I indicate again that we will be supporting this bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (18:08): I would not usually rise to make a contribution on a bill like this, and I do not propose to canvass the detail of the bill. Suffice to say, I think that all members of parliament support the establishment of this registration scheme and that by the end of this evening that work of this parliament will be done. The reason I am rising to speak is that I listened with interest to some of the comments made before lunch, by both the member for King and the member for Adelaide, about child protection here in South Australia.

I think all of us can realise that child protection remains one area of endeavour in South Australia that needs far more work, but the comments that came before lunch—namely, that the former Labor government did nothing about child protection—I find not just unnecessary but unnecessarily offensive, particularly to all of those people since the Layton report in 2003 who have dedicated their lives to trying, firstly, to broaden the recognition of child protection issues in South Australia and, secondly, actually do something about it.

It might be politically convenient for some people on any side of this debate to make broadbrush statements like that, but it is not only highly offensive to those people who work in child protection as social workers but I particularly want to say it is extremely offensive to those people who have been the victims of child abuse, including in state-run institutions and in other institutions, who have for the first time in their lives, usually after decades of deep-set and well-founded mistrust in institutions like government, taken the extraordinary step of stepping forward to tell their story.

Of course it is appropriate that we have a political debate about the merits of this legislation and that we reflect on what progress has been made, whether that progress has been adequate or not. I note, for example, that under the last term of the former Labor government an extra \$150 million a year was tipped in, and I pay due respect to the current government that a further \$150 million per year has been tipped in.

So let's end the needless politicisation about that element of child protection—the pretence that nothing has ever been done about this and the pretence about those people who dedicate their lives trying to improve the lot of children in state care or children who have suffered at the hands of people in government and other institutions of the most horrific child abuse that is imaginable. Let's move past that and start focusing on those areas that should make a difference to ensure that we can better protect children in the future, and this bill of course is just one part of that.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (18:11): I want to briefly thank the contributors at the second reading stage and comment very quickly on some of the statements made by the minister in her speech. I call out the statement that she has acted swiftly. This would have to be one of the slowest movements of a bill that was gifted that I have seen. I do not think that tricks anybody and I do not think it assists her at all in gaining the respect of social workers in regard to that commentary.

As I stated previously before we broke, when I made my initial speech, when we had our briefing the staff from the minister's office did not even know there was a bill, and that bill was tabled after much hard work. I think it is a bit cute for the minister to come out and have a crack at 16 years of Labor not acting on something they were never acting on, which was state-based registration of social workers. The previous minister, Jack Snelling, did attempt to do this in the fashion that was

recommended, and that was at a commonwealth level, so it is a bit cute to make those accusations. I want to point that out and call out the minister for saying she acted swiftly because I do not believe she did. I do believe she wants this to happen and I really do not know why it did not happen earlier.

Thank you to the member for Reynell, the shadow spokesperson for child protection, who is doing her very best to hold the minister to account by meeting with stakeholders and bringing some of those stories of stark reality into this house of parliament, which would otherwise not occur. Thank you to the member for Lee, whose relative was mentioned in the minister's speech as well. I thank him for his contribution and I commend the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call an additional member to speak, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Tammy Franks and also representatives from the Australian Association of Social Workers—amongst them, their chief executive officer, Cindy Smith. I also acknowledge the presence of Belinda Valentine and Rachel Reilly.

Bills

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

New clauses 10A and 10B.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I move:

Amendment No 1 [ChildPro-1]—

Page 8, after line 6—Insert:

10A—Delegation

- (1) The Board may delegate a function or power under this Act (other than a prescribed function or power)—
 - (a) to a member of the Board; or
 - (b) to a committee established by the Board; or
 - (c) to a specified body or person (including a person for the time being holding or acting in a specified office or position).
- (2) A delegation under this section—
 - (a) must be by instrument in writing; and
 - (b) may be absolute or conditional; and
 - (c) does not derogate from the ability of the Board to act in any matter; and
 - (d) is revocable at will.
- (3) A function or power delegated under this section may, if the instrument of delegation so provides, be further delegated.

10B—Committees

- (1) The Board may establish committees—
 - (a) to advise the Board; or
 - (b) to carry out functions on behalf of the Board.
- (2) The membership of a committee will be determined by the Board and include at least 1 member of the Board.
- (3) The Board will determine who will be the presiding member of a committee.

- (4) The procedures to be observed in relation to the conduct of the business of a committee will be—
- (a) as determined by the Board; and
 - (b) insofar as a procedure is not determined under paragraph (a)—as determined by the committee.

Ms COOK: I have a brief comment on the amendment. The original amendment, in the form that it was tabled, at this point would have meant that these committees were formed with any people. This is why we did not agree to it in the other place. It had no prescriptive in terms of ensuring that there were registered social workers or someone representing the board on those committees.

With the work that has been done behind the scenes, again I thank the Hon. Tammy Franks and her staff member, Malwina Wyra, for ensuring that the Australian Association of Social Workers has a bill that is actually workable, because this amendment now stipulates there must be somebody from the board represented on those committees. So I thank those people for ensuring that this is in fact a workable clause.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, could you explain exactly the intent of your amendment?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The intent of the amendment is that every time there is work to be done, the entire committee does not have to come together, and to bring this into line with the national standards of other very similar committees, so a subcommittee can be made.

Ms HILDYARD: Supplementary: when you speak of work to be done, what sort of work would you envisage that particular subcommittee or committee would undertake?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This was to standardise it because, as we know, we are all in agreement that we want a national scheme. In order to have a national scheme, why not have best practice in your standard bill, which could be your exemplar bill? We have brought this into line with other committees.

They could investigate whatever they wanted, but what it would be is they do not have to have a quorum and bring the whole committee together every time they want to do a different side project. It is really just to bring it into line.

Ms COOK: I am sorry, I now do want some clarity as to what this subcommittee or these committees can actually do. What powers will they have?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I can read out the amendment if you like:

- (1) The Board may delegate a function or power under this Act (other than a prescribed function or power)—
 - (a) to a member of the Board; or
 - (b) to a committee established by the Board; or
 - (c) to a specified body or person (including a person for the time being holding or acting in a specified office or position).
- (2) A delegation under this section—
 - (a) must be by instrument in writing; and
 - (b) may be absolute or conditional; and
 - (c) does not derogate from the ability of the Board to act in any matter; and
 - (d) is revocable at will.
- (3) A function or power delegated under this section may, if the instrument of delegation so provides, be further delegated.

I can continue reading, but really it is self-explanatory and it just brings it into line and it is to make it national.

Ms HILDYARD: I have a similar question to one I asked before. I just want to understand what the minister understands such a committee that is delegated to perform a particular function—I think you spoke about it as a special project. What sorts of things do you, as the Minister for Child Protection, envisage that this committee might look at? What side projects, as you spoke about them, what sorts of things would this subcommittee or this person, what functions would they undertake?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As it clearly states here in 10B—Committees:

- (1) The Board may establish committees—
 - (a) to advise the Board; or
 - (b) to carry out functions on behalf of the Board.
- (2) The membership of a committee will be determined by the Board and include at least 1 member of the Board.
- (3) The Board will determine who will be the presiding member of a committee.
- (4) The procedures to be observed in relation to the conduct of the business of a committee will be—
 - (a) as determined by the Board; and
 - (b) insofar as a procedure is not determined under paragraph (a)—as determined by the committee.

We were, of course, doing this in the fastest way possible. I even tabled my own speech because we have the members of the AASW here, so I wish that we could get this through.

Ms COOK: Absolutely. It is only 20 past six—it is not really like we are up until midnight. The questions are pertaining to the work of the committee so that we can be confident we are passing an amendment into this bill that is workable and doing something and making sense.

If I can be helpful, I would think that potentially the board may decide that they want to increase the scope of training or professional development, or there might be some thin markets and they might want to target some education. That is what I was expecting you might come up with in terms of a reason for you wanting this within the bill. I do not have a problem with it, but I was hoping to get some further examples, that is all.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: If I had read out the 16 minutes left of my speech, I would have actually said all these answers. In the timeliness, I chose not to because we know we have got people here and this is an important bill that we all wanted to get through, I thought. However, if you are not agreeing to the amendment, I am happy to extinguish it.

The amendments that were made to the bill that was tabled as a result of the committee that the member for Hurtle Vale and myself were both on that the Hon. Tammy Franks tabled in parliament were amendments made not on a political basis but by my department in order to make this an exemplar piece of legislation so that, if we are able to negotiate and help convince all of the other states' ministers—which, I might say, I have tried several times. There was zero interest from all the DCP ministers.

However, for two decades the AASW has been working hard on this and I am hopeful that they will work hard to convince the health ministers. The health ministers have been a bit busy for the last two years managing a pandemic, so I have been trying to lobby for this and advocate for this at my CSM meetings, of which we have had many because of COVID.

There have been lots of ministerial meetings and I have raised this on several occasions. There are three new ministers, so I had hoped that in the new year, should I win the election and be honoured again to be the minister, I would pursue this again in government. In order to do that, I want a national scheme.

We have tried to adjust this, not for any political reasons. I am not wedded to this. If you have a problem with it, let's drop it. This was something that my department came up with. They looked at it and they wanted to standardise it. They had the agreement of the AASW. They had the agreement, we thought, of Labor. We had the agreement of the Greens. I am not sure why you are needing to ask so many questions.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Members, we have had three contributions from the member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Reynell on the amendments.

Ms COOK: I just point out that we are agreeing with it. It is not that we do not agree with it.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): I think that will become very evident very quickly, potentially in the next 10 seconds.

New clauses inserted.

Remaining clauses (11 to 67) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (18:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Thank you to members for participating in the debate and, again, to the committee members who have brought this forward, and to the Hon. Tammy Franks for presenting the bill and for being so persistent in getting this done. Thank you for government time so that we can make sure that we do this before parliament ends so it does not sit at No. 5,323 on the Private Members, Bills, and languish into nothing.

It is a very important piece of legislation. I look forward to reading the detail in your tabled speech in regard to the work of the committees that have been generated out of the amendments, as you have indicated is in there. Without further ado, I commend the bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

AQUACULTURE (TOURISM DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG DRIVING AND CARELESS OR DANGEROUS DRIVING) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

HOLIDAYS (CHRISTMAS DAY) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Legislative Council requested that a conference may be granted to it respecting a certain amendment to the bill. In the event of a conference being agreed to, the Legislative Council would be represented thereat by five managers.

At 18:30 the house adjourned until Wednesday 1 December 2021 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***LAND TAX**

789 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (23 September 2021). As at 22 September 2021, how many landowners have applied for land tax relief under the land tax transition fund:

- (a) How many have been approved?
- (b) What is the total value of the approved relief?
- (c) How many people have applied for land tax deferrals?
- (d) What is the value of these deferrals?

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

As at 12 November 2021:

There have been 146 land tax transition fund applications approved and processed for the 2020-21 financial year.

The total value of ex gratia journals processed for these 146 applications is \$1,071,802.26.

The land tax transition fund provides relief to taxpayers who have had an increase in their 2020-21, 2021-22 or 2022-23 land tax assessment as a result of the changes to aggregation which came into effect from the 2020-21 land tax year (subject to certain criteria). The transition fund provides actual relief/reduction in a taxpayer's liability, not a deferral of a tax liability.

As part of the government's response to COVID-19, a separate measure allowing businesses and individuals to defer land tax payments was introduced. Taxpayers paying land tax quarterly in 2019-20 could choose to defer their third and fourth 2019-20 quarterly instalment payments for up to six months from the due date of the third instalment. This was available to all taxpayers and they did not need to apply for the relief.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

814 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). What was the number of hours of transfer of care delay for SA Ambulance for the months of August 2021, September 2021 and October 2021?

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

Transfer of care data is released throughout the year.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

815 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). What was the percentage of ambulances that had a transfer of care delay of over 30 minutes, for each month from March 2018 to September 2021?

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

Transfer of care data is released throughout the year.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

816 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). What percentage of priority 3 SA Ambulance call-outs were responded to within 30 minutes for each of the past three financial years?

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

SAAS performance against its key performance indicators is published periodically.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

817 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). What was the average response time for priority 3 ambulance call-outs over each of the past three financial years?

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

SAAS performance against its key performance indicators is published periodically.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

818 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). What was the percentage of priority 1 ambulance call-outs responded to on time, broken down by month, for the past three financial years?

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

SAAS performance against its key performance indicators is published periodically.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

819 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). What was the percentage of priority 2 ambulance call-outs responded to on time, broken down by month, for the past three financial years?

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

SAAS performance against its key performance indicators is published periodically.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

820 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). How many emergency department presentations spent more than 24 hours in the emergency department in the financial years of 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21?

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

Data on emergency department performance is published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and reported in real time on the SA Health Emergency Department Dashboard.

CHEMOTHERAPY

827 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). How many chemotherapy treatment spaces are there in the public health system, broken down by each individual site, and how many occasions of service were delivered at each site last financial year?

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

During the 2020-21 financial year, a total of 47,997 occasions of service were delivered where the primary reason for attendance was to administer chemotherapy, through 143 chemotherapy treatment spaces across the seven metropolitan public hospitals and ten large regional public hospitals.

Hospital	Number of Chemotherapy Treatment Spaces	Occasions of Service Delivered in 2020-21
Central Adelaide Local Health Network		
Royal Adelaide Hospital	34	15,930
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	13	4,284
Northern Adelaide Local Health Network		
Lyell McEwin Hospital	12	8,889
Modbury Hospital	0	
Southern Adelaide Local Health Network		
Flinders Medical Centre	19	10,034
Noarlunga Health Service	0	
Women's and Children's Health Network		
Women's and Children's Hospital	18	1,664
Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network		
Gawler Health Service	4	111
Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital	3	176
Southern Fleurieu Health Service	5	778
Eyre and Far North Local Health Network		
Port Lincoln Hospital and Health Service	4	403
Flinders and Upper North Local Health Network		
Port Augusta Hospital	6	309
Whyalla Hospital	6	1,854
Limestone Coast Local Health Network		
Mount Gambier and Districts Health Service	6	1,921
Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network		
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital	4	212
Riverland General Hospital	4	550
Yorke and Northern Local Health Network		
Port Pirie Regional Health Service	5	882

A further 277 occasions of service were delivered in 2020-21 where the primary reason for attendance was to administer chemotherapy, across eight smaller regional public hospitals.

VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

831 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). Across the Department for Health and Wellbeing and all Local Health Networks, how many voluntary separation redundancies have been accepted from 18 March 2018 to 13 October 2021, broken down by classification of employee?

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

September-October 2021 data has not yet been verified and so the question cannot be answered at this time.

VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

832 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). Across the Department for Health and Wellbeing and all local health networks, what is the total cost of all voluntary separation redundancies from 18 March 2018 to 13 October 2021?

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

September-October 2021 data has not yet been verified and so the question cannot be answered at this time.

SA HEALTH

833 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). What is the total cost of all preventive health social marketing (not related to COVID-19) for each year from 2018-19 to 2020-21 and what is budgeted for 2021-22?

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

SA Health is a diverse organisation and each year various parts of SA Health undertake initiatives, including preventative health social marketing.

HOSPITAL BEDS

835 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 October 2021). On average, in 2020-21, how many hospital medical beds have been unoccupied in the midnight census for the following hospitals: RAH, QEH, FMC and Modbury?

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

During the 2020-21 financial year, on average, the following number of hospital medical beds were unoccupied in a midnight census:

Financial Year	Average Unoccupied Beds
RAH	26.66
QEH	3.13
FMC	33.80
MPH	3.35

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (26 October 2021).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

In October 2020 the government approved a further \$18,000,000 in funding to be allocated to the Home Battery Scheme.

As at the end of the audit period, 30 June 2021, of the \$118,000,000 a total of \$40,184,000 was unexpended.

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (26 October 2021).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

In October 2020 the government approved a further \$18,000,000 in funding to be allocated to the Home Battery Scheme, increasing the scheme to \$118,000,000.

The remaining \$40,184,000 of the \$118,000,000 is expected to be expended as follows:

	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24	FY2024-25
Home Battery Scheme	19,184,000	6,500,000	6,710,000	7,790,000

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (26 October 2021).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

Based on the current uptake rate we are forecasting to reach 280 megawatt hours of storage by December 2022, the original storage target based on 40,000 batteries at seven kilowatt hours.

The 2021 State Budget included an additional \$18,000,000 to support South Australian home owners to continue to install larger capacity batteries while delivering the government's commitment for 40,000 subsidised battery systems. Our modelling forecasts these will be committed by December 2025.

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (26 October 2021).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining):
I have been advised:

The Department for Energy and Mining paid a total of \$310,191 as retention allowances to 14 non-executive employees of the Department during the 2020-21 financial year.

TEMPORARY GENERATORS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (26 October 2021).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining):
I have been advised:

Under the short-term capacity contract between the Minister for Energy and Mining and SA Power Networks, the Department for Energy and Mining continued to incur costs associated with the operations of the temporary generators in FY 2020-21. The costs totalled \$9.42 million, which I can confirm is made up of:

- \$9.28 million in payments to SA Power Networks for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the gas turbine and generators; and
- \$140,000 in legal fees associated with leasing the gas turbine and generators to Nexif and Iberdrola (formerly Infigen Energy).

Included in the SA Power Network payments of \$9.28 million is the continuation of the site lease at temporary generator north site (Elizabeth) of \$32,283 per month until the gas turbine and generators are relocated to the permanent home at Snapper Point and the site is rehabilitated and handed back to the landlord (Pelligra).

Costs incurred by the department are recovered under a memorandum of administrative agreement with the state-owned generator leasing company.

PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONS DEPARTMENT

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (28 October 2021).

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):
Department of Primary Industries and Regions FTEs are split into the following locations.

LOCATION	FTE
CBD	193.86
Non-CBD Metro	409.03
Far North	8.53
Limestone coast	38.51
Eyre Peninsula	46.33
Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island	20.12
Yorke and Mid North	50.9
Barossa, Gawler, Light and Adelaide Plains	11
Murraylands and Riverland	42.42
FTE Total	831.7