

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 1 December 2021

The SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan) took the chair at 10:30 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.

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

The SPEAKER: Attention has been drawn to the state of the chamber. A quorum not being present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

HOLIDAYS (CHRISTMAS DAY) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (10:35): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council granting a conference as requested by the council; and that the time and place for holding it be the Kingston Room at 4pm today; and that Mr Brown, Mr Szakacs, Mr Bell, the Hon. J.B. Teague and Mr Murray be the managers on the part of this house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (10:35): I move an amendment to the motion:

That Mr Murray be replaced by the member for Florey, Ms Bedford.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 19
Noes 22
Majority 3

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Wortley, D.

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

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Bell, T.S.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Gee, J.P.
Cowdrey, M.J.

Pederick, A.S.

Szakacs, J.K.

Amendment thus negated; motion carried.

*Parliamentary Procedure***STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (10:43): I move:

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

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required. A majority being present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

*Bills***ELECTRICITY CORPORATIONS (RESTRUCTURING AND DISPOSAL) (RATES) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (10:44): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 1999. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (10:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to correct a 20-year mistake, and the mechanism for this correction is my fair rates and electricity generators bill. As we will see, this mistake has made a significant impact on the councils and communities in my part of regional South Australia. My bill will deliver a significant boost to regional South Australia, including the opportunity to create up to 43 additional full-time jobs in regional communities—all this, and it will not cost the Treasurer a cent.

My bill amends the Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal) Act which, for today's purposes, I will call the ECRD Act. The ECRD Act regulates the calculation of council rates on land used for electricity generation. It currently does two things that need to be addressed: first, when calculating the value of land, it prevents the taking into account of an electricity generating plant. This reduces the capital value of the land and reduces the council rates that are levied for that property.

Secondly, the ECRD Act also enables the Governor to make proclamations to reduce—and only reduce—council rates on land used for electricity generation. Once one of these proclamations has been made to reduce council rates it cannot be revoked, and that is partly why we are here today dealing with this issue in parliament. These provisions are currently set out in schedule 1, section 3 of the ECRD Act.

How did this all come about? Why is it that the electricity generator sector is entitled to discounted council rates that most businesses are not entitled to? To answer those questions we need to turn our minds back to the late 1990s, when the state government was privatising the state's electricity infrastructure.

The theory was that the more attractive the asset the more it could be sold for. To inflate the potential sale price, prospective buyers were offered a discount on future council rates. What happened then was an attempt to raise more money for the state government by giving away local

government money. What is the local government sector getting out of this? Well, nothing, as far as anyone can see.

Whilst electricity generator companies are not paying their fair share of rates, councils are still required to provide the services. Roads, bridges and other infrastructure need to be built and maintained. I am told that in the Regional Council of Goyder a 100-tonne crane used to maintain wind farms travels around from property to property within the council area to service the huge wind turbines. As vehicles of this sort travel around they do enormous damage to country roads, and councils have to fix these roads.

Informing my views on these issues, I have been assisted by research by independent consultants the AEC Group, who are experts in the resources, energy and infrastructure industries. In February 2020, the AEC Group published their report, Rating Equity in SA and the Financial Impacts on Local Government's Ability to Support Growth. This independent research report found:

- Ignoring financing costs, South Australian council rates account for less than 0.1 per cent of infrastructure life-cycle costs of electricity generators. Council rates are a marginal component of costs.
- The two main factors influencing the location of new energy generation plants are the proximity of sources of power and access to the national electricity grid.
- Council rates have next to no bearing on where energy companies choose to invest. Over the past decade, there has been significant investment in new energy generation in Australia. This investment has taken place in states where electricity generators pay full council rates and in South Australia, where they do not.
- The competitiveness of South Australian regions in attracting renewable energy developments will not be impacted by the introduction of standard levels of council rates, particularly if rates levied are comparable with Victoria.
- If energy generation companies paid their full share of rates, this could create up to 43 additional full-time equivalent jobs in regional South Australia.
- Energy companies sell power into the national grid. Because of the nature of the national energy market, each generator is a price taker. If their costs, such as the cost of council rates, increase, energy generator companies are unable to pass this cost on to local consumers.

What that research means is that council rates have a marginal or negligible impact on the bottom line of energy companies. That means the offer of cheap council rates back in 1999 probably had no impact on the sale price of South Australia's electricity assets. What that also means is that regional councils have been forced to forgo tens of millions of legitimate revenue based on flawed policy reasoning. What a waste!

Over the past 20 years, when councils have expressed concern about the mandatory rates discount, governments of the day have expressed concern about the impact on investment. The AEC report completely debunks that theory. I support new energy investment in regional South Australia. The independent research demonstrates why my bill will have no impact one way or the other on this investment.

What I am yet to hear is any argument justifying the retention of rating restrictions in the ECRD Act. What policy objectives does this further? Why should other South Australians pay higher rates so that electricity generators can have their discount? By contrast, my bill is based firmly on a number of clear principles, and I want to set these principles out for the record. These principles are, in fact, the state government's own principles for better regulation which, in turn, are based on COAG's best practice regulation principles:

1. 'There should be a clear case for action before addressing a problem.' As I have outlined today, no-one can articulate the purpose or policy objectives behind the current rating restrictions in the ECRD Act.

2. 'Government action should be effective and proportional to the issue being addressed.' Again, there does not appear to be any analysis as to whether the rating restriction is doing anyone any good. When it comes to proportionality, it is very difficult to imagine that giving

away \$4.8 million each year is a proportionate response to any issue. This looks like a completely disproportionate response to me.

3. 'Ensuring that regulation remains relevant and effective over time.' This is another principle that seems to have been ignored. The purpose of the restriction may have been to help privatise South Australia's electricity infrastructure in the 1990s. However, most energy generators operating in South Australia were not even around in 1999. These companies are getting a rates discount that was not even intended to apply to them. That is why my bill will only apply to those companies who obtained their Electricity Act licence after the commencement of the ECRD Act.

Turning to the operation of my bill, this bill does four things:

1. The current ECRD Bill provides that, when valuing the land for the purposes of assessing council rates, electricity generation plant is not to be taken into account. That assessment process is different from the way almost all other land in South Australia is valued for the purpose of assessing council rates. My bill would enable electricity generation plant to be taken into account in valuing the land.

2. Schedule 1 of the ECRD also empowers the Governor to make proclamations reducing council rates on land used for electricity generation. The Governor did make such proclamations back in 2000. The schedule says that once made these proclamations cannot be rescinded. This is one of the reasons we are dealing with this problem through amendment to the legislation today. My bill will rescind proclamations made by the Governor pursuant to schedule 1 of the ECRD Act.

3. My bill will also prevent the Governor making any more of these ECRD Act proclamations.

4. My bill also deals with the specific situation where electricity generation plant (for example, a wind turbine) is situated within a larger piece of land (for example, a farm). It is not my intention for the farmer to be out of pocket. What my bill says is that if a parcel of land:

- (a) Is occupied by the holder of a licence pursuant to the Electricity Act 1996; and
- (b) Is used for the generation of electricity—

then that smaller piece of land will be separately assessed for council rates. The electricity generator will be deemed to be the principal ratepayer. The farmer will remain the principal ratepayer for the balance of the land and the farmer will not face an increase in their rates as a consequence of part of the land being used for electricity generation.

In fact, because in my example parcels of land may be carved out of a farm, the farmer will only be liable for rates in respect of the balance of the land. If the value of the farmer's assessable land is reduced because someone else is paying for it, then his rates will be reduced.

This arrangement is very similar to the rating arrangement in place for telecommunications towers. Section 154 of the Local Government Act already permits apportionment of rates for certain activities on land. It is common, I am told, for a separate rate to be applied in relation to the communication tower in a manner that does not increase the rates for the owner of the land.

Whilst my bill amends a section of a different act and the mechanism is slightly different, the same principle is involved. Importantly, my bill does not interfere with the commercial arrangements made between landlords and tenants, between licensors and licensees, or indeed any other commercial arrangements in place.

In consulting on my bill, the question has come up: if councils collectively had this extra \$4.8 million a year, what would they do? I have had some feedback on that issue. These options include reducing the rates burden on other ratepayers. One of the achievements of this parliament has been to pass local government legislation in an almost bipartisan way that will have the effect of reducing pressure on council rates. My bill is another such measure. If the energy generator sector pays its fair share, this will reduce the rates burden disproportionately borne by other ratepayers for the past 20 years.

The AEC group report found that if councils retained the extra funds this could create an additional 43 FTE jobs in regional South Australia. Those jobs would enable councils to provide additional services to local communities. Councils could ensure that they had sufficient funds to repair and maintain critical infrastructure, which they do not at the moment. I am also aware that many councils are facing increasing pressure to spend scarce funds on their infrastructure: roads, footpaths, bridges, buildings, stormwater systems and jetties. This local infrastructure is often ageing and in need of major repairs.

Ultimately, if my bill finds support there would be decisions for local councils to make after they have consulted with their local communities, but these would be good problems for a council to have. Councils will have greater capacity, without needing to inconvenience the majority of their ratepayers.

I would like to summarise my bill by setting out what it is not. This bill is not anti electricity generator. This bill merely ends a 20-year rates holiday enjoyed by the energy sector. I am a great supporter of investment in regional South Australia and also a great supporter of new investment by energy generators. What I do not support is one type of business having an unfair tax or rates advantage over others, unless there are compelling reasons.

This bill is not anti renewable energy. This bill applies to all generators who obtained their licence pursuant to the Electricity Act 1996 after the commencement of the ECRD Act. It applies to some renewable generators. It applies to some fossil fuel generators. My bill is neutral as to the source of energy, and that is how it should be. This country needs better laws and policies to meet Australia's energy needs, but council rates are not the forum for solving these issues.

This bill has no impact on land used for transmission of electricity. Lots of land in South Australia has electricity wires overhead or wires underground. Some land has easements to facilitate transmission of electricity. My bill will only have an impact if the land in question is used for the generation of electricity and the land is occupied by the holder of a licence pursuant to the Electricity Act.

My bill does not act retrospectively. It will apply to rate assessments issued after commencement. Rates notices will continue to be issued in accordance with the Valuer-General's official valuation of the land at the time of the council's rates declaration. My bill does not interfere with any commercial arrangements between the owners and users of land. Rather, my bill simply imposes a revised obligation on electricity generators to pay rates to their council.

This bill is not anti or pro privatisation. I have mentioned privatisation merely to give this house some historical context about how the ECRD Act came into being and why we now need a bill to correct this mistake. Finally, I would like to thank the mayors, the elected members and the chief executives of the Legatus Group of councils, who have clearly articulated the issues to me and the impacts on their councils. I am also grateful to the South Australian Regional Organisation of Councils (SAROC) for proposing a legal solution. Thanks also to Simon Millcock, CEO of the Legatus Group, and Andrew Lamb of the Local Government Association for their assistance in this. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

SHERIFF'S (APPOINTMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (11:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Sheriff's Act 1978. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (11:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill results from the report of the Inquiry into the State Courts Administration Council—Sheriff's Office by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee and tabled in parliament in November 2020. It is called the SARC report.

This bill encompasses measures to address longstanding issues raised in the SARC report and also to provide elements of the systemic framework for the current management and its successors to establish and maintain the fair, safe and respectful workplace which all Courts Administration Authority (CAA) employees, not just those of the Sheriff's Office, deserve and are entitled to. To that end, this bill complements the proposed amendments to the Courts Administration (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2021 currently before the house.

Repeal of section 6(2)—Deputy sheriffs and sheriff's officers, section 6 requires that all Deputy Sheriffs and Sheriff's Officers will be employed under the Courts Administration Act 1993. They are appointed by the State Courts Administrator (the Administrator) under section 21—Other staff, and all employees including the Sheriff are under the control and management of the Administrator under section 17—Functions and powers of Administrator. Yet section 6(2) of the Sheriffs Act 1978 effectively gives the Sheriff, a subordinate employee of the Administrator, the power of approval or veto over the appointment, reduction in status or dismissal of any Sheriff's Officer.

This subsection is in direct conflict with the Administrator's powers and accountable responsibilities as chief executive under the Courts Administration Act 1993. Together with section 6(3) as set out below, this has arguably had the effect of frustrating the Administrator's ability to intervene in matters within the Sheriff's Office and also has arguably contributed to the events and actions covered in the SARC report.

I must admit that the report highlighted lots and lots of issues in the Sheriff's Office across all of regional South Australia and inside the metropolitan area, and I think it is time that we change these rules. This legislative conflict is unacceptable by the modern standards and expectations of effective and accountable public administration and cannot be allowed to stand. In addition, this power is no longer necessary or desirable in the current day where prerequisite requirements for all public sector recruitment are governed by the Premier's direction on recruitment, albeit excepting the Courts Administration Authority.

Notwithstanding, the reasonable expectation would be that the Administrator, as chief executive and employer, would prudently adopt these requirements as a minimum standard—PSA without prejudice on 11 November 2021.

As in any field of operation, the Sheriff as manager will be included in the process of appointing or dismissing Sheriff's Officers or appropriate involvement in other employment matters relating to them, but such involvement and the extent of it will probably be at the behest of the Administrator, as chief executive.

Repeal of this subsection in no way derogates from the Sheriff's ability to carry out his responsibilities under the Sheriff's Act 1978 part 3—Security and order at courts and other places, including section 9D—Arrangements under which police officers may exercise powers of security officers.

The other part is amendment to section 6(3)—Deputy sheriffs and sheriff's officers. This amendment will enable the Sheriff to continue to respond to the changing operational needs of any particular participating body or court in a timely and effective manner, whilst also enabling the administrator to ensure that such recruitment and deployment is undertaken in a proper manner.

The Administrator will now be in a position to oversight any such appointments and ensure that, where necessary, merit-based selection—I repeat: merit-based selection—processes are properly undertaken by selection panels with representations from both within and external to the Sheriff's Office, and from the human resources function and that the delegate for approval of the panel's recommendation is always external.

These selection arrangements are standard in many public sector agencies and ought to be applied across the CAA. The decision to extend the term of an appointment, that is, without a merit-based process, is properly a decision only for the administrator. In conclusion, workplace culture only changes from the top. Culture only changes when the rules and not just the policies of the day or the people are changed, and culture only changes when the rules apply and are seen to be applied to all.

When I reported this issue to the particular committee of the Legislative Council, the upper house, I heard such traumatic and harrowing stories from sheriffs and others that I took it upon myself to do two things: make some amendments to the courts administration authority bill, which is before the house at the moment, and also make changes to the Sheriff's Act. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (INQUIRY INTO FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:08): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this legislation is to ensure the children and families involved in foster and kinship care in South Australia are receiving the best services and support from the state government. Foster and kinship carers are the backbone of the child protection system, caring for approximately 4,000 children in this state.

The bill seeks to establish an independent inquiry into foster and kinship care in South Australia to review the adequacy of existing complaints mechanisms, consultation processes, internal processes and arrangements within the department, and documentation and information held by the department. The bill intends to establish an independent inquiry into foster and kinship care in South Australia to review:

- complaints mechanisms in the Department for Child Protection;
- consultation processes between the department, foster and kinship carers, as well as other relevant people and organisations;
- documentation and information held by the DCP;
- internal processes and arrangements within the DCP and other persons and bodies to examine that there is a sound partnership with foster and kinship carers; and
- ensure that the rights of children in foster and kinship care are realised, respected and addressed.

It must be a sensitive inquiry due to the nature of the matters being discussed, especially protecting the identity of the children in care, and led by a person such as retired Coroner Mark Johns.

The inquiry will run for a duration of six months and will report to the relevant minister, who must table a copy of the report with both houses of parliament. In addition, the inquiry will identify the needs and concerns of carers, and how carers can be better supported in order to achieve better outcomes for children under the guardianship of the chief executive by making recommendations to improve the current relationship between foster and kinship carers and the state government. The timing of the report will coincide with the review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act, scheduled for October 2022.

When drafting this legislation, the Hon. John Darley MLC consulted with a key advocacy group of foster and kinship carers. During consultation, concerns were raised over what has been occurring in the foster and kinship care sector. The carers in this group are adamant this inquiry will allow for the voices of carers to be heard and provide them with protection from repercussions. Many individuals have reached out to my electorate office and myself personally to demonstrate support of the passage of this bill through the house today. They feel current mechanisms are not working.

Carers believe they are not currently being treated impartially and/or fairly when making complaints and this is affecting the retention of carers. They are concerned their voices will not be heard in the legislative review next year and, as such, an independent inquiry is needed ahead of the legislative review.

No-one disputes the need for delivering the best outcome for children in care. A positive and supportive system of true partnership between carers and the government is essential for achieving

these outcomes, and I hope that this inquiry will deliver the critical information for a truly effective framework to achieve this.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:12): Thank you very much to the member for Florey and, I understand, the member for Waite, who have assisted in bringing this bill into this place. I also thank the Hon. John Darley for preparing this bill for progression through the upper house and I also thank the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Clare Scriven, who helped to progress this bill, together with others in the upper house for Labor.

I have now been the shadow minister for child protection for around 15 months. I am very pleased to undertake that role because I have a lifelong, very deep commitment to ensuring that every child in South Australia is enabled to physically, mentally, emotionally and socially thrive. I have a great deal of respect for those who work in the sector, trying to advance that interest. I have a great deal of respect for foster carers who open their hearts and homes to children, some of the most vulnerable children in South Australia, and I have a great deal of respect for families who are doing what they can to strengthen their family and rebuild their family after some difficult circumstances. I care deeply about the journey of those children in care who are amongst the most vulnerable children in our state.

I know the member for Florey touched on the Children and Young People (Safety) Act, and I want to reflect on the passage of that act because it is very pertinent in terms of where this bill brings us to today. Belatedly, at the end of last year, the minister brought forward a bill to this house that was a review of that act, and Labor put forward multiple amendments to that bill. We did so because we had had countless stakeholders and countless community members approach us to voice their concerns with the content of that bill and some very serious omissions from that bill.

In good faith, as we should always do, we very carefully listened to those stakeholders and, again, I was incredibly impressed with all those stakeholders in terms of their commitment to working with and for the most vulnerable children in our state and their commitment to supporting and empowering them however they could.

On the basis of what they spoke about with me, we put forward a number of amendments—really, really important amendments—that included ensuring that Aboriginal children, families and communities' voices would be empowered and amendments that focused on a range of things to ensure there was fairness in the child protection system for all who engage with it.

One of those very important amendments was a very simple amendment, and that was an amendment to insert a clause to ensure there was procedural fairness available to foster and kinship carers in all of their dealings with the Department for Child Protection. Various bodies, including Connecting Foster and Kinship Carers and the Carers Project, advocated very strongly around those amendments and rightly Labor responded, because we know the work that foster and kinship carers do with and for vulnerable children in our state and we also know, because we have deeply listened to them, that they collectively are deeply frustrated about the way they are treated by the system.

Both the Carers Project and Connecting Foster and Kinship Carers have done extensive surveys of foster carers and, frankly, have come up with some highly alarming commentary about the way they are treated by the child protection system. Those survey results are available, and I would urge every member in this house, if they have not done so already, to consider those reports because, frankly, they are alarming.

Also alarming is the number of foster and kinship carers who come to my office echoing the sentiments in those reports. Almost daily, I have foster and kinship carers speaking with myself and my office about their frustrations with the department.

We thought the amendment we moved for procedural fairness was a very, very sensible one that would have gone some way to making sure that foster and kinship carers knew that they were being heard and that their concerns were being taken seriously. Sadly, the minister refused to accept that amendment and when this amendment was moved again in the upper house, alongside a number of other amendments focused on making sure we have the best possible system in which people's voices are heard and acted upon and that enable children to emotionally, physically and socially thrive, sadly, the bill simply stalled altogether.

Hence, it is my understanding that that is one of the reasons that the Hon. John Darley, who has also clearly heard from these foster and kinship carers, has brought this bill forward to make sure that we can have the fairness, the procedures that work and the listening that foster and kinship carers so passionately want and so absolutely deserve in our system.

So I am proud to support this bill. I think it is a great pity that we could not progress amendments that would have provided foster and kinship carers with the fairness they deserve and need via the many other opportunities that were available through this house and the upper house, but here we are. I support this bill, Labor supports this bill, and we will certainly look forward through the inquiry to continue to closely hear from and act on the wishes of foster and kinship carers.

In closing, can I say thank you to every single one of them who opens their hearts and their homes to children in our state and to the courageous advocates who speak for them so passionately.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the minister, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Belinda Valentine and Joyce Woody.

Bills

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (INQUIRY INTO FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (11:20): This is obviously a very important topic, and one that is very close to my heart. In opposition, I was the shadow minister for four years and I had literally hundreds of foster carers and parents and people come to my office who were very dismayed with the whole child protection system. It was through the leadership of Steven Marshall and the Liberal Party at that time that we determined we would have a sole minister in charge of the department, and the department would be completely separate so that we could focus on reforming and making the changes that were needed.

To remind the opposition—because they seem to forget—there was inquiry after inquiry, coronial inquest after inquest and there were endless pieces of information.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Coming into government, I could have called a royal commission, I could have wasted more money and called another royal commission, but what we know is we already have a lot of the recommendations.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There have been endless royal commissions. Right back in 2003, when Robyn Layton reported, many of the same themes were documented: the toxic culture, the cover-up and the abuse of power. Labor had 16 years to make their changes and they failed to do so.

The same things were raised again and again in 2008—or 2006, I think it was—with the two Mullighan inquiries, then we had the Debelle inquiry into the education department and the Nyland royal commission. What I am saying is that on coming into government I could have had another inquiry, but we did not because we were very aware of all the things that needed to be changed. We had a single minister dedicated to changing this system, and that is exactly what we have done. We have worked tirelessly to change this system.

There are foster carers, like Joyce Woody and Lisa O'Malley, and a few who have been around for many years as foster carers, and many of the issues they are raising are historical issues that occurred under the former government. Not all of them have been resolved, I acknowledge that,

but we are making significant inroads. As far as foster carers go, the very first thing I did was to announce foster care and kinship care payments to age 21. Belinda Valentine was there; she has been at press conferences with me, but I think it was Nina Weston who stood with me when we announced that. We thought, 'How do we support carers more? What can we do?', and that was the first thing we did.

We also thought we could support our carers and our young people more by actually filling the long-held 274 vacancies that existed in the department when Labor were in office. We broadened the qualifications, we hired more staff, we have taken the pressure off the staff so they can do their job and do better case management. We have also brought in Aboriginal community-controlled organisations to run kinship care. There is a pilot program with KWAY, InComPro and AFSS so that we again can take pressure off the limited resources of the staff and have more people helping and supporting our kinship and foster carers—so we have done a lot.

We have also negotiated 200 Catholic Education scholarships. We have a joint plan with the education department. All of our young people have One Plans. We have done extensive work to bring our departments together to utilise the whole-of-government approach to getting better outcomes for our children and young people and, absolutely, there is more work to be done.

We have introduced a statement of commitment which affirms the rights to be informed, supported, consulted, valued and respected. This was developed in a partnership approach with Connecting Foster & Kinship Carers SA and Child and Family Focus SA and the Department for Child Protection. We have launched a carer portal on the DCP website, bringing together information on becoming a carer, guidance on decision-making and financial support, and resources relating to carer rights, roles and responsibilities.

We have also produced a newsletter for carers, Caring Together, providing carers with important information and resources to support their caring role. We have also funded Connecting Foster & Kinship Carers, the peak body, and we have just announced another three years of funding. This body also advocates on behalf of foster and kinship carers. They do surveys, and the results come to me so that we can look at policies.

Do not get me wrong, I have many policies still to go. I am very keen to have a second term in government as the minister because I am absolutely passionate about this area of policy and reform. Do not worry, I am always harping on to my cabinet and to Rob Lucas about what we can do to further support our foster and kinship carers, and that will not stop.

What I will say is there have been several reviews in the last few years to do with the complaints mechanism in the department. DCP has reformed its complaints management processes in recent years, based on a series of consultations and reviews. In particular, in 2018 the South Australian Ombudsman released the Audit Survey Report, which assessed 13 state government departments' complaints management systems, including DCP's.

Following this, in 2019 DCP reviewed its complaints management system. Feedback from the Ombudsman, the Guardian for Children and Young People and the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People also informed the development of the new processes and procedures. This work resulted in the development of new complaints management processes and procedures that are robust, transparent and client focused.

Initially, complaints should be directed to the local DCP office; however, these can be escalated to DCP's central complaints and feedback management unit if necessary. There are further avenues of escalation and independent review if a complaint remains unsatisfied, including:

- internal reviews, undertaken in accordance with section 157 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017, which are available to review a decision of the chief executive or the office of the department;
- the Contact Arrangements Review Panel (CARP), governed by sections 94 and 95 of the act, provides an avenue for review of contact arrangements relating to a young person;

- the Ombudsman SA has the powers of oversight relating to responses to notifications, contact arrangements, communication issues and departmental matters referred to the Commissioner for Children and Young People and the Guardian for Children and Young People; and
- the SACAT, in accordance with section 158 of the act, which also offers a completely independent review of a decision of the chief executive.

I am advised that carers are made aware of these provisions and that they are being utilised.

However, noting the opportunity to have an inquiry, although I do not think it is needed at this time and I do think that significant work has been achieved, I also note that under the legislation there is to be a full review next year, 2022, which this could be included in. However, I am prepared to accept an inquiry at this point, noting the sensitivities around not identifying any of our foster children.

I think if this was done in a sensitive way, I am absolutely keen to improve the foster and kinship carers system wherever possible. I think anybody who has met me knows that my goal is to have the world's best child protection system. I will seek information from all around the world and our local carers and the young people they care for in order to improve our system. Whilst I do not feel it is necessary, I am prepared to accept the inquiry and the information that comes from that.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:29): I move:

That the time allotted for Private Members Business, Bills, be extended by 30 minutes.

Motion carried.

Bills

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (INQUIRY INTO FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:29): I acknowledge the contributions of all speakers and note we are furiously in agreement that we must do everything we possibly can. I thank both the minister and the shadow minister for their work in this area and acknowledge the work of the Hon. John Darley and the groups he has consulted with. As the minister said, I feel it is imperative we feed whatever current information we can into the review of the act in 2022. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:30): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COORONG ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

Mr BELL: I move:

That the House of Assembly does not insist on its amendments and agrees to the alternative amendments made by the Legislative Council.

Motion carried.

FAIR TRADING (MOTOR VEHICLE INSURERS AND REPAIRERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

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

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Attention has been drawn to the state of the house. There not being a quorum, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Member for Waite, do you wish to make any comment on amendment No. 1?

Mr DULUK: No, sir.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would like to make a brief contribution, thank you, sir. This bill was conceived as a result of work done by the Economic and Finance Committee. The member for Waite introduced this bill to this house. It has been upstairs and returned with these amendments. Some of the original intent of the bill has been maintained but, unfortunately, not all of it. As we saw in the discussion we had on this bill in this place, the government has watered down this bill to the greatest extent possible.

Let me remind those who might not be following this as closely as some others, this bill was designed to ensure that people who have a motor vehicle insurance policy, who might need the services of a South Australian motor vehicle repairer, were better protected under consumer law here in South Australia. The Liberal government has done its level best to water down the provisions that the member for Waite and the members of the Economic and Finance Committee, who participated in this review, recommended to the parliament.

I want to place on record that I am particularly disappointed with some of the representations that I and other members of parliament have received from some of the stakeholders, in particular the completely bogus claims that were put by some members of the insurance industry who quite frankly should know better.

I will be particular about this: one of the recommendations from the committee would require that on the front page of a notice of offer from an insurer to somebody wanting to take out a comprehensive motor vehicle insurance policy, or on a renewal notice for one of those policies, the insurer would have to make a very simple, very brief declaration on that front page about whether that policy offered the policyholder, the motor vehicle owner, choice of repairer—very straightforward and completely in the interests of consumers.

Members who were involved in the committee—the member for Waite and I, the member for Enfield, the member for Wright and others—all thought that this would be an absolute no-brainer because even South Australia's proud motor vehicle insurer, the Royal Automobile Association (the RAA) offer choice of repairer in their policies.

So you can imagine my bewilderment when I received representations from the government relations officer of the RAA saying that requiring this—parliament imposing this requirement—meant that the RAA's actuaries would have to recommend an increase in premiums to motor vehicle policyholders. What rubbish, what absolute rubbish!

Of course, when I asked that representative of the RAA to provide information to me as a member of parliament having to consider the amendments that were coming back from downstairs, 'What sort of impost would this cause to motorists?' the response was, 'It doesn't matter anymore. It is all done. It is all par for the course. We don't need to worry about that.'

I have to say, I expected better behaviour from the RAA than this. They are at a clear market advantage in this state and for good reason—because they are a better corporate citizen than other insurers, they provide choice of repairer and they provide their signage and affirmation for South Australian family-owned small businesses that are motor vehicle repairers saying that they are RAA-approved repairers.

That is all really good. That is all something we should support. So I cannot understand why they would not take advantage of a bill and a piece of proposed legislation within that bill that would make it absolutely clear to all and sundry that the RAA is the sort of insurer you want to be with as a motorist, that they offer choice of repairer.

Instead, unfortunately, the representations we got saw effectively the RAA's lot cast in with the other insurers who do not offer choice of repairer, the other insurers based in other parts of Australia and overseas. Those are the insurers—not the RAA—who have sought time and time again to do over South Australian family-owned small business motor vehicle repairers and the South Australians who hold their policies, and that is what we were aiming to fix up.

I am not going to stand in the way of these amendments. The member for Waite is leaving this situation better than it was without this bill. The complaint I make is that it could have been even better than that had the Liberal government and Liberal MPs not stood in the way of consumers and holders of motor vehicle policies getting a better deal, more transparency, and also the hundreds of South Australian small businesses—those locally owned motor vehicle crash repairers—not being done over by greedy, corporate insurance companies based overseas and interstate.

But that is how Liberal members of parliament think our laws should be drawn. It is clear that they have the majority here. I thought that not only were we on the side of consumers but we could stand lock step on the side of the RAA in making it clear that they are a better type of insurer than those other people out in the market. Unfortunately, I have been proven wrong.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: Can I just indicate that the government will be supporting the amendments and will be pleased to step through those in an orderly way. I indicate that it may be appropriate to step through them in due course. Amendments Nos. 1 to 7 and 10 to 13 of the Treasurer, and Amendment No. 1 [Bourke-1] and Amendment No. 1 [Bourke-2] in the other place might be capable of being dealt with en bloc. I am very conscious of the mover and if there are any necessary contributions to be made in relation to those, or other observations to be made about where we have got to in terms of amendments in the other place, then I am in the house's hands.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Minister, just to help me, how many amendments do you want to move en bloc?

Mr DULUK: I suggest that we accept all amendments en bloc, so I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): It has been moved by the member for Waite that all 12 amendments be agreed to. The member for Lee can make a contribution.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am not going to stand in the way of that, but there was one other comment that I did want to make, and it was about the penalty provisions. I indicate that we will be supporting the member for Waite in moving these amendments en bloc.

Aside from that declaration on the front page of the motor vehicle insurance policy was the initial desire of this bill to substantially increase the penalty provisions for noncompliance with the new code of conduct. The government sought to water that down. I just want to walk you through the following scenario, sir, because it is one that might appeal to your heart in particular.

Imagine you are driving along on a country road in a large vehicle like a Toyota LandCruiser and some T-rex size marsupial jumps out in front of your vehicle, sir, and you are unable to either—

An honourable member: And shoot it.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —shoot it, as one of the members opposite suggests or perhaps, more to the point, avoid it, and you come a cropper running into—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Member for Lee, just as a good bit of advice to everyone, it is not a good idea to dodge a kangaroo because you may roll and either injure yourself severely or die. But I will hand it back to you in this running commentary because it does have a minor personal connection to me.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Somebody with less dust on their boots than you, sir, is certainly me, so I take that advice gratefully. Let's say you are about to slam your 200 series LandCruiser into this T-rex size marsupial, sir—

Mr Whetstone: Or even a 300.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —or even a 300; yes, that's right, the market is changing now—and that vehicle has to go in for extensive repairs. It would not be uncommon in such a significant front-end collision for the cost of those repairs to well exceed \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 and then in particular, particularly with the 300 series LandCruiser the member for Chaffey makes reference to, there are all sorts of embedded safety systems in that car.

If an insurer places pressure on the motor vehicle repairer to cut the cost of that repair so that it is not done properly despite its extensive cost, that there is not enough time allocated to calibrate those necessary safety systems, sir, next time you are out driving, servicing your electorate in that vehicle, you may not be as safe as you should be in a properly repaired vehicle.

The reason why it was initially sought to increase the penalty provisions up to I think it was \$100,000 in the original bill was to reflect the real risk to a consumer like you, sir, of having an expensive vehicle that might have extensive damage that needs to be repaired thoroughly and properly. The existing penalty provisions do not adequately reflect the real figures and the real risk that poor quality repairs might have.

I realise this has all been organised now between a majority of members to get those through and, as I said, I am not going to stand in the way of that, but I do want to place on the record that there was a real reason the penalty provisions were proposed to be increased. It is regrettable that they are not, but perhaps that is something that will have to be fixed up at some point after the next election.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: I will be very brief about this point, and indicate that, for consistency with existing industry codes under the Fair Trading Act, the government maintains a view that the civil penalty of \$50,000 for body corporates and \$10,000 for individuals is most appropriate.

The member for Lee's contribution just now reminds me of some of the jibes in a previous set of circumstances involving capacity to open doors and things in car parks. I would hate to be in a situation where the member for Lee's circumstances were such that damage arising might require him to rely on these matters. Otherwise, I am glad to get an indication that we might be coming in to land at a suitable point on this score as well.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr BROWN (Playford) (11:52): I move:

That Private Members Business, Bills, have priority over Private Members Business, Other Motions, until 12.30pm.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:53): I move:

That the time for Private Members Business, Bills, be returned to finish at noon.

I understand there is agreement by the members involved in this next piece of business on how to manage it in that amount of time.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): The house has indicated that it will go until 12.30pm. There are a couple of ways forward. One is that there is an attempt to rescind that or we can postpone all those and go straight through to Private Members Business, Other Motions.

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

That we rescind the motion to extend to 12.30pm.

My understanding is that there is a collegial agreement that until 12 noon will be enough.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): There needs to be a movement of suspension of standing orders to rescind a motion of the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Okay. I withdraw my motion because that would mean that we do not have enough time.

Bills

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (APPLICATION FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 November).

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:56): I rise to address the bill and I am pleased to indicate to the house that there has been some considerable and productive work involving the mover and the government. I can just indicate that the desired outcome of the bill is the removal of the imposition of application fees in circumstances where an applicant victim of domestic violence is seeking such an order.

The effect of the bill as it is presently drafted is, and I think unintentionally so might be the way to describe the matter, would cover a broader range of circumstances than is intended. The result of the work that has been done back and forth is that the removal of these fees in circumstances of domestic abuse will be done by way of fees notice and that that will be implemented just as soon as possible and certainly very early in the new year.

I wish to, in these circumstances, put on the record the very good work of the Attorney-General over recent months and also the good work of the member for Reynell in responding to what we know are circumstances in which the vast bulk of applicants are experiencing a two-step process at the moment. They need to go ahead to make an application for a fee waiver, and the fee waiver is being granted in the vast bulk of the circumstances that we are talking about but, at the very least, applicants are being put through a process which is unnecessary.

What I would like to perhaps observe is that this waiver by way of fees notice will have the effect, hopefully, of saving the administrative process, giving peace of mind to those applicants and also ensuring that the state's courts administration can retain the capacity to be precise in terms of providing the waiver and so the unintended categories of an applicant might still be the subject of fees in appropriate circumstances.

I have given my undertaking to the member for Reynell to continue to work through this. There will be correspondence today to that effect, and I can give an indication of my assurance to the house that the introduction of the fees notice to address these matters will be done as quickly and expeditiously as possible.

Perhaps, with those words in terms of setting the overall circumstances in which the matter is to be addressed, I might indicate to the house that what we are here addressing is the fees that are applicable in a range of circumstances of abuse that are the subject of the 2009 act. That includes circumstances of domestic violence. The act also covers other circumstances of abuse.

The act also addresses those circumstances in which an application to vary or withdraw an intervention order might be made. We know that applications to vary or withdraw are, in a large number of cases, brought by a perpetrator. They may also be brought by a victim in circumstances of coercion, and so there is a need to navigate what can be a complex landscape.

I highlight in particular that question about that secondary process, if you like, of an application to vary or withdraw that might be initiated by a perpetrator or might otherwise come to the court in circumstances beyond what we are all endeavouring to achieve, and that is to make sure that a victim of domestic violence is not in any way suffering any administrative, financial or other hurdle in bringing forward their application.

The result of the work that has been done over recent months, including over recent days, is that that will be done in a way that I can, I think, report to the house is embraced by the Courts Administration Authority and can be embraced here by all members. I give the house again my assurance that in the days and weeks ahead I will continue to work closely with the member for Reynell with a view to implementing that fees notice expeditiously.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (EXCEPTIONAL TREE REGISTER)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 November 2021.)

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government)
(12:05): I rise to address the bill. In doing so, I would perhaps preface my remarks in relation to the substance of the bill by indicating that we all love trees, so much so that we know, going back to the significant moment in April 2000 when the introduction of significant trees was first brought about, that reflected the sentiment that we all know that trees in our natural environment, urban environment in particular, are very much to be protected and valued appropriately.

As the member for Heysen, I can indicate that it is the artist for whom my seat is named who might be credited with having been the first promoter in a way, bringing global attention to the significance particularly of our native trees in Australia at a time when native trees were perhaps regarded as of secondary quality. Hans Heysen in his artistic work brought global appreciation to the significant trees in and around his home at The Cedars in the Adelaide Hills, painting those enormous gum trees and showing what treasures they are.

In fact, it reminds me as well, in that preceding generation or two before Hans Heysen came along and did that, of *Jolliffe's Outback* cartoon in which the local officials are walking down the main street in an early colonial town, and they are surrounded by buildings and walking under the enormous gum trees and deciding for themselves as a committee what else they can do in preparation for the royal visit other than cutting down all the big trees to clean out the main street. Again, it is highlighting a view that might have prevailed in a former time, not so anymore.

There is certainly furious agreement in modern times, and legislated as such, that we appreciate, protect and preserve significant trees. We see that expressed in the terms of the significant tree controls that have been in place now for more than 20 years. There has been an ongoing debate about the process for controlling the removal of such trees and particularly the protection of those who would preserve large trees in urban areas. We have seen, therefore, significant amendment of the tree controls in November of 2011.

That means that, as presently defined, we have very particular criteria for the regulation of trees in such areas, based on trunk circumference, and we have pruning controls, species definition and provision in relation to removal in particular defined circumstances around dwellings, swimming pools and so on, with the result that it is now very familiar territory throughout the state, and particularly in urban areas that we understand the importance of such significant trees.

The bill, coming along as it does, would have the effect of establishing and maintaining a fresh register of what is described as exceptional trees according to a range of criteria. While the sentiment associated with the establishing and maintaining of such a register might be applauded, the practical difficulties are apparent also on the face of the bill. I will highlight four of them in particular just to illustrate the reasons why the government would oppose the bill as it is presently expressed.

Firstly, as I have indicated, the creation, establishment and maintenance of the register will create and in many ways duplicate an ongoing administrative function. That will require ongoing specialist advice, in that it contemplates that this would be reported on at least once a month. There would be a list that is maintained by councils and there would be the consequent administrative burden that might be clear in just describing it.

Secondly, and perhaps related to that, there is no indication as to council support or otherwise for the administrative process involved, and that is for the reason—and this is the second point I would perhaps highlight—that we have not seen any particular consultation along those lines or engagement processes in relation to the nomination of an exceptional tree.

As someone who is newly responsible for planning in my ministerial capacity, I highlight that the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, the outworking of which we are now seeing implemented, has very much at its core that consultation occurs consistent with the community engagement charter. Under the bill's provisions there is really a departure from that approach, in that property owners who have a tree that council might nominate would not be notified pursuant to the terms of the bill. I just indicate that in the broader context of the PDI Act and its objects.

Thirdly, I indicate that the currently regulated significant tree controls apply in metro Adelaide. They also apply in urban parts of the Hills and the Mount Barker council area. The bill, as it is presently described, would apply statewide and so we would see this exceptional tree register then implemented statewide. Regional parts of the state, of course, are regulated by the Native Vegetation Act and so we would have work to do in terms of the overlay.

Fourthly, I will just indicate in respect of the bond provisions that are provided for in the bill—without working through that in more particular detail—that they will impose a significant financial burden on development in such ways that would be affecting an exceptional tree. Those are just a number of the issues with the bill as presently drafted.

Returning to my introductory remarks, the sentiment might be applauded meanwhile, and it might be for others to talk about the State Planning Commission's initiatives in relation to open space and trees, but otherwise I would indicate that those are the reasons why the government would oppose the bill as presently drafted.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr BROWN (Playford) (12:15): I move:

That Private Members Business, Bills, have priority over Private Members Business, Other Motions, until 1 o'clock.

Motion carried.

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (EXCEPTIONAL TREE REGISTER) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (12:15): I also rise to make a contribution to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Exceptional Tree Register) Amendment Bill introduced by the member for Waite. I thank him for his efforts in bringing such an important issue to this house. I also want to comment that it is refreshing to have a new Minister for Planning dealing with this issue, and I must say that my comments are fairly well along the lines of the new Minister for Planning in terms of our approach to this bill.

I think it is a very important issue to have front and centre in protecting tree canopy in metropolitan Adelaide and South Australia more broadly, but particularly metropolitan Adelaide, where we have seen a significant reduction in tree canopy, particularly in certain council areas. However, my concerns are very similar to those of the Minister for Planning in terms of the definition of what an exceptional tree is and the burden that may put on local councils in respect of updating monthly an exceptional tree register and the time and cost involved in that when the definition of an exceptional tree is actually, in my view, fairly vague.

Some of the examples in there include trees that are of an outstanding horticultural value; a tree that is of an outstanding aesthetic significance; a tree that commemorates a particular occasion, including planting by a notable person or being associated with an important local, state or national event; and trees that can be considered outstanding examples of its species. These are all within the

definition of the exceptional trees in the proposed bill, and I think that the breadth of that would make it very difficult for the State Planning Commission to come up with the original register with the input of local councils and for local councils to then have the obligation to update that on a monthly basis.

Our consultation with local council representatives indicates that they are concerned with the administrative burden of implementing that tree register and updating it. There is also concern with administering the bond system that is proposed by this bill. Obviously, we agree with the intention of trying to protect tree canopy, but this bond system I think would be overly burdensome on local councils to administer.

I think, from speaking with various stakeholders, it might not achieve the intention, in that some stakeholders have said to me they just would not apply for the development approval, or pay their bond, knowing they are going to lose their bond. That, of course, defeats the purpose of trying to protect tree canopy in this way, so on our side we likewise will oppose this bill, although we support the intent of it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will go to the member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:19): Thank you, sir, and congratulations on your retirement speech yesterday. I am sad that I did not contribute, but it was all inclusive, as I witnessed.

I would like to make a contribution to the commission to establish and maintain the exceptional tree register. The feeling is that it will impose significant and ongoing administrative function, and it is also unknown exactly what councils will do in implementing such a register.

If we look at the requirement that councils must provide a list of exceptional trees at least each month, as other members will talk about, what designates a significant tree? Obviously, living in a regional setting, living on a river or living on flood plains, or being surrounded by commercial trees or ancient forests, there is a significant piece of work that would need to be done, particularly in understanding what the significance of a tree register means.

Currently, I think there are a number of areas of duplication when it comes to tree registration and whether it is adhering to the Native Vegetation Act and whether there would be confusion under the current legislative controls by other regulatory requirements for trees. I would say that the bond provisions of the bill are impractical. They will impose significant financial cost burden on any development affecting an exceptional tree or adjacent to within 10 metres of an exceptional tree.

What are exceptional trees? What is the significance of exceptional trees? Are they a tree that is a native tree? Are they an introduced species? Are they a tree of significant age, or are they trees that have been planted by our forebears or our forefathers for a level of significance?

As an example, if I look in the Riverland to the area of Monash, there is the Lone Gum. It is the only river red gum, a 20-metre tree, which was still standing after much of the land was cleared. It gave shade to the teams of surveyors who camped while that area was being developed. Also, the Monash school uses that tree as their emblem. What we need to better understand is that urban canopy and preserving brilliant trees is great, but it does not just have to be in an urban setting.

As I have said, the area that I represent, being Chaffey, is one of the greatest electorates in South Australia and it has a number of areas with trees of significance. It also has ancient forests. So what is the role of looking at preserving trees of significance if it is just in an urban setting? Where is the significance of protecting or keeping that register of trees of significance?

I know that a flood plain I overlook from my home has trees that are 400 and 500 years old and they are significant trees, but how are those trees counted? How are they registered? We have to have a better understanding of exactly what the trees are there to do, why they are there and if they were planted for reasons. I think there needs to be a much clearer understanding, so that is why I think this bill will be impractical and impose further financial cost burden on any further development.

I want to talk a little more about the significance of trees in general and why we have large trees that are normally given a registration or given significance here in metropolitan Adelaide. I think South Australia is a beneficiary of all sorts of trees that have to be registered and protected, but also trees that are there not only to reduce the consumption of water and the consumption of energy but they are there for different reasons.

They are there in different climates, and different trees are in different areas of our state to help protect not only animals but humans from the heat and from the sun. That seems to be having a greater bearing on any constituents who might live nearby or be there in passing. Particularly on the banks of the River Murray many trees have been planted on nature strips and on the verges in our communities. Primarily that is done not only for beautification but also as a contribution to provide transpiration, to help keep the climate cooler and also to make it more livable.

I will not talk too much about the trees that I have planted over my lifetime as a farmer, as a primary producer, but I have planted a lot of native trees as a contribution back to the environment. I have also planted significant numbers of commercial trees, probably in the order of hundreds of thousands—whether they be citrus, whether they be stone fruit or whether they be for wind protection for those commercial plantings. We need to better understand that this bill will add a level of complexity, and I do not think that anyone is prepared to shoulder the burden of the register.

But what I will say is that many, many landholders, including my neighbours, my fellow farmers and horticulturalists, keep registers themselves. Whether they are commercial trees for horticulture properties or whether they are part of the native tree network that is adjacent to flood plains or river corridors or on the banks of the river, we need to better understand exactly what is currently there as a registered tree.

We know that the Murray-Darling Basin Plan is there for the benefit of our natural environment. It is there for the benefit of those watering programs that will give life to the regeneration of many of the trees. Sadly, what we have just seen come through the Riverland in recent times was the massive storms. I do not see anyone taking note of the number of trees that have been blown over, thousands and thousands of trees that are significant.

We have undercutting on riverbanks, then we get high winds, and then all of a sudden those trees blow into the river. No-one is there taking the loss of those trees into account. But with high rivers we see regeneration. We are now seeing young red gum saplings starting to grow again. Sadly, we are not seeing some of those river flows getting back to that higher country where we can see trees of significance, particularly black box, that are needing that watering to substantiate the ongoing life of that tree. Through drought and through salinity impacts we are seeing a significant number of trees that are falling over, that are just wasting through no fault of anyone, bar a natural weather event.

The bill does give a level of complexity; I see it as being duplication. That is why here within government we will not be supporting it. But I do see that trees are life. Trees need to be accounted for, but we are currently experiencing more and more burden from those who are looking to put duplication into the system.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (12:29): I rise to speak on the member for Waite's bill to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act (PDI Act) 2016. The bill seeks to amend the act by inserting a new definition of 'exceptional tree' requiring a register of exceptional trees to be established by the State Planning Commission, and setting up requirements and bond payments for any development that may affect an exceptional tree.

We know that since the introduction of significant tree controls in April 2000 there has been a continual debate between the rights of property owners to remove trees that they deem inappropriate and those who seek to preserve large trees in urban areas. As a result of that debate, the tree controls were amended on 17 November 2011, and we have seen definitions for regulated trees and significant trees. We have also seen the concept of maintenance pruning introduced, allowing up to 30 per cent of a regulated or significant tree crown to be pruned for specific reasons, as well as the introduction of a list of tree species that were exempt from tree controls, and a number of other changes.

I know that our Minister for Planning and the shadow minister for planning have raised concerns about this particular bill and some of the unintended consequences it might create in terms of the burden it imposes on others. What is of particular interest to me is that the State Planning Commission has noted the community concern regarding the loss of established trees from the Adelaide tree canopy during the consultation that occurred prior to the finalisation of the Planning and Design Code.

In May 2021, the Conservation Council of SA released a report titled, 'A call to action: protecting Adelaide's tree canopy'. This report was partially funded by a grant from the commission, and the scope of the commission's open space and tree project includes:

- a short-term review of a number of matters related to trees;
- the release of tree guidelines prepared with Green Adelaide;
- a longer term comprehensive review of all regulated tree legislative measures;
- a review of the operation of the new Urban Tree Canopy Off-Set Scheme following 12 months of operation; and
- as part of the preparation of the new 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, a review of tree canopy targets and further investigation about how the planning and development system can further urban greening areas and achieve outcomes.

The commission is currently finalising its recommendations for consideration in regard to this, so it is premature to progress any legislative changes in relation to tree policy at this time until the commission has completed the project, which importantly involves significant engagement and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders.

I understand that one of the concerns with regard to this particular bill is that engagement and community consultation have not occurred. Personally, I am a big advocate for community engagement in all that we do, so that is a big concern for me. Nevertheless, whilst this particular legislation may be somewhat premature, we must act now to nurture and grow our existing trees and to continue to plant new trees. Without a doubt, this is an important area and, legislation and debate aside, now is the time to ensure that we continue to do all we can to increase our tree canopy.

I am so proud of the work we have done and continue to do as a government. We formed government in 2018, and one of our election commitments was to establish Green Adelaide. We have delivered on that, and we continue to do incredible work through the Green Adelaide Board. For those who might not be aware, Green Adelaide is a South Australian government-supported organisation that is working towards a vision of a cooler, greener, wilder and climate-resilient Adelaide that celebrates our unique culture.

Green Adelaide is a statutory board that was established in July 2020 by the Marshall Liberal government, and it was also strengthened as part of the 2019 South Australian natural resources management reform and the introduction of the Landscape South Australia Act in 2019. Its vision will be achieved through partnerships, education, influence and investment in Adelaide's people and the environment, and we know that this will help Adelaide to attract industry, investment, residents and visitors and, most importantly, continue to secure our future as a vibrant and livable city.

In my local area alone, as a government we are delivering a number of greening projects, partnering with local councils to increase tree canopy. We have projects funded by the state government and/or Green Adelaide occurring in St Marys and Edwardstown.

The electorate of Elder is quite diverse in terms of its tree canopy, so there are some suburbs that have a lot of trees and incredible street trees cooling the natural environment, but in other suburbs like St Marys and Edwardstown there is a real opportunity for us to increase the tree canopy for residents living there and by doing so not only cool the environment and provide homes for wild habitat but really increase the amenity for local residents living in those suburbs.

I am also absolutely thrilled that we are delivering the Pasadena biodiversity corridor in partnership with local council, and works are already underway. This project will passively irrigate the reserve by feeding stormwater through soakage trenches. This will promote growth of existing and new vegetation with amenity, canopy cover and cooling benefits for not only nearby residents but all visitors to the reserve. This is again just an incredible project happening here in my local area. I know whilst there are a number of great greening projects tackling climate change in Elder, there are even more across a number of other electorates in all of South Australia.

Regardless of the outcome of this bill, I wholeheartedly support its intent, which recognises the value of trees and the benefits and amenity that trees bring to our streets, to our neighbourhoods,

to South Australia and, ultimately, to our climate. I think the member for Chaffey put it quite well when he said that trees are life.

I know I have had a number of meetings with local residents where they have shared with me their appreciation and love of local trees. I recall one meeting where we were talking about trees and one resident brought in a sound clip of the birds singing from a gum tree across from her home. It was so beautiful and I think it speaks volumes to how much people in my local area—and I know across the board—love our trees and are committed and want to see our government doing all that it can to support our existing trees, to plant new trees and nurture them. Certainly, that is exactly what the Marshall Liberal government is doing and we will continue to do so.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Morphett.

Ms Bedford: The member for Waite was on his feet, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Apologies. I have called the member for Morphett and, of course, the member for Waite would understand that if he speaks he closes debate. My impression is that there are other members who are wanting to contribute.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (12:37): Thank you, member for Waite. Certainly, I understand the member for Waite's interest in this matter and of course him wanting to stand up, but I just want to put here to parliament today the interest of the constituents of Morphett in trees, in tree canopies. It certainly is very important.

I will just say, too, a little bit about the bill itself in terms of establishing and maintaining a register of exceptional trees. These are based on a number of criteria: whether they have outstanding horticultural value; if they are a rare species; if they are in a unique location; or they are of outstanding age, height, circumference or canopy spread. There are other matters that go onto that, but it is worth talking about height and circumference spread because that is how, at the moment, trees are classified.

Back in April 2000, this was worked into defining significant and regulated trees. Regulated trees are those that, one metre above the ground, have a circumference of two metres, and significant trees are those that, one metre above the ground, have a circumference of three metres. Of course, that does protect those trees, but we know with developments, with bushfire risk, that while those are well intentioned, there is also that counterbalance in terms of people wanting to develop their own land, people wanting to keep their house safe, so these tree controls have been refined over time.

But, of course, since they were last amended back in November 2011 to try to give some balance, there is still this continuing move towards development. Certainly, in my electorate of Morphett, there is some significant development going on. If I just talk about the suburbs themselves, we have the coastal areas, and then moving inland further to those coastal areas of Somerton Park, Glenelg, newly to come in, Glenelg North, which are very established suburbs and have heritage controls, from a planning perspective, which are very important to the people living there in terms of being developed.

But you will see in other parts of the electorate, whether that is Morphettville, Glengowrie, Park Holme or Plympton Park, these are fantastic places to live. They are very close to the ocean and also quite a short drive into the city. There is great amenity as well, from all the built infrastructure in there, and so there is a lot of development going on.

With this development, where previously you would have your classic quarter-acre block with a house on it, a driveway and two cars, with a front yard where quite often there would be a substantial garden with trees there to protect and give shade to the house, and then of course the back garden where there would be fruit trees and other trees and significant areas for kids to play, that has been utilised by this urban infill to convert those into two or three residences on that one block.

Of course, the densification to achieve that certainly does substantially reduce the amount of open space on each block that is available for trees to grow. Quite often, as you go around, you will see these old houses. When they are demolished, not only is the house demolished but every single bit of vegetation on the property is demolished as well; it is just basically brought back to bare earth to be developed. Any trees that might have been growing for decades are brought down. While

there are trees put on these new developments, those trees are young, they are not mature and they have many years of growing ahead of them, but in their place you certainly lose that canopy.

That is certainly the intent of the member for Waite—by listing these exceptional trees, it does protect that canopy. I would say the Marshall government certainly is very mindful of that. As a government, we are committed to increasing Adelaide's urban tree canopy and greening our cities across metropolitan Adelaide.

The other point to note is that these tree controls are not only of significant regulated controls, and they do apply across metropolitan Adelaide, but they also take in some parts of the Adelaide Hills and the Mount Barker council areas. The proposed bill that we have before us from the member for Waite has the bill provisions applying to having an exceptional tree register statewide, so not just the metropolitan areas but into the regions. We heard the member for Chaffey speak about the eucalypts in his area, his old urban forest as well, so that will be taken into account.

If I move back to the urban canopy and why it is so important, prior to coming into parliament I was the Mayor of Holdfast Bay. As a council, Holdfast Bay was part of a number of councils that set up what was called Resilient South, which looked at practical action and how we can adapt to climate change.

I think the environment minister in this place now has been doing fantastic work in the overall environment space. You will hear him talk about practical action. Practical action is adapting to climate change because we know that in terms of South Australia's ability to influence the big climate change effects that are happening, countries such as the US with their massive population, China trying to lift their billion people out of poverty, India trying to lift their over a billion people out of poverty, they are big emitters, they are interacting and having a big impact on climate change. So, yes, we need to do our part, be a leader in this role, which we are, but also, from an adaption point of view, look to adapt.

To understand how we need to adapt and what we need to adapt, one of the things that was done with Resilient South was to do what they call urban heat island mapping to see where the urban heat spots are in our community. We did this on one of those hot days, a 39° day, just to see what the spread of heat was across the councils of Holdfast Bay, Marion and then more widely out to Onkaparinga and Mitcham.

It was really quite startling to see. Near the coast you could see that it was starting to warm up but still reasonably cool, then moving into those mid suburbs, if I talk about my electorate, Glengowrie and Morphettville, and then moving across to that South Road region where there is quite a large amount of concrete and bitumen, you could see the startling changes in urban heat, upwards of 3° to 4° difference between the coast and these big urbanised concrete areas.

The coast being cooler, some of that is due to the coastal winds but a lot of it is because it has urban canopy and established canopy because, of course, those suburbs may be more established and so those trees have had decades to grow. That is certainly something that the Marshall government is committed to increasing.

One of the ways we are doing that is with Green Adelaide, to prepare a five-year regional landscape plan. Since 2019, as a government we have put significant funds towards this. It is administered by Green Adelaide and known as Greener Neighbourhoods Grants. We have committed \$1.6 million that has been distributed across projects in this program. This has resulted in 8,500 trees being planted.

We are also making sure that we are supporting those street trees as well. The rainwater that is going down into stormwater, we want to be able to use some of that rainwater to irrigate these trees, so this program has also led to 200 additional stormwater inlets being established to irrigate those street trees. That is a fantastic initiative that we have got going across Adelaide. It is certainly paying dividends by creating biodiversity corridors in some areas of my electorate.

Along Sturt Creek, we have Willoughby Avenue Reserve, which is in Glengowrie, and that has the biggest tree in Marion, a fig tree with a magnificent canopy. That is certainly important. There are also beautiful eucalypts there. At sunset or at sunrise, as you walk around you can hear the birds chirping away. Trees really bring people closer to nature. As a government, we certainly want to drive

and commit towards greening our streets, greening our neighbourhoods and I am confident the plan we have set in place will do so.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:47): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and what an ornament to this place you are!

An honourable member: Doily!

Mr PEDERICK: Chuck him out, sir. I rise to speak to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Exceptional Tree Register) Amendment Bill introduced by the member for Waite. Certainly, as a regional member and as one serving on the Natural Resources Committee, I am very well aware of the benefits that trees, scrub out in the regions and also shelter belts, whether they be in regional areas or in urban areas, have on the community. I want to talk a bit about what we are leaving for the next parliament. As part of the Natural Resources Committee is the investigation into the Native Vegetation Act and the management of native vegetation, which can be a vexed argument.

I remember when land clearing was coming to an end in South Australia—I am talking about farming land, obviously—in the late seventies. When the word got out that there was no more land able to be cleared for farming after a certain date, the dozers and chains went 24 hours a day.

In most cases they got it right—in most cases. Sometimes, and you get this in Mallee country, they might have gone a little bit high on a sandhill but that has all been fixed up with plantings of veldt grass, lucerne and other plants that can stabilise the soil. Sadly, in other cases, there were opportunities to clear really good, flat, productive land. Some of that was done but then, for whatever reason, some landowners let it go past the time, when you could not clear the regrowth, so that absolutely great grain-growing and wheat-producing land was lost to production.

I note that there are many different views on how much vegetation is out there. Some people have the view that it is only the corridors up and down the roads. However, you only have to get up in a light plane or even in a commercial plane and fly over the state, and certainly fly over Adelaide, to see how many trees and sheltered areas there are, especially in the broad area of Parklands that we have here and the parks being put in place by the environment minister, David Speirs, and our government.

Vegetation does produce a great deal of amenity, especially in the urban or heavily built-up areas in our regional towns, where obviously there is a lot of concrete and bitumen, and it is great to allay what can turn into heat islands with trees and shrubs. What happens now with new developments, which is a much better proposal than what happened with old developments in regional towns and planning right across the board through Adelaide as well, is they have to have 12 per cent of green space, and that has to be put in place to alleviate the impact of cutting up that land.

We certainly need development, as we are seeing in the regions where you can barely buy or rent a property because they are just not available, because people are coming to the regions and finding out how good they are. A lot of that has happened because of the impacts of COVID-19.

So trees are important but, as we saw with the fires a couple of years ago and with bushfires generally, they become a tunnel of fire when they light up. We have seen some terrible bushfires in the last few years up in the Hills at Cudlee Creek and Harrogate, at the top end of my electorate, and this was raised at public meetings I attended because there are some quite significant trees, some beautiful eucalypts along these roads. Before the Cudlee Creek fire, a lot of people had only recently—and when I say recently, it might have been in the last 10 or 15 years—moved into the Hills. It is not their fault, but they did not realise what could happen and how late is too late.

If your bushfire survival plan is to leave your property, and if the road is a tunnel of fire, I would suggest that you should be staying home and making the best of what is there. It is good to see people taking up the mantle of farm fire units and having units at their home. They can be as simple as a 1,000-litre shuttle hooked up to a Honda pump, or another pump, and you instantly have a fire unit for not a huge expense.

It is a vexed question and I do not know if anyone will ever have the right answer. It is certainly a vexed question as far as trees along roadsides are concerned. An issue I have brought before the Natural Resources Committee is the clearance you are allowed, especially when transporting equipment in regional areas. Farming equipment has become bigger, longer and wider and you just

cannot get that up some roads because the native vegetation clearance rules are that strict—I believe only a metre back from the guide post.

A lot of times, when you have really wide equipment that could be, in the old language, 40-foot or 60-foot air seeder bars, cultivators. It is quite wide equipment and it is a struggle to get up the road. I note that a lot of people are designing the equipment so that it stretches longer but you can still get the width when you unfold it.

As the member for Chaffey said, in farming it is very nice to put back in places where you might need shelter belts. We put in several kilometres of shelter belts back in the early nineties, and it is fantastic to have them in place, and that was direct seeding to scarify the seeds and get them in. Back in the 1970s, I remember that the last paddock that was cleared on our place my father used to always cultivate over the last few stumps. For whatever reason, they never got picked up, so the scrub regenerated a little bit, but it was never too much and so dad would crop over it.

When he had a bit of illness, the farm was put out to sharefarmers and they went around this little patch of scrub and now it has turned into a beautiful shelter belt so, in a strange way, it is fantastic that it happened. It is certainly a good idea to protect trees, but we also need to have reality around planning and management. We need to let the processes go through on what the planning department are doing with the consultation with regard to the management of significant trees, and that would take into account what the member for Waite is trying to do here with another category of exceptional tree.

You also get some undue outcomes with significant trees. We have seen that in recent times, where trees, mainly in the Hills, have, sadly, crashed down on cars and inadvertently killed people. It is a very difficult thing to get the right management and get the whole community safety management right as well. I can also reflect on the saga of the Burnside Shopping Centre tree. What a saga! There would have been well north of \$1 million invested to protect the tree that, at the end of the day, never made the grade.

I am very interested in the continuation of the debate, but on this side we are keen to see the planning processes take place, to acknowledge the significance of trees but also the way we cohabitate as a population to get the right outcomes for all.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (12:57): I thank the member for Waite for bringing this debate to the parliament—the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Exceptional Tree Register) Amendment Bill 2021—because I think trees are a bit like motherhood: we all support trees and we all support motherhood. Like many things in this place, regardless of what political party you come from, I think we want the same outcome, and the debate is about how you achieve that.

We heard today that the Labor Party does not support this bill and the government is not supporting this bill. It does not mean that we do not support the intent of the bill. I think there is no doubt I learned very early in my fledgling political career that there are people on the other side of the chamber with different political views who you can do business with.

Many of you would know about the success of a coalition between the left and the right in the Prospect council and David Pisoni and Russell Wortley from 1991 to 1993, when I moved a motion that there be an investigation into where we could place trees on the southern end of Main North Road, going into Medindie, in front of all the car yards.

We picked a very strategic time to put up the motion, when we knew we had the numbers, when some of the old farts, who were opposed to this sort of stuff, were away from council. We got the numbers and we got it up. To this day, you can see those trees in front of the car yards and they are now nearly 30 years old. There is no doubt that it is a legacy of Wortley and Pisoni coming together for the greater good of the people of Prospect.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Unley, you have 30 seconds. We will ring the bell.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is a shared responsibility between the community, local councils and government, and we are all working together to get those outcomes.

Debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

WAITE ELECTORATE ROAD UPGRADES

Mr DULUK (Waite): Presented a petition signed by 54 residents of greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to invest in a new concept that provides greater safety measures and traffic flow at the Waite Road and Cross Road intersection, Urrbrae.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

Parliamentary Committees

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:01): I bring up the second report of the committee on an application for right of reply.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The SPEAKER: Member for King, the Clerk has informed me that you may wish to move the adoption of the right of reply report. I invite you to so move.

Ms LUETHEN: I move:

That the report be adopted.

Motion carried.

Citizen's Right of Reply

CITIZEN'S RIGHT OF REPLY

Response by Hon Michael Wright

Agreed to by Hon Michael Wright and the Standing Orders Committee Pursuant to Standing Order 398:

September 18, 2021

Dear Premier,

I write following your Ministerial Statement to Parliament on Thursday, September 9, 2021 concerning a complaint made about the conduct of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing at a meeting which I attended.

The Statement contains several significant errors and inaccuracies about my participation in the meeting upon which you then rely to suggest that I acted with improper and/or ulterior motives.

I will address each of the significant errors and inaccuracies and the misrepresentation of my motives for participating in the meeting.

The Ministerial Code of Conduct

You asserted in your Statement that;

Mr Wright had with him a copy of the code and quoted to the minister sections 2.4 and 2.5'.

That assertion is inaccurate. I did not have a copy of the Ministerial Code of Conduct in my possession at the meeting. I raised the issue of the Ministerial Code of Conduct towards the very end of the meeting and read passages from sections 2.4 and 2.5 from hand written notes I had prepared prior to the meeting. I informed the Minister that he may have breached the Code in his handling of the funding arrangements.

The Scope of Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct

In your Statement you referred to the Ministerial Code of Conduct and said:

Clause 2.4 deals with honesty. Clause 2.5 deals with fairness and diligence in decision making.

This is an incomplete and inaccurate summary of the provisions of Clauses 2.4 and 2.5 of the Code in the context in which the provisions were raised at the meeting.

Clause 2.4 requires a Minister to act not only 'honestly' but also 'diligently and with propriety in the performance of their public functions and duties'.

The omission of the reference to diligence when referring to Clause 2.4 is relevant because that is precisely the point I was making to the Minister at the meeting.

It is also relevant because narrowing the scope of Clause 2.5 of the Code in your Statement to acting 'honestly' underpins the suggestion in the Statement that I was acting with improper and/or ulterior motives, an issue I will return to shortly.

Clause 2.4 of the Code deals not only with 'fairness and diligence in decision making'.

Clause 2.5 of the Code reads;

Ministers should not make an official decision without first giving due consideration to the merits of the matter at hand and the impact the decision is likely to have on the rights and interests of the people involved and the citizens of South Australia.

A Minister must use all reasonable endeavours to obtain all relevant information and facts before making a decision on a particular issue and should consult, as appropriate, in relation to the matter at issue.

The omission in your Statement of the requirement on Ministers under Clause 2.5 of the Code to consider the impact of decisions on the rights and interests of citizens and to consult is relevant in the context of the meeting.

The purpose of the meeting was to inform the Minister that the rights and interests of the sporting community were overlooked in his decision making and he had not given sufficient weight and consideration in the consultation process undertaken by his Department, to the views of those whose interests were adversely affected by a fundamental change in funding arrangements. That was and remains our grievance with the Minister.

The Assertion that the Minister was Accused of Dishonesty

You assert in the Statement that I suggested that the Minister had acted dishonestly. You said;

I believe the minister was entitled to respond strongly to the suggestion of dishonesty made by the President of Sport SA.

I emphatically deny that I suggested, or in any way implied, at the meeting that the Minister had acted dishonestly.

In response to the reference at the meeting to the Ministerial Code of Conduct the Minister asked me twice whether I thought he was being dishonest. On each occasion, I responded 'No'.

I was not given the opportunity to further explain to the Minister the relevance of my reference to the Code because of his continual interruptions and escalating overbearing behaviour. The Chief of Staff to the Minister abruptly terminated the meeting almost immediately thereafter.

You have invited me through your Statement to withdraw any suggestion of dishonesty on the part of the Minister. I note you have not contacted me directly about an invitation to withdraw. I can confirm that as no suggestion of dishonesty was made by me, it would not be appropriate to issue a withdrawal.

Suggestion of Improper and/or Ulterior Motives

In your Statement you impugned my motives in participating in the meeting with the Minister. As referred to above, you made a truncated and not contextualized reference in your Statement to Clauses 2.4 and 2.5 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct and then said;

Mr Wright could not have been unmindful of the fact that his action would provoke a response.

I emphatically deny that I acted with the intention, or expectation, of provoking the Minister.

As noted above you go on to say in your Statement that the Minister was 'entitled to respond strongly to the suggestion of dishonesty'. I made no such suggestion and that was made clear to the Minister at the meeting. The Minister was not responding to a suggestion of dishonesty, there was no such provocation. The Minister's conduct and behaviour cannot be explained or excused as a reasonable response to anything said by me at the meeting.

The Investigation Process

I was not given the opportunity prior to your Statement in Parliament, during the proclaimed 'independent' investigation or any other occasion, to deny or comment on the assertion that I suggested that the Minister had acted dishonestly. I was not given the opportunity to deny or comment on the assertion in your Statement that I was motivated to provoke the Minister.

This represents a failure of fairness and process and calls into question the objectivity and reliability of any findings contained in the report or arising from the investigation generally. I should add that I was not provided with a copy of the report or the contents of the report which relate to my involvement in the meeting.

I respectfully request that you urgently correct the record and withdraw any imputation about my motives, in Parliament by a Ministerial Statement of equal prominence to your Statement of September 9, 2021.

Hon Michael Wright

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:01): I bring up the 50th report of the Legislative Review Committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:01): I bring up the third report of the committee, entitled Changes to Standing Orders.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. As the minister responsible for climate change, does the minister think it is appropriate that he holds shares in a coalmining company?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:03): I have a declaration on the public record that I have a very small portfolio—very, very small, in fact. I am quite comfortable with the level of disclosure there and have no issue with people in the public domain knowing that I do that.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. How many shares does the minister hold in the coal mining company South32 and what is their value?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:04): I have various superannuation investments. I don't know exactly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I could not tell you details of either the companies nor the value of those off the top of my head.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister consider selling his shares in the coalmining company South32 after it was reported that its mine expansion plans would have long-term and irreversible environmental impacts.? With your leave, sir, that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has the call.

Dr CLOSE: In February of this year the New South Wales Planning Commission refused to approve the expansion of South32, finding that the adverse environmental impacts would be long term and irreversible.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:05): This was brought to my attention at the time, and I was disappointed by that, but unfortunately the Ministerial

Code of Conduct, I think, precludes either the buying or selling of shares, so it would be difficult, I think, unless a particular conflict were to arise, and so—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Well, I'm not sure that a conflict has arisen: it is just an ethical situation. I suppose that, from my point of view, I certainly would not be expanding on that investment at any point in the future, but I am quite comfortable holding those shares, which I have held for many, many years. South32, I think, is or was a subsidiary of BHP, and so anyone who has investments in BHP probably has some level of exposure to South32 because it was split away six or seven years ago I believe.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister consider selling his shares in South32 after it was found guilty and fined for allowing coal-polluted sludge to spill into waterways in New South Wales this year? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Dr CLOSE: According to an ABC news report on—

Members interjecting:

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

Dr CLOSE: —on 1 April 2021 South32's Dendrobium coalmine was fined \$15,000 for pumping sludge into Mount Kembla creek.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:06): It is very disappointing. I was certainly aware of that. I wasn't going to divest myself of those shares at this point in time. As I said, I would not be expanding that or recommending to anyone that they invest in that organisation. But that is a small share portfolio I have had for many years, and really it's something that I will probably hold onto for many years to come one way or the other.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question again is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Has the minister ever had to excuse himself from cabinet discussions over climate change because he held shares in a coalmining company?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:08): I also—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —drive a petrol car. Maybe one day I will drive an electric vehicle, but at the moment I drive a petrol car and I am not excusing myself from cabinet for that. There are many activities that we undertake in life which have a potentially detrimental impact on emissions going into the atmosphere, but you try to do your best as a citizen—in my case, as the minister—to lower your carbon footprint. When I fly, I sometimes pay the carbon offset there.

I think that probably the vast majority of people in this house have exposure to mining companies, and potentially coalmining companies—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Well, we do—we're in here with you.

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —through superannuation investments, and I don't think that they feel they needed to excuse themselves from climate-related discussions as a consequence of that. Actually, we can see this drift into exactly what I was talking about yesterday and over recent days,

this drift into the sort of crazy, woke left, lecturing, patronising stuff rather than taking a practical, sensible approach.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Water. Has the minister received any dividends from South32 in the time that he has been the minister responsible for climate change?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:09): It would be very difficult for me to refuse dividends from a company that I have invested in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —so I am certain there have been dividends during this time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Listen to this false—

Mr Picton: They're just throwing their money at you.

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —surprise over here. The woke rhetoric just is ridiculous—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The idea that a minister responsible for climate change—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —should divest themselves of any investments associated with emissions-creating industries of which the parliamentary super scheme and many other things—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —would probably have connections—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There are all sorts of things here. I neither understand the line of questioning nor think that would pass the pub test. The lecturing, finger waving Empress of Woke, the deputy leader, says, 'I don't understand it.' It is yet another distraction from the practical environmental agenda that this government has been progressing for four years: banning single-use plastics, expanding our national parks and network, restoring—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Under the Labor Party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —the rangers became an endangered species while the deputy leader sat in silence appeasing those decisions, I am sure, around the cabinet table. The environment department under the Labor Party was diminished, diluted, and its capacity massively curtailed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: They divested themselves of the environment department—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and they should be ashamed of that very, very sad journey, narrative and rhetoric that occurred under their time in office. We have gone about building the environment department, and we have in many ways, and I have said this publicly, built on their record around climate change. We have invested in infrastructure, such as the interconnector over to New South Wales, to build resilience into—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —our grid so that we can export renewable power into the future. We have an ambition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee! Premier!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —to reach up to 500 per cent of our electricity needs in renewables in the coming decades. We will not only lead the nation but potentially lead the world in this area, enabling us to produce green commodities, green steel, green hydrogen, and lead the world. That is just the reality—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You were upset about closing Leigh Creek!

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —of the situation.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: This government, the Marshall Liberal government, has worked endlessly to ensure that we have a practical approach to climate change, emissions reduction—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and adaptation. Canopy cover in the future—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —using water sensibly to cool our urban environments, not only Adelaide but regional communities like Port Pirie, with the announcement recently that we were looking at ways to green that city and give it more resilience not only in the face of heavy industry in that community but also in the face of a changing climate. I am exceptionally proud of what we have done. We can talk about it at an international level. We should be proud of our record, and for the deputy leader to once again go down a woke spiral in her criticism and patronising rhetoric is unsurprising but disappointing.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Why are South Australians paying \$212 more for the electricity in their homes than the Marshall Liberal government had promised they would? With your leave sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Australian Energy Regulator 2021 Annual Benchmarking Report reveals South Australians have the highest energy residential power prices of any state or territory in the National Electricity Market. The Liberal Party policy document prior to the last state election specifically stated their measures would see, and I quote, 'an average South Australian household power bill fall by \$302 compared to the latest 2016-17 prices'. On that measure, prices this year should have been \$1,572 per year, a \$302 reduction compared to the 2016-17 price of \$1,874 but the report says the price is \$1,784.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier and the member for West Torrens will cease their exchange.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:14): It's quite extraordinary—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —after the member for West Torrens was the former Labor government's energy minister and in the last two years of their term power prices went up \$477 for South Australians, to be asking why power prices are higher in South Australia than in some other places.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier! Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Let me be very clear: two independent consumer-focused—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —organisations, the Essential Services Commission of South Australia and the Australian Energy Regulator—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Both show you broke your promise.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —have both looked at the facts and their information makes it very, very clear that we have delivered—more than delivered—on our commitment with regard to the reduction in electricity prices. It is quite extraordinary for those opposite to even want to raise this topic, to be quite frank, because at the same time as we have reduced electricity prices for all South Australians we have reduced emissions as well. We have also moved from being the worst state in the nation with regard to blackout reliability to the best in the nation on blackout reliability.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Those opposite will be thrilled to know that the wholesale cost of electricity in South Australia is plummeting and the wholesale price today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —will reflect the retail price tomorrow. So we are very optimistic that not only have we delivered \$303 per year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —over the period since the election according to ESCOSA, or \$422 over the period since the election—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: What about your election commitment?

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —by the figures produced by the AER, but the fact that wholesale prices are also falling very dramatically in South Australia and faster than most other states, those opposite will be thrilled to know, means the future retail prices of electricity will continue to go down. Let me also just say—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —that this has not yet factored in the \$100 per year benefit that we are all aware of associated with the interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Chaffey!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Commissioning of the interconnector will commence in 2023. That will be an absolutely fantastic step forward for South Australia and it will be a step that carries on from 20 years ago when the Labor Party and those opposite said that they would build an interconnector with New South Wales.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Former Premier Rann—

The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Child Protection is called to order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —said that that would happen and in fact they held that policy for a very long time. They didn't deliver on the policy. They just said they were going to do it for a very long time, right up until the moment when we said that we actually thought it was a great idea too. Those opposite then decided it was a bad idea. We have had a whole range of different opinions from those opposite from 'I don't know what you are talking about' to 'That was never our policy' to 'Yes, I still disagree and I think it's a terrible idea.'

But what everybody knows, what they have never ever disagreed with, is that there will be another \$100 reduction per year for the average South Australian household in electricity bills due to the interconnector. So a \$477 increase in the last two years of Labor, a \$303 or \$422 increase—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —I'm happy to split the difference and take the number in the middle—since we came into government and there is plenty more still to come.

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Minister, can you please update the house about the practical environmental initiatives being delivered by the Marshall Liberal government?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:18): I thank the member for Chaffey—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —for his question. Actions speak louder than words—and this government has been spending the last—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —3½ years rebuilding the morale and the capacity of our environment department, of the EPA—

Mr Malinauskas: You cut it.

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, having generational increases in expenditure, particularly in the capital program within the department—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and transforming our national parks regime with more rangers. There were 300 rangers at the turn of the millennium here in this state and by the time—

Mr Boyer: Everyone is a ranger. Everyone gets their own ranger outfit.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —those opposite left office there were only 93. We built that by 45 per cent and have almost 140 rangers, making a real difference at the coalface, welcoming visitors and volunteers into the community, connecting with local communities, teaching them about the value of our parks and ensuring that they can access it safely and sensitively. Our story around practical environmentalism continues. We have our nation-leading ban on single-use plastics from 1 March 2021 and we are ambitious for that legislation, setting the legislation up—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in such a way that, as the market or the community provides solutions and demands more, we can add more items to that legislation through regulation, expanding that environmentally proactive body of legislation to ensure that our creeks, our oceans and our parks do not become subject—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —to plastic pollution. We have reinstated our native heritage protection grants cut from many millions of dollars to only \$4,000 by those opposite—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —hugely reducing the capacity of people who have chosen voluntarily—private landowners—to set aside land for conservation and the environment. So disrespected were those people, so ignored, almost—

Mr Pederick: Divested.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —divested, yes. The opposition divested their interest in private conservation, and there was only \$4,000 per annum in the kitty when we came to office. We have increased that with a \$3 million two-year pilot program, giving private landowners the opportunity to participate in conservation activities again.

We have established Green Adelaide, an organisation with a high level of clarity around its vision to create a cooler, greener, wilder more climate-resilient Adelaide, building into the livability of our capital city, looking for ways to protect and expand canopy cover and particularly focusing on our urban rivers and beaches and looking for corridors that can be enhanced, invested in and improved for our natural capital in this state.

We have a big focus on the River Torrens, looking at wetlands along the Torrens, rewilding the Torrens with platypus, looking at ways to ensure there are more raptors in the city, more butterflies, more pollinators. We are working with Green Adelaide to do that. Right across the state we have gone back to basics with natural resources management reform, setting up landscape boards with local people, local expertise, local priorities, managing the natural environment. We are not the party that invested in dirty diesel generators. We are not the party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that put up its hand and said, 'We want to take the world's nuclear waste.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: That was their big idea.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The world's nuclear waste—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —bring it to South Australia. We are the party of practical environmentalism, practical climate policy and we are getting on with it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of interjections is disorderly.

GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister received any advice that there are further delays on the Gawler line electrification project?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:22): I thank the member for the question. We have been quite public in this project. Of course, it's a huge project, one that Labor had on the table and took off the table and put on the table more times than I care to remember. We have said and we have made it very clear—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who's off the rails?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is true: under Labor, it was very much off the rails. We have said that it will be finished early next year. We are working really hard on that. We have had with this project a number of situations as far as getting specialists across to work on the project during COVID times, and that has been difficult in a number of sectors. In fact, if you look at our \$17.9 billion infrastructure spend, a record spend for South Australia, by the way—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —\$17.9 billion—you wouldn't believe it, more than those opposite ever thought to put into infrastructure—we are building a number of projects right across South Australia. I can run through them all—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —but out of all of those projects—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —there were a couple that were impacted by COVID. Gawler rail was one—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and we have made that very public. We are getting on with doing that job, and we will get that done as quickly as we possibly can. The Granite Island Causeway I think was one that was potentially impacted as well.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: A few others had some slight impacts—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Light!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —but the great thing was that the crews here in South Australia we had working on all these projects right across the state had done such a good job that they had got themselves ahead of schedule, so any slight impact from COVID they were able to make up. I am really proud of the work that these crews have done—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —right across all of our infrastructure projects. We will continue to power ahead and deliver more of the infrastructure that South Australia needs because it's important—

Ms Cook interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —to keep building what matters.

GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Has the minister been advised that train services—

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Who is it to? Which minister?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: To the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure—thank you, coach. Has the minister been advised that train services on the Gawler line will not resume until 9 April 2022?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:24): I will refer the member again to my previous answer, the public statement we have made. The public statement we have made is that that project will be completed early next year and we will keep working towards that time line. Again, there are a number of things that are going on. You would have noticed just recently, again, there have been some setbacks of course with COVID right across the nation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are working through those, getting the experts in to do the job. The other thing with the rail project—again, I know the problems that those opposite had when they delivered tram projects and a number of the build issues they had then.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What you do have to do when you are doing a rail project is make sure that it is done safely. You have to actually follow the rules and regulations—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, resist the urge.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —of the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. We will continue to do that. We will work on the signalling to make sure that we get it right. Again, I do recall that those opposite looked at this project, started it, stopped it, started it, stopped it.

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It was quite horrendous.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated; there is a point of order. I will take the point of order. Under standing order 134—

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

The SPEAKER: —I will hear the member. The member for West Torrens on standing order 98.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Rules applying to answers: ministers should be answering the substance of the question and not debating it. The minister is debating the answer, sir. Could you please get him to come back to the substance of the question, which is whether or not he has received any advice whether there will be any delays beyond 9 April next year.

The SPEAKER: There is some force in relation to that submission, standing order 98. Minister, I draw you back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir. I have completed my answer.

GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. What advice has the minister received regarding the operational date for passengers on the Gawler line?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:25): I am happy to answer that for the third time. Again, this has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —been put in the public domain. The project, as we have said, the opening date for that will be early next year.

GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Supplementary question: when early next year? Will it be before or after the March state election?

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:26): Exactly. Again, I can't give any more detail to the member other than what we have said publicly, and that is that it will be ready early next year. I have outlined the factors we have been dealing with. We have been dealing with COVID—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and we have been dealing with signalling issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, what I can tell the member is we will be delivering this project, unlike those opposite who didn't deliver this project. The people in the north should be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —rightly angry with the Labor government because they promised it so many times—

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and they were let down.

The SPEAKER: Minister—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell the people of the north—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —because they have worked through—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir. Again, in replying to answers, ministers may not debate the question; they must answer the substance the question. The minister is now debating it. He has no responsibility to the house for any Labor Party policies. What we would like to know is: will the train line be open before or after the state election in March next year?

The SPEAKER: Minister, standing order 98 is one with which you and I have wrestled for some time. I draw your attention to the standing order.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: There is no debate. The fact is Labor didn't deliver this project. You are right—the time line they set wasn't met. We have been very clear. I have been very clear with our time line: we will have it finished in the first part of next year. This is a project that Labor had on again, off again, on again, off again, and the people of the north have a right to be disappointed and upset with that and I feel for them. They have had to work through this project. Again, we have had to deal with COVID as we have gone through this project—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and a lot of external circumstances that are difficult to deal—

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

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Again, standing order 98. The question was very specific: will it be open before or after the March state election? The minister continues to debate rather than answer specifically.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister is seeking to inform the house, as I heard it, that the project is likely to be delivered in the first half of next year. It's reasonably—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Early next year. It was reasonably precise. I will allow the minister to continue.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir. I refer them to my previous answer.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Has the government's mental health triage phone line service deteriorated to alarming levels? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: The state secretary of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars, said this morning:

Since moving to the Glenside campus in 2020, the government-funded mental health triage service has deteriorated to alarming levels.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:29): I thank the member for the question. As the minister representing the Minister for Health in this house, I will seek a detailed answer and bring it back to the chamber.

The SPEAKER: Unless there's a supplementary, I am going to turn to the member for King.

Mr PICTON: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:29): Supplementary question to the minister: has the minister seen reports that 60 per cent of calls to that service go unanswered, and does the government think that it's appropriate that 60 per cent of people are not getting an answer when they call for mental health assistance?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:29): I assume, as the supplementary arose from my answer, the member is referring to the Minister for Health, and in seeking that detailed answer I will seek that he includes information relevant to the supplementary question in that one answer.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:30): 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 has supported South Australia Police since the last election?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:30): I thank the member for King—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens! The minister has the call.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —for the question. We absolutely have supported South Australia Police extensively since the 2018 state election. Today, I was joined by the member for Elizabeth at the Police Academy, where we just welcomed our newest group of candidates, Course 49, who graduated today, and we wish them well in their careers, of course. May they be a long and successful bunch of careers.

In terms of police station hours, we know that we have not only restored but also expanded on police station hours in a number of stations. We won't talk about how those opposite left those stations. When you look at Henley Beach Police Station in the member for Colton's electorate or the Norwood Police Station in the member for Dunstan's electorate—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —or even the Glenelg Police Station in the member for Morphet's electorate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —not only have we restored those opening hours but also expanded those opening hours. No-one could have predicted the global pandemic—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —that is COVID-19 and the way it would have impacted our state or indeed the world. Can I say, as minister I'm extremely grateful and proud to be the Minister for Police, to watch these men and women, their hard work and their dedication, and how they have served our state enormously well.

We know at some points in the pandemic there have been over 600 police, in fact, who have served us in relation to COVID-related duties—all in all, at least 350 each and every day. We recognise the burden that load has borne on some of those officers. Not only have they had to conduct excellence in their operational day-to-day roles but also in dealing with the pandemic. That's why, having recognised that burden, we have invested almost an additional \$100 million to make sure that we pour that into SAPOL in response to the pandemic, doing things like bringing forward the recruitment of cadets and also PSOs and accelerating recruitment wherever we can.

It is also really important that we continue to protect those who protect us. That's why, after much delay from the former government, where these things weren't committed to, we have unveiled and unrolled over 2,000 stab-proof, bullet-resistant vests, and 2,600 have been fitted—they are bullet resistant and stab resistant—at a cost of \$8½ million. They are going to be vital for—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —the protection of our officers who are on the frontline because we know, unfortunately, when some run out of situations, our officers have to run into them, so it's vital they have the protection needed to keep themselves safe.

We have unveiled our Security Response Section, which continues to respond to dynamic incidents. We have committed \$34.9 million also in relation to the mobile workplace transformation plan. Once that is rolled out, that's going to save 30 minutes per shift per officer. That is absolutely fantastic for SAPOL officers to work more efficiently.

For the first time ever Crime Stoppers has received state government funding—the first time in our state's history—with \$800,000 over four years, which is going to go a long way towards helping SAPOL be the eyes and ears to help stop crime. There is an additional \$270 million in new investment and a budget of around \$1 billion for South Australia Police.

KALANGADOO POLICE STATION

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:34): Supplementary question to the Minister for Police: when will the government deliver on its promise to reopen the Kalangadoo Police Station?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:34): Well, it has been a while since I have had a question from the member for Elizabeth, so I am delighted to talk a little bit about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —the regional review. As I have alluded to—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, minister! The member for Hammond!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: In the spirit of bipartisanship today, we offered the member for Elizabeth a ride to the Police Academy and I knew that bipartisanship would only last for about an hour, but here we are. In relation to the Kalangadoo Police Station, there are certainly no draft recommendations regarding the opening or the closure of any police station. Obviously, SAPOL—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —continues to undertake—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —a regional review. Obviously, the global pandemic has presented many challenges.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The global pandemic—

The SPEAKER: Minister—

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. You are doing an excellent job up there. I know it's not an easy job. I know that sometimes I would have liked one of those vests, let me tell you, when I was up there. SAPOL continue to do that body of work that is the regional review. Of course, the COVID pandemic has led to some delays, but that body of work will continue to be undertaken. I remind members that since coming into government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned. The member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —we have invested an additional new \$270 million in additional funding. As I said, the police budget is now around \$1 billion—an all-time high since we came in to government. Of course, there is a range of other measures being spent like the \$34.9 million—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —investment in the Mobile Workforce Transformation Program. That will actually ensure that frontline officers can actually spend less time behind a desk and more time on the beat.

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. There is a point of order. I will hear the point of order under 134. Please identify the point of order, member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: The point of order is 98, sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

Mr ODENWALDER: The question was very clear. I asked the minister: when will the government deliver on its promise to reopen Kalangadoo Police Station? I am sure the member for MacKillop would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am not going to be dictated to by those—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —who close down stations like the Newton Police Station.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of excitement is reaching disorderly levels. Standing order 98: minister, I draw your attention to the substance of the question.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: With respect, sir, I think I have completed my answer. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

CHILDREN IN CARE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Are children in care subject to ongoing targeted sexual exploitation by adults in the community? With your leave, and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: In her annual report 2020-21, the Guardian for Children and Young People states that she 'continues to have serious concerns about the prevalence of harmful sexual behaviour between children and young people in care and the targeted sexual exploitation of children and young people in care by adults in the community'.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:37): Obviously, cyber safety and sexual predators are a problem for all young people throughout Australia and throughout the world. If anybody recently saw the recent documentary that was on SBS *The Children in the Pictures*, it highlighted the cyber rings of people all around the world that have been going on for many years, Shannon McCool being one of the largest paedophiles who ran a ring of paedophiles throughout the whole world. So this is not a new issue. This is not an issue only for child protection and this is not an issue only in this state. It's an issue around the world.

As I have mentioned recently in this house, but I will mention it again, we have just recently released our Power to Kids program, which is run by the MacKillop Family Services CEO, Robyn Miller, and this is a direct response to the findings of the royal commission into child protection. I will quote from the press release:

We know many of our young people in residential care have experienced horrific family violence, abuse and neglect, which makes them vulnerable to exploitation, and that many carers have not been equipped with the skills to identify and respond effectively.

Power to Kids also focuses on assisting staff to determine when to access key professionals and agencies, such as SA Police, to initiate a broader response.

So we are acting on the issues and, yes, they exist and, as a whole of community, we need to do all we can to keep all of our children and young people safe.

CHILD AND YOUNG PERSON'S VISITOR SCHEME

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:39): My question is again to the Minister for Child Protection. Would specifically funding the Guardian for Children and Young People to undertake the Community Visitor role for children in care keep children in care safer and better supported if they have been sexually abused? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: In her annual report 2020-21, recently tabled in this house, the Guardian for Children and Young People states that she 'currently has limited capacity to provide the level of individual advocacy for children who have been sexually abused' and also that 'there is [very] clearly a need for this important work to be facilitated'.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:40): We have discussed the visitor program in this house several times before. However, the Children and Young Person's Visitor Scheme was a pilot program that was funded for two years. The pilot program was scheduled to finish on 30 June 2019, but funding was extended to 30 September 2019. The findings of the report and external evaluation were considered by DCP, and will not be continuing with this at this time.

The government has to determine where its money is spent. Some of the things we are doing, additional measures that are being taken to support children and young people in care, include working with our non-government partners to ensure that cyber safety policies are in place, reviewing and updating the policies and procedures relating to the use of mobile phones and social media in residential care homes and working across government to support the design and implementation of Australia's first national strategy to prevent child sexual abuse, which will focus on preventing child sexual abuse in all settings, including institutions, within families and online.

We are funding and hiring the Lead Psychiatric Director, Prue McEvoy, who works directly with our most complex children and young people to help them through their traumatic experiences. We have introduced complex case review meetings, which bring together people from the child's care team and other relevant parties to discuss a shared plan, taking into account the child's trauma history and individual needs. We have also funded and are implementing the Sanctuary model of residential care, which provides a trauma-informed approach to practice that seeks to create safe environments for children and young people as well as staff.

We are funding a new pilot program, Breathing Space, that is specifically targeted at helping vulnerable children and young girls in care who are at risk of becoming or who are pregnant, funding the Guardian for Children and Young People, Penny Wright, and her office almost \$2 million per annum. In her role as the guardian, she can continue to visit all residential care facilities in the state and advocate for children and young people in care. We are also establishing a therapeutic care support team with 10 new allied health professionals.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:42): My question is again to the Minister for Child Protection. Minister, can you guarantee that when a child in your care is abused every reporting procedure is adhered to?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:42): We have the CARL, the Child Abuse Report Line, that was instigated many years before I was the minister. We have expanded that. We have more staff, and we have initiated the callback facility that was available but never utilised under the former government. We are answering more calls than ever before. The eCARL is also being used very successfully. I believe there have been incredible improvements in all areas of my department.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Minister, did you make the Guardian for Children and Young People aware of the two cases of children in your care being sexually abused and pregnant in 2020?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:43): I don't believe it is my role. I believe there is a significant incident reporting unit that has now been established—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —and at no point does it say that the minister is to inform the guardian. There is a procedure. The guardian is notified when I am notified.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on the latest data on electricity prices, and are there any alternative plans?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elizabeth is called to order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:44): Yes, I can. Thank you very much, member for Newland. What we know is that ESCOSA has said that, since we came to government, we have decreased electricity prices by \$303. But with regard to the latest data—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —on electricity prices for households and businesses in South Australia, which the member asked about today, I have good news. The independent Australian Energy Regulator has confirmed that the average power bills have come down nearly 20 per cent since we came to government. The AER's annual retail energy market—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —performance data confirms that the median annual bill is now \$1,784—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —which is \$422 less than the \$2,206 that it was when Labor left power. What is more, the AER data shows that there are fewer households in hardship than under Labor.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: What else do we know—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —because you did ask about other alternative plans. We are very clear about the fact that we have a multipronged energy policy—small-scale storage, large-scale storage, demand management, supply integration, grid-scale storage—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: They are all working together. What we also know on the other side is that former Premier Rann said that he would build an interconnector but never did. What we know is that former Premier Weatherill said that he would be completely focused on climate change and then spent \$600 million on dirty diesel generators without telling anybody.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: What we also know is that when they bought the dirty diesel generators the price of electricity went up. So there are alternative plans out there. There have been and there still are.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: One of the plans afoot at the moment, and I use the word 'plan' very loosely, is those opposite wanting to build a hydrogen project.

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

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, there is a point of order. I will hear the point of order under 134.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the minister has no responsibility whatsoever over any Labor Party policies at all. He has no responsibility to the house at all, sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee is called to order. I will listen carefully. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was very clearly asked: 'Are there any alternative plans?' One of the alternative plans—I have talked about two previous ones, which were disasters, and I am going to talk about the current one, which—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —if ever allowed to be put into effect would also be a disaster, and one of the reasons for that is that those opposite have a \$500 million black hole in their costings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Those opposite refuse to release their costings—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Those opposite are hiding—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Those opposite should share with the public—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Any member can address me on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members! Deputy Premier, please be seated. Member for West Torrens, you are on a second warning. Members, I draw your attention to standing order 142, which prohibits noise or interruptions. The level of noise and interruption is considerable. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: There is nobody opposite who should be more ashamed of the situation they are in than the member for West Torrens, who is the architect of the disgraceful disaster in energy that was thrust upon the people of South Australia before the last election.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 96:

2. questions may be put to other Members but only if such questions relate to any Bill, motion or other public business for which those Members, in the opinion of the Speaker, are responsible to the House.

The energy minister is not responsible to the parliament for any Labor Party policy at all.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: You are ashamed of your policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am going to hear the Deputy Premier. The time on the question is fast expiring. There is some force in the point of order. I will hear the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As energy minister, I am actually responsible for the fact that people in South Australia need to know about—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —alternative plans.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If those opposite believe in their plan, they will release their modelling. If those opposite believe in their costings—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —they will release their costings. What they have done is release some—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —glossy photos that say, 'It'll all be great,' and some information that says, 'And it won't cost much.' Well, neither of those things are true.

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: There is a \$500 million black hole in their policy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —and nobody should believe otherwise. They should release their costings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will cease interjecting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the leader on a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, I've got a question, sir.

The SPEAKER: A question. Very well. Before we do that, the member for Lee can leave the chamber for 15 minutes under 137A—in fact, 14 minutes so that he can return to crossbench questions, which I know he enjoys.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

ELECTION DEBATE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Why won't the Premier debate me, as Leader of the Opposition, in the lead-up to the election at either a Master Builders Association, a Business SA function or a Property Council function, all three of which have issued invites both to the Premier and me, yet only I have accepted thus far? What is the Premier scared of?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford! The ranks have already been thinned. They might be thinned further.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, I have well in mind standing order 96. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): Yesterday, during question time I committed to coming back to the house with a detailed explanation on the need to have a Deputy Premier. I was advised that the portfolio of Deputy Premier should not be vacant for two key reasons. Firstly, if I was to be incapacitated or unable to perform my duties, the portfolio of the Deputy Premier makes it immediately clear who takes responsibility.

The second reason relates to the legal arrangements for ministerial portfolios. Ministerial portfolios are constructed as bodies corporate which would mean that, if vacant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the body corporate would need to be dissolved. The advice I was provided with was that it was considered unsuitable. In relation to the Administrative Arrangements Act, I was advised that section 7 of the Administrative Arrangements Act provides for the Governor to constitute ministers as bodies corporate but not to create the office of an unincorporated minister.

I would just point out that during the matter of privilege raised by the leader of opposition business, he alleged and I quote:

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.

I have checked the *Hansard* and I did not say that. I would just remind the house of the need to be careful when the member for West Torrens makes claims about other members. With regard the question that the leader has asked, there will be of course a schedule of debates in the lead-up to the next election and I would just encourage the leader, in the time he has remaining, to develop some useful policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader and then the member for Elder.

ELECTION DEBATE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary question: given the leader is willing to have debates with me as Leader of the Opposition, why hasn't he agreed to debates at Business SA, the Master Builders or the Property Council?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): I think there are—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, you are warned. Member for Playford, I resist the urge to make a human sacrifice.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are a range of venues that we could use to host debates in the lead-up to the next election. One, for example, could be at the Repat site. I don't think a lot of people would like to be reminded that the Leader of the Opposition, while he was the health minister, actually saw fit to close down and break the hearts of the veterans in South Australia. Now, that would be a worthy venue for a debate with the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you again, sir, for highlighting that we do need to set a schedule—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will keep in mind some of these venue suggestions. Of course, one of the other things that we will probably need to debate, given the deputy leader's questions to the Minister for Environment and Water today, is everybody's superannuation investments. A cursory glance reveals a very interesting own goal for the member for Port Adelaide. The Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —has superannuation with both Statewide and Rest and we understand that they both have investments in South32—another own goal from the member for Port Adelaide. It is an incredible—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —own goal drawn to the attention of the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the people of South Australia: the Leader of the Opposition's investment in South32. Don't tell me he's got another person who's after his job.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Don't tell me there is another one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Indeed I will. The member for Playford can leave the chamber for 12 minutes under 137A, and the member for Hammond can join him. The member for Elder has the call.

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

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:53): My question is for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on what the Marshall Liberal government is achieving through its record \$17.9 billion spent in infrastructure in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: What a question!

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:54): I thank the member for Elder for her question and her interest in that \$17.9 billion figure. That is how much money we are spending on infrastructure over a four-year period—more than this state has ever seen before. Fundamentally, it is about building what matters for the people of South Australia, and I know the member for Elder cares about investing in the type of infrastructure that is beneficial to the people of South Australia

As we roll down to Christmas, it is probably an opportune time to update on what this means for the people of South Australia. This record spend is fixing more than 4,500 kilometres of roads, creating thousands and thousands of local jobs and making our roads safer and more productive. There is no shortage of achievements to talk about here, especially when we compare to the former government—visionaries who lacked foresight. They would have reportedly just sat in the wings when it came to announcing projects, rather than actually getting on and doing the planning works. If we compare and contrast, it is \$17.9 billion in infrastructure, compared to those opposite, who managed a mere \$10.5 billion.

But never fear, the Liberals are here to fix the mess that they left. The pipeline of dizzying heights never seen before in South Australia is what we are rolling out. I thought I might break it down into geographic regions and just list a few achievements in a few of the regions. Let's start with Eyre Peninsula and the member for Flinders, who has done an outstanding job in his time in this

place. There is \$125 million going into the Eyre Peninsula, \$32 million of course going in to build much needed overtaking lanes.

It was great to hear him talk about the upgrades of the Tod Highway, the Flinders Highway and the Lincoln Highway yesterday in his valedictory speech. We are making those roads safer. As the member for Flinders has always said to me, a wider road is a safer road, and we are delivering wider roads on Eyre Peninsula. This is vitally important, of course, for making our roads safer, but also better for tourists as well as they flock to Eyre Peninsula because they want to see what our regions have to offer, so it is wonderful to see this work rolling out.

Regarding the Eyre Highway, I know the member for Giles would be very welcoming of the \$125 million investment we are putting into shoulder sealing on the Eyre Highway as well to make that safer. The member for Stuart, of course, up there in Port Augusta, is keeping a very close eye on the Joy Baluch Bridge and the duplication project there. This is something he has championed for a long, long period of time and in government he is delivering for the people in his local community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That project is now 70 per cent complete, or so he tells me, and it's on track to be finished next year. This is great. I know the member for Stuart and the member for Frome are both very interested in the work we are doing on the Augusta Highway, a duplication ignored for too long by the previous Labor government. We are getting on with that. In addition, the Horrocks Highway in the Mid North region has received over \$80 million worth of funding to widen that road and add shoulders and overtaking lanes there as well—more safety treatments to make that a better road.

The member for Narungga is over the moon, some say like a dog with two tails, watching over the overpass that is being built at the notorious Crash Corner. He is so happy. The Port Wakefield overpass is coming along wonderfully well. Watch this space—it will be delivered very, very soon.

If I skip across to the south of our state and the Granite Island Causeway, the local member down there, the Minister for Primary Industries and his wife are watching this go up every day. She is sending me photos all the time, very excited about that, and we are doing wonderfully well there. Of course, there is \$560 million for the Fleurieu Connections package to fix Main South Road with two grade separations, not the roundabouts that Labor wanted to put in. We are putting in grade separations. We are doing this job properly and investing in the Victor Harbor Road as well, another massive achievement.

For the projects in metropolitan Adelaide, the list is too long. I'm running out of time. I will come back at another time to talk more about how we are building what matters.

TRAIN SERVICES

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:58): I have a supplementary to the Minister for Transport. Has the government sold off Renewal SA land at Aldinga, which was planned to be used for a train station for the eventual extension of the line to Aldinga?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59): I'm not responsible for Renewal SA. What I do know is that we are building the Fleurieu Connections package and that is what my responsibility is. As I outlined, there is some \$560 million to duplicate that road. Of course, we know that, as you get into Aldinga, there is a roundabout there—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Wright!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —that the locals are absolutely furious about. It was put in by the previous Labor government.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: A point of order on relevance: this is about a road. My question was quite clearly about a train line and a train station, which the Minister for Transport quite clearly has responsibility for.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is some force in the point of order that has been raised.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I understand why the member is a bit touchy about the roundabout down there at Aldinga that the Labor government built. People don't like it. We are putting in grade separations there. As far as Renewal SA is concerned, I will take that on notice and ask the appropriate minister.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Are children in your care living in placements that are dangerous and harmful? With your leave, and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: In the Guardian for Children and Young People's annual report, when describing the ongoing staffing crisis the guardian notes:

These factors have led to such a shortage of residential care placements that, despite the strongest advocacy by my office, some children have been required to continue living in placements that are dangerous and harmful.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:00): I might just note that the previous guardian used to comment—I think for about 10 years it was ignored—about the large bed facilities and the danger that children were being left in, in places like Queenstown. In fact, not only did they ignore the previous guardian's calls to close these large bed facilities that were the source—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —of most of the runaways and most of the troubles and most of the issues but Labor sought to build a new one that caused troubles itself. Coming into government, I knew that Labor had made a complete mess of child protection. In fact, there's a very good article from interviewing Jay Weatherill, the previous minister, about just how wrong he got child protection and the mess that it was left in.

We moved very swiftly to close the Queenstown unit. We have also closed the Gilles Plains unit, we have downsized and capped the numbers in other units and we have refurbished. In fact, the Sturt Street assessment unit is now known as Diagonal Road. It looks like *The Block* have been in and renovated, it looks so amazing. It looks like a magazine cover when you take photos; it's absolutely stunning.

We have gone to great lengths to improve the living conditions of all our children. We have just built an architecturally designed specific home in Davoren Park. We will wait for six months or 12 months to get feedback from all the young people living there and the staff to see if there can be any enhancements made, but we are building homes that are homes that treat children the way that they should be treated, unlike what we saw when we came into government.

We have done extensive recruiting of residential care workers. We have more residential care workers than ever were employed before, and they are working in our residential care homes—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —which are of a better quality and standard than ever before. We have a rolling recruitment for residential care workers and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —we continue to work with TAFE.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Every two months we have new carers coming through. With the help of the Minister for Skills and Innovation, we have had 91 of our carers go through and do a certificate IV or diploma course, which means they can now not only be foster carers but they can get jobs in residential care, and some of them have and some of them are getting further experience. We are building depth and capacity throughout our department, and we are fixing the mess that I was left by the former Labor government.

In residential care, the other things that we are doing that are fantastic are that we have invested \$600,000 in the Sanctuary therapeutic model. That is being rolled out over three years. It will enhance the experience, and it will be better for children as well as the workers. That training is being undertaken right now. The MyPlace program as well has led to the refurbishment of what was the Sturt Street unit and now the Diagonal Road location. We have also upgraded many of our other homes. We are proud of the investment that we are putting into improving outcomes for children and young people.

DRY CREEK LINEAR PARK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. What is being done to identify and establish significant green areas in the north-east, such as along the Dry Creek Linear Park near Walkleys Road in particular, to be brought to the same level as the Glenthorne National Park?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:04): I thank the member for Florey for her interest and care for our natural environment. I know she is interested in practical outcomes that improve the livability of her communities, create conservation opportunities and draw people into practical action and volunteering to benefit the natural environment.

It is a really interesting place that I visited in the north-east with the member for Florey I think sometime last year, which is the Dry Creek corridor. The importance of river corridors and those connected areas that move through the landscape, often from the hills to the sea, should never be overlooked when it comes to their immense value for restoration and recovery because they do connect various points across the landscape. They are often unbroken in many ways—not entirely, but they are unbroken corridors of open space that can be invested in to create space for biodiversity to survive and thrive.

The Dry Creek corridor in particular has been identified as being potentially a strategic project for the Green Adelaide Board in the future. It has been great to connect with some members of the friends of Dry Creek. I know that through the Green Adelaide Grassroots Grants program, our legislated guaranteed \$2 million fund for community grants on an annual basis, the friends of Dry Creek received about \$6½ thousand in a previous round to go towards tools and weed control and revegetation programs.

It is also important for these areas to try to identify connections with traditional owners in relation to this area of the state, and that's obviously the Kaurna people and, extending further up into the Hills catchment, the Peramangk people. The Dry Creek area has been, as I mentioned, identified by Green Adelaide as one of these strategic corridors in a similar way that not only Glenthorne is but the Field River valley, which extends further away from Glenthorne into the southern suburbs, through areas like O'Halloran Hill, Trott Park, Sheidow Park and on into Lonsdale and Reynella and Reynella East.

That connected corridor is incredibly valuable in the south, but we have to look for these connected corridors in other parts of the city and invest in them accordingly. In the north-east, the Dry Creek corridor is incredibly valuable. Then, through the heart of the city and into the western suburbs, there is of course the Torrens catchment and corridor which we, through Green Adelaide, are investing significantly in, not only in the CBD context but out into the western suburbs through the Breakout Creek investment, which is a multimillion dollar investment.

The Green Adelaide Board have been looking very closely at the opportunities with Dry Creek. They have identified it as a place worthy of significant investment. They are looking for ways to leverage that through their strategic plan in the coming months. Kelvin Trimper, a member of that board, a significant South Australian and someone I know both myself and the member for Florey would describe as a friend and someone we rely on for greening and conservation advice, has firmly locked onto the opportunities with Dry Creek, keen to connect with the friends of Dry Creek, the Green Adelaide Board and my department to make sure that corridor is preserved and revitalised into the future.

I thank the member for Florey for drawing this important project to my attention and finally would apprise the house of the \$500,000 investment in the Dawson reserve, which is part of that broader corridor, which the Marshall Liberal government has made possible in recent weeks.

TAFE SA

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the future direction and security of the Port Pirie and Port Augusta TAFE campuses in regard to staffing in particular, and also provision of courses relevant to the industries?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:08): I thank the member for the question. Firstly, in relation to the campuses, we look forward to seeing those campuses used for training and also further opportunities for training-related activities for students who live in Port Pirie, Port Augusta and the districts. The TAFE board and the TAFE chief executive have in recent months released for consultation and discussion their regional review.

One of the key areas they are working in—and they are working in this across South Australia, but Port Pirie and Port Augusta are obviously key campuses, key locations where this is happening—is not only how to ensure that TAFE campuses, through the increased focus in regional South Australia in TAFE's general work and their engagement with local industries and businesses, are meeting the local demand but how they also give more and broader opportunities to students in regional South Australia who might not traditionally have had access to a particular course in Port Pirie or Port Augusta or any other regional location. This is, I guess, one of those serendipitous benefits that comes out of the things that have been driven by necessity through COVID.

As people have become more comfortable and more familiar with technology, they have also become more familiar and more comfortable with the opportunity to do blended learning. Potentially, you might be trying to gather a group of 14 students in a course and, rather than waiting for a full year, or potentially two years or maybe it will never happen, to make it viable in one particular location you can bring together two or three locations through a high-quality AV investment or high-quality engagement between lecturers and students.

It doesn't mean that the lecturer needs to be in the same room as the student for every single class. If they can share that course across two or three locations, you will increase the number of courses available, increase the number of times that they are able to be offered, speed up the process between somebody indicating an interest in undertaking a course or training and, indeed, that course being available at their local campus in a high-quality facility.

The TAFE board is obviously looking at those investments, where they might need to be made, in particular campuses to ensure that at those facilities that level of access is available as much as possible to students wherever they are in South Australia. For students in Port Pirie and Port Augusta, I have every confidence that in the years ahead those engagements between TAFE and local industry will continue to be enhanced.

Not so long ago I was with the member for Stuart at the John Pirie Secondary School, and we also visited Port Augusta Secondary School a couple of times, to talk about the Flexible Industry Pathways they are offering and, indeed, using the model that is available because of the reforms of the Marshall Liberal government for training in schools and vocational education and training (VET) in schools through the Flexible Industry Pathways.

What we are doing is enabling students at our schools to have access to high-quality training delivered by quality RTOs, in especially TAFE SA when it comes to schools, who are able to deliver

that to school students. Because of the work we have done, we have identified particularly which courses are relevant for school students who are seeking to go straight from school potentially into employment, especially if that's through a traineeship or apprenticeship on the way, so identifying what are the most high-value training opportunities for those students. We have also gone to industry and business and asked what specific sorts of training will meet the skills shortages both in regions and across the state.

Those Flexible Industry Pathways, offered at John Pirie Secondary School, offered at Port Augusta Secondary School, the member for Stuart and I certainly had great feedback from the schools about what they will offer those students, and we get great feedback regularly from businesses and industries about how happy they are. We have more than 3,000 businesses that have offered a traineeship or an apprenticeship for the first time ever in the last three years. We have had a 30 per cent increase in the number of school-based apprenticeships and traineeships in the last financial year and we are going to keep doing that work and keep giving more opportunities to those students.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:12): My question is to the Premier. Premier, once the Emergency Management Act lapses do the directions given under that act also lapse?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:13): The Emergency Management Act remains in place. What we have coming to a conclusion now is the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act, but the Emergency Management Act, you're quite right, is essentially the main piece of legislation that we have in the South Australian parliament to control how we deal with all state emergencies. The State Coordinator is appointed under that act, who is, of course, the police commissioner.

That major emergency declaration is renewed every 28 days on a recommendation from the police commissioner, but it needs to be accepted by the cabinet, and ultimately it goes to the Governor. That remains in place for the foreseeable future. Ultimately, as I said yesterday in the parliament, we will have a look at revising the Emergency Management Act because it was never envisaged for emergencies that went over 19, 20, 21 months. It was really more for a flood or a fire.

With regard to the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act, which was passed and concludes, I think, today or yesterday, that had a series of powers, some of which were relevant initially, some which were no longer relevant, some where we have found other ways of delivering those on a continuing basis and some which we just didn't feel we needed going forward.

As I said yesterday, on balance, we didn't feel that we needed to extend that. Back in August, a different situation, we did argue prudently to extend it through until next year, but a lot of work has been done since that time, of course. I think we as a state find ourselves in a much better position now than where we were in August because of the great partnership we have with the people of South Australia, the high vaccination rate. So for all of those reasons, we formed the opinion that we wouldn't be seeking an extension to the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act.

WAITE GATEHOUSE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Minister, can you please update the house on when the historic Waite Gatehouse will be relocated to its new home within the Waite campus? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

Mr DULUK: I thought the house might appreciate a bit of a time line. As we know, in December 2020, the state government announced that it would demolish the Waite Gatehouse and, after joining with thousands of protesters, this decision was reversed. On 15 March 2021, the government announced that they will instead relocate the gatehouse to a new site. Plans for the new building were released and approved in August this year, but since then we have heard little. Some three months later, minister, can you please let us know when work will actually begin on this important community project?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:16): I thank the member for the question and note how

wonderful it was to work with the local community and find a solution that actually meant that the heritage of that building was maintained and it's actually going to be put into a usable space and facility. What I did do, and I had the privilege of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —having a look through the gatehouse about a month or so ago and can I tell you whilst it might look okay on the outside—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —inside it has gone to rack and ruin. The derelict nature of that building and—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the fact that it's not used for any purpose whatsoever, it really was not a functional building. It was great to work with the university and then to be able to actually work with them and work with companies to move it brick by brick as opposed to picking it up and carrying it which was the first thought that people were looking at. So the solution I think will be an outstanding solution.

As far as the time line is concerned, I know work is being done. I will get back to the member with the specifics of it, but being able to move it brick by brick, and in fact move it closer to the gate that is actually on the property now, the irony of all this is the gatehouse as it was positioned was there to protect the gate of that property. The gate that it was there to protect disappeared a number of years ago—no-one knows where it is—so it actually didn't have a gate to protect.

Where it will be relocated, and with the designs that the member talks about, it is going to be far more usable for the university, the campus, hopefully for volunteers, and those groups as well will be able to use this as it is repurposed and the company that is looking to do this has a great history in this sort of set-up.

What will actually happen is the house gets pulled down brick by brick and every piece is actually numbered and then put back in piece by piece, place by place. So the actual character of the building will be maintained which I think is what the community wanted as we went out and consulted with community on that and that's what we are going to get.

Whilst technically the heritage is not quite the same, some people in the heritage space feel that if you move a building like that, some of the heritage is lost. But the community actually wanted the character kept and maintained. By bringing it down brick by brick and rebuilding it in a position that actually will be usable and make it accessible for the community I think will be a really great result and a great win. Of course, the road project will get done as well, so it's a great outcome. But the time and the detail I will get back to the member on.

Personal Explanation

DISABILITY

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:18): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms COOK: Yesterday in the other chamber in question time, Minister Lensink implied that I spoke about a person in care's death in parliament and also then in the media without permission of the next of kin. This is absolutely untrue. I had absolute permission of the sister of the person who wanted this matter raised both in the parliament and in the media. It is untrue what the minister said.

*Bills***HOLIDAYS (CHRISTMAS DAY) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL***Conference*

The Legislative Council agreed to the time and place appointed by the House of Assembly for holding the conference.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:19): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

*Grievance Debate***HEALTH SYSTEM**

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (15:19): If you turn on your TV at the moment, you are blasted with a 'massive' \$1 million advertising campaign from this government telling you how everything is wonderful in the health system. This is the Premier's advertising campaign to try to distract people from what they are actually seeing, with their own eyes, going on in our health system day after day.

I will tell you some of the things you will not hear about in the government's \$1 million advertising campaign on our health system. The first is the news today—reported in InDaily, and the family has also contacted the opposition directly—of a woman who had a C-section at the Lyell McEwin Hospital who had to leave the hospital without her baby after just 24 hours, while she was still bleeding. This is incredibly distressing for many South Australians. The new grandmother of the baby contacted us to say:

Now I am angry. Daisy was born via c section YESTERDAY & Lyell McEwin Hospital are saying Mum has to go home without Daisy because they have no beds! 24 hours after a caesarean! Mum is bleeding, on heavy pain killers. Supposed to be a happy time, but they are both in tears.

That is a terrible sign of what is going on in our health system—and you will not be seeing that in this government's massive \$1 million advertising campaign. You also will not be hearing about what happened to a family over the weekend at Murray Bridge hospital. It was a journalist, Amanda, who made the revelation of what happened to her husband after a motorcycle accident on the weekend. He was taken to the Murray Bridge hospital and required further care at that hospital, but there was not sufficient ability to provide those services. She said:

Husband in a motorcycle accident this morning. Taken by excellent SA Ambulance to Murray Bridge. Sees doctor. Needs transfer to RAH for internal scans. No ambulances can do today. No beds in Murray Bridge. Night ahead in the emergency here. Broken system.

That is yet another example of what is happening. You are not seeing that in the advertising campaign that is on our TV screens, with glossy pictures.

I tell you what else you also will not see: the images that came out yesterday, videos from both 2pm and 10pm at the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department ramp showing ramped ambulances lined up for hours outside the emergency department, stuck with patients who needed appropriate care or tests inside that hospital who could not get that care. This is happening again and again and again. Ramping is up 576 per cent under this government: not up 5 per cent, not up 10 per cent, but up 576 per cent.

This government had the gall to issue a legal direction this week, saying, 'Ramping is going to stop. We've made it the law that you have to stop ramping.' But they have not put the resources in to make that happen. They have just passed the buck down the line. Our clinicians are not ramping because they want to, because they think it is fun: they are ramping because there are not sufficient resources available to see those patients.

Last night, again, we had the Ambulance Service at OpStat Red, meaning there were not sufficient ambulances available to respond to cases because of that continuing ramping. There were many cases in our community where there were unattended emergency callouts to 000 for cases that needed a lights-and-sirens response—because there were not enough ambulances. Yet again, that is something you do not see in the taxpayer-funded \$1 million advertising campaign.

I tell you what you also will not hear about in their advertising campaign: the revelation that came out this morning from Elizabeth Dabars from the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation about our mental health triage line. This is the line somebody goes to if they need support for themselves or a loved one, or somebody they know, who is in a desperate situation. It has been revealed this morning that, under this government, 60 per cent of those phone calls are not even getting answered. These are people in desperate situations. These are people trying to save the lives of other people, and this government does not even put on enough staff so that those phones can get answered.

Obviously, those people end up in our overwhelmed emergency departments. Obviously, those people do not get the care that they need. Despite the government's \$1 million advertising saying how great everything is, despite the government prioritising their \$662 million basketball stadium, which we will put all into health, I think that the public can see with their own eyes exactly what is happening, and they are forming a view that this government does not care about their health, and they are going to take out their anger on that at the ballot box this March.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25): I rise to correct the record and give the local community in the southern suburbs factual accuracy about the Torrens to Darlington project that will shave around 20 minutes off their journey and enable them to bypass 21 sets of traffic lights and improve safety in their community.

As elected representatives, we have a responsibility to represent, advocate and inquire on behalf of our community. Perhaps more importantly, politicians are also a source of information for our communities and it is imperative that we pass on accurate information. The member for Badcoe, Jayne Stinson, gave a disgraceful and misleading address to this parliament on 18 November.

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Badcoe's address was littered with misinformation—

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order raised by the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The minister just accused the member for Badcoe of misleading the parliament. He cannot do that without a substantive motion, and he used her name rather than her appropriate title. I ask him to withdraw and apologise immediately.

The SPEAKER: That may be, but it might also be that the member for Badcoe would raise that matter with me, in which case I would hear the member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: I raise that matter with you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I understand that the member for Badcoe has taken offence. The standard is a subjective one, minister, and as a result I give you the opportunity to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Mr Speaker, I withdraw and apologise, and I will rephrase.

The SPEAKER: Very well. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Badcoe, Jayne Stinson, gave a disgraceful address to the parliament on 18 November. The member for Badcoe's address was littered with misinformation designed to fearmonger within the community. Firstly, the member for Badcoe asserted that the people of Badcoe are not the beneficiaries of the tunnel.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 127, personnel reflections on members:

A Member may not...impute improper motives to any other Member.

The minister just said that the member for Badcoe was deliberately trying to incite some sort of behaviour among her constituents by giving inaccurate information. That is incorrect, and the minister should apologise and withdraw immediately.

The SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to standing order 127. I understand that the minister has withdrawn and apologised. It may be that there was an additional statement that followed the withdrawal and apology, but in any event that may be a matter that the member for Badcoe would, again, raise with me.

Ms STINSON: I raise that with you, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Very well. I understand, minister, that offence has been taken in relation to words following the withdrawal and apology. I understand that there may have been reference to a disgrace or other matter. In any event, the most straightforward way to resolve it may be just to withdraw and apologise and then we will continue. I will listen carefully to your remarks.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir. I just seek clarification on what words are offensive?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As I understand it, there was a reference to a matter of disgrace. It is not entirely clear what that matter is, but in any event the member for Badcoe has taken offence. Minister, it is a subjective standard. A further apology may be a course which you adopt, in which case I will then listen carefully. I also remind members that it is important that members making a grievance contribution be heard, so I will listen carefully to the minister. It may be that a further withdrawal and apology would resolve the matter, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I seek your clarity here, sir. I did describe the address as disgraceful. That is my opinion and I put that on the record.

The SPEAKER: It may be your opinion, minister, but whether or not it is your opinion is not material to the subjective standard that applies to the point of order that the member for Badcoe has raised with me.

What is important, and I emphasise this, is that the member for Badcoe has taken offence, not that you consider it not to be offensive. That clearly is not the standard. As I say, it is a subjective standard and I invite you to withdraw and apologise in relation to this suggestion that there is a matter of disgrace.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Very well. I will listen carefully to the remainder of your remarks. I ask that the minister not be interrupted. However, minister, it is important that your contribution remain well within the standing orders.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Mr Speaker, I am a bit perplexed with the sensitivity of the member for Badcoe, but we do need—

The SPEAKER: Well, that, minister, again brings the standing order into clear focus. It is a subjective standard and I ask you not to reflect on a member, under 127. The standing order is clear minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I appreciate that, sir.

The SPEAKER: Continue your remarks.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Badcoe's address was littered with the misinformation designed to fearmonger within the community. Firstly, the member for Badcoe asserted the people of Badcoe are not beneficiaries of the tunnel. This is incorrect. This claim is simply false and ignoring the massive benefits people living in Plympton, South Plympton, Ascot Park, Edwardstown, Kurralta Park, Ashford, Keswick, Black Forest, Clarence Park, Clarence Gardens, Everard Park, Millswood, Marlestone and Netley will receive.

Most of these residents are likely to see uplift in their property values once the project is complete, as they are close to the tunnel portal and will have 130,000 less vehicles on the South Road surface road. Modelling shows a \$2 billion property value uplift along the Torrens to

Darlington stretch of the north-south corridor, and the residents of these suburbs will be the beneficiaries of that, contrary to what the member for Badcoe has claimed in this place. These suburbs, as she said, will not be the beneficiaries of the tunnel when in fact they will.

Further, those living in these suburbs will be close to the tunnel portal, meaning they have the easiest access to hop on the north-south corridor and be in the Barossa to the north or McLaren Vale and Aldinga in the south without encountering a traffic light on the north-south corridor. Aside from the travel times and improved road safety, we are also investing \$125 million to green the communities, plant more trees and deliver more local community projects to improve livability. The people of these suburbs will reap some of those benefits too.

The government has been transparent regarding the property impacts of this project, and we acknowledge that residents of Glandore will be affected. However, it is both right and courteous to speak directly to the property owners being impacted before the design is released more broadly. The member for Badcoe went on to say, and I quote, 'I requested an urgent briefing from the minister because I wanted accurate information to share with the people.'

I agree with the member on this front and organised that briefing for the benefit of her community. Unfortunately, the member for Badcoe's office cancelled this briefing the day before it was scheduled in late October. To me, that shows that the member for Badcoe is being disingenuous.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If she truly cared about the community and she wanted to get them accurate information, she would not have cancelled that briefing. The member for Badcoe also asserts, and I quote, 'I have been sent absolutely no information at any stage from the department or the minister as the elected representative for this area, despite repeated requests.' This is factually incorrect.

The member for Badcoe was first briefed in person on 22 December 2020. Since that time, I am advised that the member for Badcoe has only written to my office requesting information about this project five times, from which we have responded—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —to three, addressing her concerns, and the remaining two were received in November this year and a reply is being provided.

In addition, the member for Badcoe asked 43 questions on notice in parliament for which she received a response to all 43 before she made the above statement about receiving no information. The member for Badcoe's statement was again false, misleading and designed to fearmonger in the community, in my opinion. The member for Badcoe—

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

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The minister has again accused the member for Badcoe of misleading this house. He has done it now on three occasions. I ask him to withdraw and apologise or move a substantive motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister please be seated. I hear members out, under standing order 134 in relation to the matters that the member for West Torrens has raised. Minister, standing order 127 provides a prohibition in relation to personal reflections on a member. I draw attention in particular to standing order 127(3), which prohibits you from making personal reflections on any other member. As well, standing order 127(2) prohibits all members, including you, from imputing improper motives to any other member.

However, in this instance, the matter has been raised by the member for West Torrens and not from the member for Badcoe. I warn you, minister, and I allow you to continue your remarks. You are warned.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Badcoe has also made a host of assertions about the property acquisition process. The truth is that those with affected properties are being engaged directly by the department, and any information they require should be sought through their case manager.

I have been advised—and I hope that it is not true—that there have been Facebook posts that have been put up about this project and then deleted because information has not been correct. It has been inaccurate and misleading for the community. I would encourage the community to use the department as the source of truth.

Ms STINSON: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated, there is a point of order. I will hear the member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: I raise standing order 127, which is personal reflections on members. The minister is clearly alleging that I have done something true, but then saying that he does not know if it is true. This is clearly absolutely outrageous behaviour and I would ask him to apologise and withdraw these statements.

The SPEAKER: Minister, I have warned you in relation to standing order 127. The member for Badcoe has indicated that she has taken offence in relation to matters that you have raised. You may wish to withdraw and apologise. I also emphasise that, if there are allegations that any member has misled the house, that is a matter that ought be raised, for example, under a matter of privilege. You have not raised a matter of privilege with me, therefore I have warned you in relation to standing order 127. I give you the opportunity to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I withdraw and apologise. I would encourage the community to use the department as the source of truth via the website, via their case managers, through the mailing list and so on. With the remaining time, I would like to list some quick facts about the Torrens to Darlington project.

The SPEAKER: You may well take that course, minister, but as I understand it you have not withdrawn and apologised. The standard—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I did.

The SPEAKER: You did? Very well. I hear you in relation to that matter. Minister, please continue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hurtle Vale! I am going to indulge the minister because there have been a number of points of order. I will continue to hear the minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It will save motorists around 20 minutes. You will be able to drive from Torrens to Darlington in around nine minutes. Motorists will be able to bypass 21 sets of traffic lights, road safety will be improved and \$125 million is being spent on green communities to plant more trees and improve local community infrastructure, such as parks and open spaces. Property value uplift along this stretch of South Road is estimated to be \$2 million and it will create 4,900 jobs.

PAUL, MR N.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:37): I will change the tone slightly. I would like to make some remarks in tribute to a gentleman and a friend, Noel Paul. Noel was a committed South Adelaide Football Club member and eight-year chair of the beloved Panther Club. He was a true believer and also a life member of the South Australian Labor Party.

From a very young age, Noel was not only loyal to his Panthers but heavily involved as a drinks steward and a scoreboard attendant during the days of the Panthers at St Marys. I would like to point out that in the Labor Party he was several different office bearers in the local sub-branch and at party office and a loyal trade unionist over many years with the CEPU postal division.

Noel was a role model. He provided selfless service and dedication to the South Adelaide Football Club in particular. Since the passing of Noel Paul, I have dedicated, along with the Panther Club, a memorial award that will recognise the virtues held by Noel Paul in another worthy member of the Panther Club annually, and this will carry on Noel's name in the Panthers.

My husband, Neil, and I would also like to place on record our deep thanks to Noel for his frequent messages of love and support for us ever since we lost our son, Sam, and his welcome encouragement of the work of the Sammy D Foundation. We will miss seeing Noel at the Panthers. My thoughts have been and are still with Jenny and Noel's family and friends and all our Panther Club volunteering members.

In acknowledging the sad passing of Noel, I would like to speak about Maxine McPherson. Maxine is the inaugural winner of the Noel Paul Award, and I was very pleased to present that to Maxine recently at the Panther Club Christmas break-up. Maxine is a stalwart of the local southern community and of our Panther Club. I am sure she does not mind me saying she is an octogenarian. Max still volunteers her time for fundraising activities and managing events and is currently the Secretary of the Panther Club and manager of the barbecue and the canteen. She is absolutely tireless.

For many decades, she served as marketing manager for the Panthers, and she ran such now frowned upon competitions, such as Miss South Adelaide. She also helped out and helped coach and run the cheerleaders, I understand. Everyone at South Adelaide knows and loves Maxine, and I want to thank her for her service and for what she has done and continues to do for the club, and congratulate her publicly on being the inaugural recipient of the Noel Paul Award.

I would like to also pay tribute to Kurna Meyunna tribal woman Aunty Georgina Williams, a Senior Woman of Water. Sadly, Aunty Georgina passed away recently. She was a dear friend to many of us and a much appreciated guiding voice in our southern suburbs. If anyone has had the pleasure of watching a Welcome to Country ceremony by Aunty Georgina, they are left with no doubt—with the banging of the rocks and the summoning of the spirits from all corners of our community: from south, north, east and west. It stays in your heart, it reverberates through your soul and I will miss it.

Aunty Georgina, a strong activist, dedicated her life to her people and her culture but most of all to her family. She continually resolved to bridge the gap between understanding so there may be a future where First Nations people have true voice and can self-determine. History needs to rightly be recognised for its length and breadth, beyond 200 years of white settlement. If there was ever an event to support her land, she was there.

Recently, I watched the David Unaipon Award, where Aunty Georgina won an emerging talent award for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander writers for her work on *Mekauwe = Tears Volume #1*. These writings are a journey through her life. She was a poet, singer, writer, dancer, theatre director, mother, grandmother, aunty and elder we loved dearly. Rest easy, Aunty Georgina. Nukkada.

Condolence

PAUL, MR N.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:42): On indulgence, I would just like to reiterate my sadness at the death of Noel Paul, one of my constituents and whose politics I obviously did not agree with but whom I regularly saw at the Marino train station. He was a near neighbour of mine and contributed a huge amount to the community I represent. On behalf of this side of the house, on behalf of my community, to Noel's partner, Jenny, and his family I would like to pay my respects.

Grievance Debate

FAMILY VIOLENCE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:42): I am extremely grateful to be in the position to fight for my community to become the safest state for children to grow up in. This is why I became involved in politics and why I am prepared to work so very hard every day to serve my local community.

At my listening post on Saturday, a kind constituent came deliberately to apologise to me because she felt that her husband was rude to me whilst I was doorknocking. She told me she tries to share her views with him and he will not listen. I told her that she does not need to apologise for her husband's behaviour. She deserves to be respected. We agreed that you do not have to agree on anything to be kind and respectful to one another.

Last week, a community member came to me also with a serious concern that her four-year-old son has been sexually abused, and I am strongly acting to make sure her concerns are investigated thoroughly. We must work together to stop this violence in our community, and I thank my community members for bringing their concerns directly to me.

Today, I rise proudly to communicate just some of the real action and real funding delivered by the Marshall Liberal government to prevent family violence in South Australia. I note that the lion's share of this real change has been led by the Attorney-General, the member for Bragg, and I thank her.

Firstly, this week we passed the Civil Liability (Institutional Child Abuse Liability) Amendment Bill, which means hundreds of sexual abuse victims can consider launching fresh legal action and relitigate their matters if they feel that previous settlements were disproportionate to the harm suffered. In October 2021, we introduced the Criminal Law Consolidation (Abusive Behaviour) Amendment Bill, which introduces new offences for abusive behaviours, also known as coercive control.

With regard to intervention orders, the Attorney-General broadened the definition of 'abuse' to enable more victims to apply for intervention orders. She also increased penalties twice for breaches of intervention orders. In 2018, the Liberal government introduced a new standalone criminal offence of non-fatal choking, suffocating and strangulation in a domestic setting. Alarming, there have been hundreds of charges laid.

In relation to sentencing discounts, under the former Labor government, the Sentencing Act 2017 provided that a defendant could receive a sentence reduction of up to 40 per cent if they pleaded guilty within a certain period of time from their first court appearance. In 2020, the Liberal government delivered changes to the Sentencing Act 2017 to lower the discount available for serious offences against a person.

We made changes to allow victims to avoid having to give evidence in court by allowing police-recorded interviews with victims to be admissible as evidence. In 2018, we introduced the \$1.9 million Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. The scheme enables a person who may be at risk of domestic violence to get information about their partner, or former partner, to help them make decisions about their safety.

The Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service was given an additional \$2 million. This vital service offers victims of domestic and family violence specialist legal assistance to apply for intervention orders, end tenancy agreements and navigate court processes. In terms of child sex offences reform, we introduced a suite of child sexual abuse reforms. These bills implement recommendations from the Royal Commission on Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse and additionally clarify that an offence is committed if a perpetrator communicates with a fictitious child, i.e., a police officer.

There is so much more. I am proud to be part of a government committed to real action, real change, real funding and hard work every day to create a safer South Australia. I want to once again thank the Attorney-General, the member for Bragg, for leading much of this legislative change and funding to support the most vulnerable people in our community.

FARM FIREFIGHTING UNITS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:47): I rise today to talk about the farm fire units that do such an amazing job on Kangaroo Island. We saw it during the 2019-20 bushfires, those devastating bushfires that actually claimed the lives of a father and son who were out with their farm fire unit fighting the fires. Sabrina Davis is a fantastic woman from the western end of Kangaroo Island. She and her husband, Ben, lost their home and their farm in the bushfire. They and their children live out there on the west end and are rebuilding their home and rebuilding their lives. It is a very tough job for those people who lost so much in the bushfires.

Sabrina has taken on so many additional tasks since the bushfires. She has become an author and has written a wonderful book called *Humans of Kangaroo Island*. She has received lots of recognition at both the state and national level for her community work. It was no surprise that on Sunday she was there again leading the fundraising efforts and dispersing items to the farm firefighters of Kangaroo Island.

At the Parndana Oval, a flow of utes came through with their farm firefighting gear on the back. The paid staff and volunteers from the CFS were there. All the farm fire units were registered for the upcoming season. They had all their safety equipment checked off to certify that they could go out onto the fireground. When they do go on the fireground, they log in with the CFS to cover them with insurance. It is a very good scheme and makes sure that nothing has been left to chance and that everyone's vehicle and equipment passes muster and is fit for purpose.

I was there with my sidekick, Dusty the Kangaroo Island kelpie. Dusty, of course, was born five weeks before those bushfires. His owner, Shane Leahy, lost his home, lost his farm, lost his sheds and lost his vehicles. In fact, he lost everything except the shirt on his back, the shorts he was wearing and the seven five-week-old pups that miraculously survived.

The main reason that Dusty was there on Sunday—he is always over on the island with me—was that he did a collaboration with Pirate Life Brewing. Michael Cameron and his son Jack, the founders of Pirate Life Brewing, leapt at the chance to do a Dusty Draught, a very tasty beer that was launched last Christmas and raised \$3½ thousand for these farm fire units on the island. That money went towards buying fire blankets for the utes the farmers use to go out and fight the fires. That is just one extra layer of protection for them when they are out there.

Interestingly, if we go back to New Year's Eve 2019-20, when the fires were already burning across Kangaroo Island, I had a phone call from someone on the island who said, 'You know, all those guys in the utes are out there with no way of communicating with each other. How can we get the government to give us a whole bunch of two-way radios?' I said, 'It's New Year's Eve, no-one is going to be open for the next few days and, just to fill in all the forms, it would probably take until June or July to get any radios. How about we put out a call on Facebook?'

So we did that and we had about 160 sets of two-way radios bought through Jamieson Marine on the island. I want to give a shout-out to Bradley Jamieson, who does such a great job over there. He was on the phone taking credit card details from people around Australia who purchased a set of these two-way radios that we know saved lives, that we know helped people get through those fires and that we know helped people get to safety during that incredible fire, particularly on 3 January 2020.

The Vietnamese Buddhist group from South Australia also played a part in helping the farm firefighting units as well. I got a phone call in mid-January from my upper house colleague Tung Ngo. He said, 'The local Vietnamese Buddhist community have raised some money and they would like to donate it to a good cause.' I was thinking they might have raised a few hundred dollars. I asked, 'How much have they raised, Tung?' He said, 'More than \$60,000.' What we did with that was they pay it to the five or six auto repair places on the island and any farm firefighter who needed to get their gearbox or any other damaged part of their vehicle fixed because of the damage done during the fires could go to one of those auto repairers.

There was a lot of generosity towards the farm firefighting units on the island. I want to thank Sabrina and all those people who have kept that going since the fires and as we prepare for the upcoming fire season.

COVID-19 CROSS-BORDER PERMITS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:52): I thank the Liberal Party for the indulgence. I have a deadlock conference I need to get to. What I want to talk about today are the SA Health border permits. I acknowledge the very hard work that my staff are continually doing in our office. I heard yesterday in the member for Flinders' comments that as MPs we are only as good as the staff that we have who assist us. That is certainly the case in my electorate.

I have Bailey on the front counter, Kate, Denise and Travis. I have to say that the workload for a border MP's office over the last two years has been absolutely overwhelming. I do not want to

be condescending, but I do not think the people who have city offices realise the workload on a regional MP who lives on a border and the pressure put on their staff. It is something I have never encountered. Each month we think it is going to get easier, but each month it gets harder. At the moment, it is being exacerbated by the SA Health border permits.

We talked a bit about just one case but this is one of many. We have had staff all day for weeks now, every day for weeks, trying to assist people to download apps on their phone, to connect digital vaccination certificates to that app, and that is for people who are a little bit technologically savvy.

Jack is an 80-year-old member of my community. Jack does not have any family in our region and he came into our office asking for help with the SA Health border permits. All Jack wanted to do was travel from Mount Gambier over to Victoria for a few hours to attend the Harrow Historical Society meeting, but he does not have an email address and he only has a home phone. He does not have a mobile. Unfortunately, Jack's experience is not unique. This system is failing particularly our older people and those who do not have a smartphone.

I guess it has been incredibly frustrating. My staff are very professional, so when they are making comments to me that some of the contacts in SA Health have been rude, dismissive and arrogant, I take that on board because all we are doing is providing a frontline service for the government representing our community. The very least I think people from SA Health can do is actually assist us to assist the state government in providing assistance to our community.

That is an area I would like to see improved because the wait times have been unacceptable. The attitude of people with comments like 'Well, get somebody else in their family to help them. You should not be doing it as the local MP's office. If they do not have a smartphone, then they cannot travel,' is absolutely appalling for many of our community members who live in a cross-border area.

I do hope the health minister gets a copy of this *Hansard* and looks at some of the attitudes. I know that people are under stress, our office is under stress, but you need to provide a service and I really want to thank my staff for their hours. Sometimes I will ring the office at 6 o'clock at night and Denise is still there because there is the other MP's work that needs to get done as well as assisting people with border permits.

So thank you to my staff. I would like some people in SA Health to pull their socks up and have a reality check on what it is like to be assisting people, not actually trying to denigrate people. With those comments, I make my contribution.

NEWLAND ELECTORATE

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:57): Today, I rise to speak about the wonderful north-east community that I am privileged to represent and the work we have done as a government to ensure that our community is the best place to live, work and raise a family.

A key part of any community, and this is particularly the case in the north-east, is its sporting clubs. Sport is the lifeblood of any community and I am proud of the work we have done to support projects and community groups to improve our clubs as these are critical to keeping people active and healthy, and boosting their self-confidence.

This ranges from new multipurpose courts for Tea Tree Gully Tennis Club, which were in fact an election commitment, to new change rooms at the Hope Valley Sporting Club and everything in between, including a new roof at the Modbury Bowling Club, a new change room at the Tea Tree Gully Sportsman's Club and the lights at the Tea Tree Gully BMX Club. The Modbury Jets will be getting new change rooms and stands, Hope Valley Tennis Club has got resurfacing, Modbury Tennis Club is getting support for lights, Tea Tree Gully Golf Club is getting support for their lift, and there is much much more. These types of projects aim to enable these clubs to grow and thrive for years to come.

We also delivered on our election promise to open the Hope Valley Reservoir to the public for the first time, giving residents in the north-east and neighbouring communities a wonderful place to explore and exercise in. In fact, I would say it is another practical policy championed and delivered by the Minister for Environment and Water, allowing people in our community to enjoy the great outdoors.

There are fantastic views across the dam and over 4.9 kilometres of trails—and not just trails, in fact. We have picnic spaces. There is a Nature Play space now and there is also exercise equipment. It is really a great space to spend a day out.

I always look forward to my visits to the reservoir, and we will continue to listen to community feedback and look for ways to further improve and grow the experience. With many thousands of visitors since the reservoir opened to the public, the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to the project has been embraced and welcomed by the local community.

As a government, we have listened to concerns over the difficulty of parking around Tea Tree Plaza for people using the O-Bahn, and I am delighted that we will be investing \$48.5 million to build a new multistorey park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza. The new Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride will provide an additional 400 car parks, augmenting the 700 existing car parks at the current facility and delivering better services for public transport users. The project will create 215 jobs and address significant concerns about the current capacity, making the commute into work a whole lot easier.

On top of this, we are delivering a stronger public transport system to the people of the north-east. The Marshall Liberal government is investing significantly in a stronger public transport network and is committed to delivering increased connectivity that is faster and more reliable for public transport users. Currently underway are works to install priority bus lanes at four key intersections along the route between Tea Tree Plaza and Golden Grove.

We are spending \$373 million on resurfacing and vital maintenance works on our roads. While there may be short-term inconvenience—and it certainly can be frustrating at times—these works will lead to a smoother experience for all road users, in particular including work that has just started on Hancock Road between Burns Street and Grenfell Road, but also, of course, on other projects in the area like Reservoir Road, Smart Road, McIntyre Road, Golden Grove Road and so on.

Many schools around my electorate are also receiving much-needed upgrades, including the Banksia Park International High School, Modbury High School (which I visited with the Minister for Education just recently) and Ardtornish Primary School, as well as a whole range of projects of maintenance works and smaller projects across other schools.

Another really important project is the government's commitment to fix the Tea Tree Gully Community Wastewater Management System, something we have already planned. We have allocated funding to commence these works with, as we speak, properties being transferred to SA Water sewerage. Our plan will see all properties on this archaic system transferred at no cost to the households, delivering a solution to a problem that has been ignored by many for decades. Our plan works because it is built on the principle of always engaging the community, being open and transparent and making sure that, when there is any disruption to their home, SA Water will work with them.

Of course, I could not talk about our fantastic community without mentioning the most important institution in our community, Modbury Hospital. I can remember campaigning on this issue, and I am really pleased that in the 3½ years we have been in government the hospital has undergone the biggest upgrades in its history. There had been a lot of talk for years prior, a lot of talk by many people, but we are actually dealing with it. We are actually delivering an upgraded hospital, and that is what the community wants.

I am proud to be working as part of the Marshall Liberal team to deliver for the north-east and look forward to continuing to do this well into the future.

WAITE ELECTORATE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:03): Mr Deputy Speaker, I know that in recent times you have wondered what we do in this place, and many outside these walls do as well, so I thought I would take my time in this grievance to explain what I have been doing in this house around petitions and what it means for the people of our communities.

This year, my community has had many reasons to petition the parliament and, indeed, the government. I have been proud to assist in gaining signatures and tabling some very important local

petitions. First of all is one we tabled just this week, the future of Cross Road petition, calling on the state government not to allow Cross Road to become a major freight route and to investigate alternatives to transport and freight throughout our state. Signed by thousands of South Australians, it was tabled this week.

After tabling that petition, I am glad that I received a letter from the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport outlining that the government has no plans to drive more trucks down Cross Road and, indeed, plans to get more trucks off Cross Road and the down track of the South Eastern Freeway. I think that this is a wonderful announcement by the government, and I thank it for working with my community to ensure that this has happened.

Of course, this has seen a lot of change in policy from the government in terms of transport down on what I call 'the flats' in the electorate around Saving the Waite Gatehouse, and saving the Mitcham Service SA as well, which is something that we did. I know that the member for Florey played a huge part in saving the Service SA centre in her community. These campaigns have received large community support. At the time when these proposals were on the table, they were seen as very negative for the government, and I am glad to see that the petitions have worked in getting change from government.

I know that the campaign that is gaining more and more attention is about the safety and improvement of Waite Road and Cross Road at Urrbrae. Many hundreds of residents have signed this petition, which I tabled this week, to ask the government to invest in a new solution for this troublesome intersection around passenger and, indeed, commuter safety. With more and more accidents—and there was one there the other week—we need to act now to protect lives on our roads.

We tabled a petition relating to Northcote Street up on Shepherds Hill Road urging the government to take immediate action to install a pedestrian crossing at Northcote Street to allow pedestrians to access the Blackwood Primary School and high school sites. Of course, we have the Eden Hill CFS station at that station, as well as Karinya Reserve, the Sturt Lions Soccer Club and the wonderful Eden Hills Scout Club. I know that the scout club is looking desperately for some funding and new facilities. It is a really important intersection and so important that it is improved.

We are still working on one campaign, and that is supporting Scouts and Girl Guides and having them eligible for the Sports Voucher program. For some reason I cannot understand, the government will not support it, and I am still waiting for the opposition to pin its colours to the mast as well. Currently the scheme allows for primary school age families to claim \$100 in return for participating in eligible recreational activities.

Indeed, our community was successful in lobbying the state government to expand that scheme to cover all families from reception to year 9 starting in 2022, but we need to do more to ensure that Scouts SA and Girl Guides SA are covered by this scheme. Recently, the CEO of Girl Guides South Australia, Kerrie Ackerman, wrote to me saying, and I quote:

Girl Guides SA supports our inclusion in this scheme, as over 1,300 family members who would benefit from the vouchers.

She went on to say:

The vouchers will offset some of the annual fee for participation, which for some families is cost prohibitive due to financial hardship.

Why the government, and indeed the opposition, will not commit to supporting the Sports Voucher scheme for families who choose to participate in Girl Guides and scouting activities is beyond me.

Of course, taking a different note is our live music industry. I also presented a petition on behalf of 777 residents of South Australia requesting that live music gigs, events and venues are no longer targeted with singing and dancing bands and venue capacity restrictions and receive the same capacity limits as supporting events.

Our music and our live industries are doing it so tough at the moment. Just this morning on radio the owner of the Grace Emily and Driller Jet Armstrong from Sugar talked about how hard it is to get insurance in the hospitality industry at the moment. Allowing live music and dancing at our venues is so critical not only to their ongoing success but also to those who provide live music—our musicians—to really have an income and to contribute to society.

Another petition I presented this week was from 3,625 residents asking for the government to no longer declare the state of emergency in respect to the outbreak of the COVID-19. Of course, all petitions are so important to driving change in our community and to ensuring we have a debate.

Just in my last minute, I want to thank the member for Florey and her work around petitions and ensuring that any petition that has signatures from more than 10,000 people gets properly reviewed by the Legislative Review Committee. It is so important that parliament continues to listen to the voice of the people.

Time expired.

Parliamentary Committees

STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Deputy Premier, Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:09): I move:

That Dr Harvey be appointed to the Statutory Officers Committee in place of the Hon. J.B. Teague (resigned).

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mr BOYER (Wright) (16:10): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain suspended so as to allow consideration of Private Members Business, Bills, Order of the Day No. 19, to take precedence over all other business until consideration of that matter is completed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required for me to accept this motion. I see that one is not present, so ring the bells.

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

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	21
Noes	22
Majority.....	1

AYES

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

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Duluk, S.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

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. (teller)
Harvey, R.M.
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tanzia, 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 negatived.

*Bills***SUICIDE PREVENTION BILL***Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 16 November 2021.)

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: I am wondering whether the minister can provide an update on the current status of the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention. We understand that the Premier has informed the house that the Premier is now the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention. What does that mean in terms of the work that was being undertaken by the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, and what is the current staffing and resource allocation towards the role of the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the question. The Premier is undertaking that role himself for the period certainly through to the election. In regard to staffing, there have been no changes to those arrangements. At the last meeting, I think the Premier was there in person. I believe it is his intention to be there at the next meeting as well. I am not sure how many further meetings there are going to be between then and the election, but certainly I am aware that the Premier will be at the next one. That is a body of work that he is committed to supporting personally and using his status as the Premier to elevate in the period certainly through to the election. We are looking forward to the passage of this bill and being able to assist in the continuing work the government is doing.

Mr PICTON: The house, I believe, through the estimates process, has previously been informed that one ministerial staff member of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been allocated to work for the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention. Is it still the case that that allocation has been made? If not, has that staff member returned to provide just advice for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing?

Likewise, there was I believe at least one FTE made available from either the Department for Health and Wellbeing or Wellbeing SA that was attached to the Office of the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention. Is that departmental officer still providing services supporting the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention or has that role now returned to either the department or Wellbeing SA?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I just want to clarify that I think the member identified two positions—I was just trying to hear the member clearly. As I understand it, those positions are still attached to this role, still attached to the work that they have been doing. There have not been changes to that.

Mr PICTON: So has that ministerial staff member who was working for Mr Wade but attached to this role now actually moved to the Premier's office to advise the Premier in relation to these matters?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: To be clear, all ministerial staff work for the Premier at any rate. The one who was attached to this role continues to be attached to this role. I am happy to make inquiries in relation to the physical location but, as I understand it, nothing has changed from the way it was operating previously.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have one question for the minister. Each of the previous Premier's advocates in this role has ended up defecting from the Liberal Party. Is it your expectation, minister, that the Premier will also defect from the Liberal Party?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I think that question is a disappointing use of the house's time, and I am going to focus my answers on questions that are relevant to the bill that we are debating.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 8 passed.

Clause 9.

Mr PICTON: I will ask just a couple of questions generally in terms of the Suicide Prevention Council. Can the minister outline how often the Suicide Prevention Council meets and, perhaps on notice, can he provide details in terms of the meeting dates for the past year?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The question relates to the current Suicide Prevention Council and the clause we are debating relates to the establishment in legislation of a suicide prevention council. I will take it on notice and determine what is available and bring back a response to the house.

Mr PICTON: What is the total allocated budget for the work of the Suicide Prevention Council?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will take that question on notice and bring back an answer for the member.

Mr PICTON: Why, from my reading of this—and I am happy to be corrected if I have read this incorrectly—is there only one person with lived experience who, as a representative, has to be included on the council? Was there consideration of additional people with lived experience who would be representatives on the council or not?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the question. Indeed, there are some outlines of some people in the clause who have lived experience and, indeed, leadership of suicide prevention initiatives or services in an NGO: one person with the lived experience of suicide or experience supporting veterans, first responders, LGBTIQ.

In relation to the consultation, my understanding is that not only was it broadly understood—and it is certainly the government's position that you would expect there would be more than one person with lived experience or certainly with connections in this area—but it described largely the other specific areas that people wanted articulated.

Up to 13 members are to be appointed by the minister who, in the opinion of the minister, collectively have the necessary knowledge, skills and lived experience of suicide to enable the Suicide Prevention Council to effectively carry out its functions under this act—and then the specific delineations. From my reading of that, it is clear that while there are specific identifications that at least one person must fulfil certain criteria, to have those 13 people able to collectively have those experiences will enable the council to fulfil its functions. It would be for the course that there will indeed be more than that one person to fulfil that role, and the legislation has been drafted in a way that provides some flexibility and some specific requirements.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 15 passed.

Clause 16.

Mr PICTON: As the minister may be aware, or certainly his advisers are aware, as well as the current Suicide Prevention Council there is also an issues group in relation to suicide prevention that includes senior representatives of government departments. This was raised in the other place, and I understand that the Hon. John Dawkins, who, as I have noted in this debate, is really the pioneer of this legislation being brought to the house, has certainly shown his keenness that that issues group also be legislated.

The government have obviously formed the opinion that that should not be the case. Can the minister assure the house that there will be a decision made that that issues group will be a committee under this clause 16 and, if so, that it will contain the same membership as is currently the case for the issues group?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the question and acknowledge the work of the people who have been participating or who have been members variously over the course of the last three to four years on that issues group. That issues group currently is obviously formed without legislation. This clause provides a framework within which the Suicide Prevention Council can establish a committee such as the issues group.

We believe that it is very likely that the issues group in its current form will be reconstituted in a very similar form as allowed under this clause. Of course, this clause establishes that the council itself will determine those members, but my advice from the Chief Psychiatrist is certainly that we anticipate a very similar group of people, if not exactly the same. It may well be exactly the same, but obviously a number of those roles are filled by people whose jobs change over time. You do not expect any committee to be static in its membership exactly into perpetuity.

This clause also presents the flexibility for the Suicide Prevention Council to make further appointments in the years ahead. Our expectation is that that issues group, as described by the member, by the Hon. John Dawkins, by the Premier, and by all those people in government and in the community who have supported that issues group, will continue, and this clause provides a legislative framework for it to do so.

Clause passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18.

Mr PICTON: I have already asked the minister in terms of the staffing issues but, in relation to clause 18(2), I am wondering if the minister can outline what the nature and effect of that clause is in terms of arrangements established administering an administrative unit of the Public Service to make use of staff, equipment or facilities of that administrative unit? Practically, what is that going to mean?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Effectively, I think this makes clear, if clarity is needed, that the work of the Suicide Prevention Council at the moment is supported by Wellbeing SA's suicide prevention team in undertaking its work. This clause empowers the council to have an arrangement of that nature continue. I understand that a general clause of this nature is in place for most statutory bodies, according to the note I have just been passed by officers who would know. Effectively, it enables Wellbeing SA to provide support to the council established in legislation as it did to the council when it was set up administratively under the current arrangements.

Clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Clause 20.

Mr PICTON: This is in relation to the state Suicide Prevention Plan. Obviously, the current plan that is in operation in South Australia is the South Australian Suicide Prevention Plan 2017-2021, so this is the final year of operation of that plan that was established under the previous government. I am wondering if the minister can give an update on the development of the new plan, which presumably will start from next year in 30-odd days' time, and what is the likely timing in which that new suicide prevention plan will be completed and released?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the question. Wellbeing SA have been doing work on this. They have undertaken consultations. They have developed a draft. I believe the current Suicide Prevention Council is giving the matter its consideration. So in relation to the timing, I do not have a date for the member but obviously that work is getting close.

Mr PICTON: Under this provision, does the state Suicide Prevention Plan require approval by the cabinet, or will the Suicide Prevention Council be able to establish that independently, or is this something that could be changed or edited by the government of the day via the cabinet?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Obviously the clause makes it clear that it is to be approved by the minister. Having been prepared by the Suicide Prevention Council, I am advised that it would likely go to cabinet for noting. In terms of variations, the clause talks about variations. It can be varied by the Suicide Prevention Council itself—again, with the approval of the minister. I think that is reasonably straightforward.

Mr PICTON: In relation to if there is an issue between the minister and the Suicide Prevention Plan, would the Suicide Prevention Council's version of such a plan be released before it has been approved by the minister?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: To be clear, I was trying to get a great deal of clarity on the previous question. Can the member please do me a favour and articulate again the most recent question. I will try to give a firm answer to both.

Mr PICTON: Essentially, the question is: the Suicide Prevention Council will do their work; will that be released, or is it only released once it has the approval of the minister? If there are changes made because the minister has intervened, the public would not know, or will it be transparent that there will be changes?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: My understanding is that it would be in the order of the way these reports have happened previously—indeed, the 2017 to 2021 plan the member identified before. The officer with me was not in the role he now holds at the time, but my presumption is that cabinet or the minister considered that and then released it to the public. The difference here is that the preparation is being done by the Suicide Prevention Council, and it is their work that is to be approved by the minister, presumably noted by cabinet, and then released to the public as well.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 34 passed.

Clause 35.

Mr PICTON: This section deals with the establishment of the South Australian Suicide Register. What is the total budget allocated for the establishment of the Suicide Register, and what is the total ongoing budget for the maintenance of the register?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will have to take that on notice and seek to bring back an answer for the member.

Mr PICTON: By when will the Suicide Register be established?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: In relation to an earlier question—I will just quickly deal with this and then come back to the question the member has just asked—I do not think it is a significant change from the description the member made or my answer but, for clarity, I am advised that the staff that support the council are a combination of one Wellbeing SA staff member and a ministerial adviser—sorry, that was the question asked.

The answer is that the council is supported by the staff within the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention office. If that does not provide any greater clarity, the member can ask again and we will follow up and get greater detail later. In relation to the establishment of the suicide prevention register, I have been advised by Wellbeing SA that that is very close to being ready. Without wanting to presume the outcome of the debate today, hopefully we will be cracking to go within the next month or two.

Mr PICTON: Firstly, in relation to the previous issue that the minister has highlighted, it was a little bit confusing, but what I am taking from it is that the Premier's Advocate has one ministerial staff member and one Wellbeing SA staff member and that they are the staff who support the council as well as supporting the Premier's Advocate.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: There is a lot of nodding going on, so I am going to assume that is all accurate.

Mr PICTON: In relation to the register, there was an issue. I believe I spoke about it in my second reading contribution. It is some time ago now, so it is hard to remember. Originally in this bill, there was going to be data in relation to suicide attempts that would be included in the register. The minister in the other place sought to remove information in relation to attempts. That would no longer be included in the register. I certainly had a briefing from the Chief Psychiatrist and Dr D'Onise from Wellbeing SA outlining the reason why, at this stage, attempts could not be included in the legislation, which I guess we reluctantly accept is not possible at this stage.

However, there was discussion that at some stage in the future there would be the potential that that could be included. If it is the case that down the track there is a definition that is sufficient that can be made, can that be included under the legislation that we have before us, either by way of the legislation or by way of a regulation that could be included under it, or would that require

coming back to the parliament to change the legislation in relation to the register to enable attempts to then be included?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am advised that the proposed register for attempted suicides—I think are the words of the member—could be done by regulation at a later stage.

Clause passed.

Clause 36.

Mr PICTON: What will be the manner in which the suicide register is reported? I am aware that in other states there is, I believe, monthly, if not quarterly reporting that takes place. Particularly given that the minister has outlined that this is only a month or so away from being up and running, is there going to be regular reporting from the details of how the register will operate and, if so, how will those reports be released? Will they be public, will they be on a website, will they be monthly, quarterly or annually? How will that information be dispersed?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the question. I understand that the final decision in relation to the timing has not necessarily been made at this time, and there is work being done with the national partner on that. I also should clarify that I am pretty sure that I used the words 'the next month or two'. I would not want to impose an artificial deadline that may or may not be able to be met.

I am advised that there will be at least annual reporting on general information from the register, but both in relation to the decision about timing and the manner of its presentation, one of the primary objectives is of course to ensure that it is in a manner that prevents identification of individuals.

Mr PICTON: I do not have any more questions but, just on indulgence while you are in the chair, sir, it has been my pleasure over the past almost four years to do many, many bills in committee with you, sir. I congratulate you on your retirement and certainly the even-handed way in which you have conducted your work as the Chair of Committees. I hope you have a very peaceful retirement. We will certainly miss you and you are a great loss to this house.

The CHAIR: You are very kind. Thank you, member for Kaurna.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, I did not get to do this yesterday when many, many others did, but over the last 11½ years I have cherished your friendship and working with you. I agree with what I have observed in the committee stage with what the member for Kaurna just said and so many other people said yesterday. I do not think there is a member in this house who has indicated their retirement who has had so overwhelmingly expressions of how much people will miss them. I am just so pleased to count you as a friend of mine.

In the years ahead, both your family will enjoy your company and your community will see you still involved in that community, and I am absolutely certain that you are going to keep contributing wonderful things to the state of South Australia, particularly Eyre Peninsula and your home—I was going to say your home town—but all of the areas that are your home. I am really pleased to commend the committee stage to the next bit.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Morialta, you are very kind and I appreciate the comments from you both. Of course, the member for Morialta and I came in at the same time, so we have shared all of our days in here at the same time.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (37 to 44) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

In moving that this bill be now read a third time, I would like to make a brief contribution on that third reading. I was intending to say some of these things at the end of the second reading debate but in

the house's—and I am grateful to the house for doing so—will to move things along as quickly as we possibly could last week, I missed out on that opportunity.

Both on my own behalf and the behalf of the Minister for Health, I wish to thank the members who have spoken on and supported this bill. Indeed, it is a major milestone in the history of the parliament by establishing the first ever legislation to prevent suicide in South Australia and, indeed, the first legislation of this type in Australia.

The legislation will dramatically change the reach of suicide prevention action across the state by establishing a whole-of-government and whole-of-community approach. It will establish a systems approach that will help and enable us to drive down the rate of suicide by effective prevention as well as provide improved support and care for people with lived experience of suicide, including their families and friends.

The immediate next steps, with the passage of this important legislation, will be to establish the Suicide Prevention Council, legislated in its now form; the development of the next state Suicide Prevention Plan; and to establish any regulations that may be required. I am sure that we are all looking forward to this legislation commencing as soon as possible.

I would like to thank all those people who provided a response during the consultation phase on the bill and their strong support for this legislation. Many people with lived experience of suicide spoke openly about their experiences and supported this legislation, seeing it as a much-needed measure to improve the prevention of suicide and the responses of our service agencies following the suicide of a loved one.

I note and recognise and appreciate the work of the former advocates, the Hon. John Dawkins and the Hon. Dan Cregan, for their work in this area, and I know certainly the Premier is very appreciative of his own role now in pursuing the work on a more personal front. The development of this legislation has been important and many people have worked towards it. I would like to thank members of the Premier's Council on Suicide Prevention, who have wholeheartedly supported the introduction of the legislation and worked to ensure the best legislation possible, noting that South Australia are trailblazers in this field.

Finally, I would like to thank the officers who have supported the development of the legislation, particularly Ms Kay Anastassiadis of the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist, as well as of course Dr John Brayley, the Chief Psychiatrist, who both provided me with support today with the bill. I would like to thank the shadow minister for health in assisting us with its speedy passage through the committee stage today. I would like to thank Ms Lyn Dean, the Chief Executive of Wellbeing SA; Professor Katina D'Onise, the Executive Director of Prevention and Population Health at Wellbeing SA; the staff of their offices; and indeed the suicide prevention team in Wellbeing SA.

It would be remiss of me not to note that the member for Heysen and I were discussing the recent forum in his electorate, which Justyna Rosa from that team chaired, and the great way that the Wellbeing SA team were able to interact with the stakeholders and the community members who were in attendance on that night and how much those community members appreciated that work. I also thank Mark Herbst, parliamentary counsel, all of the other public servants who have been involved in the debate and all of those who have contributed to the second reading debate prior to today.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (16:56): This is a significant moment for this parliament and for our state. Suicide prevention is the business of every member. It is the business of every South Australian. In my first remarks to this place, I mentioned briefly but with no less feeling the suicide of my godbrother. It is a memory I always carry with me and my family always carries with it.

Stigma around deaths by suicide is still a significant and distressing issue in our community. It is also a hard fact that in country communities a death by suicide tears us apart. It is right that, on what may be the penultimate day of this parliament, we are seeing through this significant change and that as a parliament we are coming together to ensure that this legislation passes.

In making remarks about my godbrother in the first remarks that I made in this place, I brought a prayer for change. It must be the case that we can do better as a community, that we can encourage everybody to find their place in this world, that we can see worth in every human being,

and it must be that we continue to signal to our community that those in deep distress will—will—be able to obtain significant support at the time they need it and not at some other time and not too late.

I put on record my thanks to the Premier's Council on Suicide Prevention and my thanks to the Premier for establishing that council. I record the deep honour that I felt in serving as the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, in view particularly but not only because of the death that I mentioned.

I thank, too, all the suicide prevention networks right across this state. Members of those networks are contributing directly from the heart. Too many are contributing because of lived experiences. Those lived experiences are incredibly distressing to hear about and to learn of, but it is important that we carry those experiences in the quietness of our heart, even those of us who have not been touched by suicide, though it is hard because of the frequency of the event in our community not to be. We must also carry in the quietness of our hearts the stories of those when they are brave enough to share those stories with us, particularly if they come from suicide prevention councils.

Finally, I acknowledge the work of the minister in the other place and the minister in this place taking carriage of this important legislation. I also place on the record my sincere gratitude to the President of the other place for ensuring that the flame in relation to this issue in both our houses did not die.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:00): Firstly, can I thank the Speaker (member for Kavel) for his very powerful words. I think that this is a stark reminder that, as well as a policy issue, this is a personal issue for almost every member. Sadly, we know that suicide has touched so many people in our community. All of us represent communities that have been touched, and of course many of us have loved ones who have been lost. We need to do everything we possibly can through our work in this house to make sure that there is not one more.

Sadly, there is a long way to go. This is an important milestone. This is an important change to our laws that sets up this framework. We have been wholeheartedly supporting this legislation and, as noted, we have introduced our own version of it into the parliament. This is something where this will make a difference, but there are a whole range of other things that also need to happen. This framework needs to be followed up by action in a whole range of areas to make sure that people can get the support that they need. Unfortunately, there are many disturbing reports where that is not the case. Particularly, in my role as the shadow health minister, we do find out about some of those.

Today, I would particularly like to thank all those people with lived experience who have advocated so strongly—people who have advocated on behalf of their family members, people who have advocated to make sure that others do not experience what they have experienced. In particular, in this house I think we should absolutely mark this occasion by thanking the Hon. John Dawkins MLC, the President of the Legislative Council, who I will briefly breach standing orders by noting that he is here with us in the chamber today. I thank him for really being a pioneer in terms of pushing this issue for well over a decade in this house. As he retires, this is a fitting moment that this is now going to pass and become a law, and it will now start the next chapter of our work to prevent suicide in South Australia.

I also thank the member for Kavel for his work as the Suicide Prevention Advocate after the Hon. John Dawkins was no longer in that position. I thank the government and all the advisers. We are very hopeful that this will continue to make a difference for this important work in South Australia.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HOLIDAYS (CHRISTMAS DAY) (NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:03): I have to report that the managers have been at the conference on the Holidays (Christmas Day) (No.2) Amendment Bill, which was managed on the part of the Legislative Council by the Hon. T.A. Franks, the Hon. K.J. Maher, the Hon. E.S. Bourke, the Hon. T.J. Stephens and the Hon. R.I. Lucas. We there received from the managers on behalf of the Legislative Council the bill, and the following resolution adopted by that house:

That the disagreement to the amendment of the House of Assembly be insisted on.

Thereupon the managers for the two houses conferred together, but no agreement was reached. I move:

That the report of the conference be taken into consideration forthwith.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: I move:

That the bill be laid aside.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
Noes 20
Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Harvey, R.M.	Gee, J.P.
--------------	-----------

Motion thus carried; bill laid aside.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September.)

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (17:11): I rise to speak on this bill and in doing so I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. At the outset of my contribution today, as I did yesterday when discussing the Civil Liability (Institutional Child Abuse Liability) Bill, I again offer my love, my support and my thoughts to those who have suffered the utter horror of child sexual abuse and who in so many cases continue to bear the damage and the sorrow it has wreaked on their lives.

This bill rightly, albeit incredibly shamefully very belatedly, addresses recommendations from the 2017 Criminal Justice Report of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. This bill's proposals include, firstly, the introduction of a new offence of failure to report that applies to a prescribed person who knows, suspects or should have suspected sexual abuse by

or against a person in an institution or out-of-home care. The proposed maximum penalty is three years in prison.

Secondly, the bill's proposal includes the introduction of a new offence of failure to protect that applies to a prescribed person who, and I quote, 'knows that there is substantial risk' of abuse by or against a person in an institution or out-of-home care, with the maximum proposed penalty being 15 years in prison.

The prescribed person is defined in the bill as an employee of an institution, including a person who is a self-employed person who constitutes or who carries out work for an institution or carries out work for an institution under a contract for services or carries out work as a minister of religion or as part of the duties of a religious or spiritual vocation or undertakes practical training with an institution as part of an educational or vocational course or carries out work as a volunteer for an institution or is of a class prescribed by the regulations or provides out-of-home care.

I note that until 1976, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 presumed that boys under 14 were incapable of having sexual intercourse. This bill makes the removal of this presumption retrospective to periods before 1976 so that offenders rightly have no ability to rely on it.

This bill would also allow the Director of Public Prosecutions to appeal interlocutory judgements that may lead to the abandonment of a prosecution. It proposes to expand existing provisions under which child victims can prerecord evidence to avoid confronting their accuser during cross-examination. It also requires the recording of all police interviews of child victims, regardless of their age at trial, and allows applications for these recordings to be used at trial. It seeks to expand the current arrangements for pre-trial special hearings that allow these for people under 14 or with disability to include all victims of child sexual abuse or domestic violence. With court approval, these could also be used for vulnerable witnesses in child sex offence matters.

With regard to juvenile offenders, the bill amends Youth Court arrangements for preliminary examinations in committal hearings so that prerecorded evidence from another court may be admitted and victims are not required to give oral evidence.

In relation to expert evidence on children, the bill allows expert evidence in relation to the development and behaviour of children generally and on those children who have been victims of child sexual abuse to be admissible. This is similar to recent changes in domestic violence legislation. With regard to evidence, the bill relaxes the admissibility test for tendency and coincidence evidence by removing the word 'substantially' from section 34P of the Evidence Act 1929. I note that the Law Society's Criminal Law Committee did have concerns about that measure.

This bill introduces a limited defence to a position of authority offences but only for positions of authority linked to the provision of religious, sporting, musical or other instruction. As such, it would not cover teachers nor those who care for people with disability. For this defence to be allowed, the victim must be at least 17 years old and the offender is either under 18 or has a reasonable belief that the victim is aged over 18.

For relevant offences, the victim must also have given consent. The bill provides that information gained during religious confession is not prevented from being given or disclosed in criminal or civil proceedings. Finally, the bill makes change to sentencing arrangements for multiple offences. It requires that the indicative sentence for each separate offence is stated when a single headline sentence is given for multiple offences.

As I spoke about yesterday, as with too many pieces of crucially important legislation that impact the lives of the most vulnerable South Australians, this government has waited too long to act. The royal commission provided its recommendations four years ago. Had the provisions in this bill been in place months or years ago, as was the case in the discussion yesterday about the civil liability bill, there is every chance that more offenders could be behind bars for longer and that those who have suffered child abuse would have had their voice heard more readily and in a much sooner way.

This bill was also introduced to the other place in late August this year. Once second reading speeches were completed in the other place, this bill was passed in less than half an hour even after debating amendments from the crossbench—half an hour—because that is what happens when the house and those who sit within it prioritise what is important to this community. Like so many other

critical pieces of legislation here in this house, because of this government's inaction on the most important of issues, the days turned into weeks and then the weeks turned into months.

Here we find ourselves, more than three months later, in possibly the last scheduled sitting week before an election. Once again, I am appalled and utterly saddened that the government has demonstrated its lack of commitment to those who have experienced child sexual abuse, people whose voices should always be expeditiously heard and always amplified at the earliest opportunity.

These are critical reforms and Labor welcomes them, but it is utterly bewildering why the government would let something with universal support just sit and sit and sit on the *Notice Paper* for so many long months on end. Sadly, as I also mentioned yesterday, we have witnessed this sort of behaviour and delay previously with this government in relation to sentence discounts for child sex offenders. In that case, as I outlined yesterday, the Attorney-General sat on an expert report from a retired judge for 19 months—19 months, Mr Speaker.

It was only after Labor introduced a bill to remedy that terrible situation that the government introduced a bill, but then took so long to pass its own bill that we had a veritable plethora of serious offenders at the Magistrates Court trying to plead guilty before that new law took effect. The courts literally, as I also mentioned yesterday, had to schedule a special court session for 13 serious, heinous criminals who will now be released from prison earlier because this government failed to act.

Sadly, we have seen this kind of behaviour previously with so many issues, where the government promised to act or had a deep moral obligation to act but completely failed to do so in a timely manner. As I also spoke about in relation to the bill in regard to institutional child sexual abuse, this has happened on everything from some of their own election commitments on things like petrol pricing and social worker registration right through to dealing with child sex offenders. A number of domestic violence bills have also simply sat on the *Notice Paper* for periods of a year, in some cases periods of almost two years.

The Wicked Campers legislation that I introduced sat on the *Notice Paper* for two years, despite our community crying out for this parliament to take a simple step forward to ensure those vans, with horrendous slogans that promoted disrespect and violence towards women, would be off our roads. After two years and many, many media stories, multiple adjournments by the government, refusal to act, passing of responsibility to the federal government despite it clearly being something that needed to happen here in this place, despite other states and territories and particular councils, particular music festivals, acting on this issue, finally, after two years, the government moved a bill that was almost identical to the one we had moved.

There is no good reason to play those sorts of silly games when you are talking about issues that deeply impact our community. I would say that with this issue we contemplate today, as with the one we contemplated yesterday and the further bill I hope we get to today or tomorrow, there is absolutely no good reason whatsoever to delay those bills. In fact, I would say they are amongst those that are most important for us to act on expeditiously and decisively. I cannot think of more important issues to progress.

Yesterday, I expressed my anger about that. Today, I just feel bewildered because I know there are good people opposite who care deeply about the wellbeing of South Australians—and particularly about the wellbeing of those who, as I have said, have gone through the horror of experiencing child sex abuse.

I do not understand what happens over there that means these bills do not get progressed, that means they do not get prioritised. As I said, I have moved from being really angry about it yesterday to still being angry on behalf of those community members who have been waiting and waiting, but I am also just utterly perplexed about what on earth they are focused on rather than being focused on these most important issues.

I would say, again, that as well as delaying these important bills in our parliament we have also seen multiple examples of this government cutting particular services and supports that people who have experienced child sexual abuse rely on not only to ensure that they are receiving the advice and support they need but also that they interact with the incredible workers in those services, which means that they do not feel alone when they have to contemplate next steps about the terrible abuse they have experienced.

In saying that, I think again of the millions of dollars that were cut from the Legal Services Commission in their very first budget on coming into government. I think about that when I consider the \$780,000 that was cruelly cut from the Domestic Violence Court Assistance program in their second budget. We have heard the Attorney say words to the effect that there was a reallocation of funds and that there are particular funds around that Domestic Violence Court Assistance program that are now located, I think, in the Legal Services Commission.

However, the Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service is a specialised service that provides support to women from women, and alongside providing legal advice and support it provides a great deal of connection to other services and supports that women who are experiencing domestic violence may need. To simply say 'Oh, the money is just over here now' is just nonsense. That was a terrible cut that has impacted South Australian women who we speak about so often in this place as needing access to service and needing access to support when they are facing the most difficult, fearful times in their life.

We saw this disregard for South Australians who need support in the government's third budget when they significantly put up the Victims of Crime Levy by around 50 per cent without actually then boosting support for victims. We saw this, again, when they gutted the Victim Support Service and left so many regional towns filled with people needing support without any in-person counselling whatsoever. It is shameful.

Again, Labor offers its full and unqualified support for this bill and the content of the bill. We do have just a few very small questions in relation to the provisions in the bill when we get to that stage. However, our key question for the government, and I will keep saying it, is: why on earth are we dealing with this today and not months or years ago? There are people who have been affected by this delay, people who needed our support in our community.

The parliament does not need to hear the answer to that question about why these delays. The government owes that explanation to victims and their families. In thinking about that explanation that is owed, I shudder to think what would have happened to these bills had the parliament actually been shut down as those opposite tried to do in our last sitting week.

It would have meant that these bills, despite all that time that was available to progress them, would have just simply languished. I cannot imagine the way that would have felt for those people who needed access to the provisions of this bill to ensure that they had the advice, the right system and the support they needed as they dealt with these really, really serious issues.

If the government had got its way with stopping the week before last, all three child sex abuse bills that are on the *Notice Paper*, including this one, would have simply lapsed. If the government had got its way, those who have experienced child sexual abuse would have had less access to justice and compensation. If the government had got its way, then serious child sex offenders would be spending less time in prison.

It was only Labor and others on this side of the house who demanded that we stay here and do what we should always do, and that is put South Australians first and make sure that we enact legislation that ensures they have the support that they absolutely need and particularly at their most difficult, difficult moments.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Reynell, forgive me if I missed this, but I assume you were the lead speaker?

Ms HILDYARD: I said that right at the beginning, thank you. I think you were changing over.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was not in the chair at the time, so thank you for that.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (17:30): I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse) Bill 2021, another example of the important work led by the Attorney-General, the member for Bragg. I am so pleased to be a member of the Marshall Liberal government implementing the recommended changes to create a safer South Australia and provide justice for children and survivors.

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse released its Criminal Justice Report in August 2017. This bill delivers action, not talk. It delivers real changes to legislation to deliver on incredibly important recommendations. The report makes 85 recommendations aimed at addressing or alleviating the impact of past and future child sexual

abuse and related matters in institutional contexts. A number of the recommendations of the report require legislative reform to be implemented and are addressed in the Statutes Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse) Bill 2020. The principal reforms are:

Defence to position of authority offences: the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 contains several specific sex-related offences where the defendant is in a position of authority in relation to the child. These offences were created in recognition of the highest standard expected of persons who are in a position of authority and the extra vulnerability of a child in that situation. The category of persons who are in a position of authority includes a person who provides religious, sporting, musical or other instructions, which could include young adults who are similar in age to the alleged victim.

Failure to report offence: clause 7 of the bill implements recommendation 33 to create the offence of failure to report child sexual abuse by employees of institutions that operate facilities or provide services to children who are in their care or under their supervision or control, including medical and religious institutions. Employees of such institutions are in positions of trust with children and have a duty of care to prevent their sexual abuse.

Failure to protect offence: clause 7 of the bill implements recommendation 36 to create an offence of failing to protect a child from sexual abuse in institutions that operate facilities and provide services to children who are in the care or under the supervision and control, including medical and religious institutions. The offence emphasises the obligation of responsible people to prevent child sexual abuse, not just to report it once it has occurred.

Presumption of males under the age of 14: in 1976, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 was amended to abolish the presumption that a boy under the age of 14 is incapable of having sexual intercourse. Clause 8 of the bill implements recommendation 83 to make this presumption retrospective so that perpetrators of historical sexual offences cannot be protected from being charged and convicted due to the presumption.

Prerecorded evidence: recommendations 52, 53, 54, 56 and 60 propose prerecording of evidence by child sexual abuse victims in order to alleviate the need for these victims to attend court where they are again confronted by their abuser and often experience significant distress during cross-examination. Provisions of the Evidence Act 1929 and other related legislation already allow for prerecording of a victim's evidence at various stages before and during trial. The proposed reform seeks to expand those provisions.

Investigative interviews: clause 20 of the bill implements recommendation 52(a) by amending the Summary Offences Act 1953 to require recording of investigative interviews with police of all three child sexual offence victims, no matter what their age is at trial. Application can be made under the Evidence Act 1929 for these recorded interviews to be admitted at trial, instead of the witness having to give evidence.

Pre-trial special hearings allow witnesses to give evidence before trial without the defendant present. Such hearings are currently only available under section 12AB of the Evidence Act 1929 for children under the age of 14 or where the witness suffers from a disability that affects the person's capacity to give a coherent account of experiences or respond rationally to questions. In line with recommendations 52 and 53, clause 11 of the bill amends the Evidence Act 1929 to expand categories of witnesses who may have pre-trial special hearings to include the following:

- all victims of child sexual offences, no matter what their age at the time of trial; and
- any other witness who is a child or is vulnerable who is to give evidence in a child offence matter.

Application would be made for the court to decide whether they should come within these provisions. It has also proposed that these pre-trial special hearings be available for domestic violence victims.

Audiovisual hearings: clause 13 of the bill implements recommendation 56 to amend the Evidence Act 1929 to require audiovisual recordings of the evidence of all victims of child sexual offences. **Juvenile offenders:** clause 21 of the bill implements recommendation 84 to:

- amend the Young Offenders Act 1993 to provide that, for the purposes of a preliminary examination at committal proceedings in the Youth Court, prerecorded evidence of a victim of a child sexual offence given in another court or during the investigative interview can be admitted; and
- provide that a child sexual offence victim cannot be required to give oral evidence at a preliminary examination during committal proceedings in the Youth Court.

Expert evidence on children: clause 14 of the bill amends the Evidence Act 1929 to implement recommendation 69 to allow expert evidence in relation to the development and behaviour of children generally and those children who have been victims of child sexual abuse to be admissible in proceedings relating to sexual abuse of a child. Such evidence would be useful to the judge and jury to better understand evidence given by children.

Propensity or similarity of account evidence: recommendations 44, 45, 49, 50 and 51 propose reform to the test for admissibility of tendency and coincidence evidence to increase the admissibility of this evidence in child sexual abuse matters.

Religious confessions: clause 16 of the bill implements recommendation 36 and the intent of the principles endorsed by the Council of Attorneys-General to provide that the fact that information was gained during or in connection with a religious confession does not prevent that evidence being given or disclosed in civil or criminal proceedings.

Sentencing for multiple offences: clause 17 of the bill amends the Sentencing Act 2017 to implement recommendation 75 to require the court, when setting a sentence in relation to offences involving multiple discrete episodes of offending or where there are multiple victims, to indicate the sentence that would have been imposed for each offence had separate sentences been imposed. This reform ensures that recognition is given to separate episodes of offending in sentencing.

Sentencing standard for offences involving child sexual abuse: clause 19 of the bill implements recommendation 76 to amend the Sentencing Act 2017 to make it clear that, in sentencing for child sexual offences, sentences must be set in accordance with the sentencing standards at the time of the sentencing, instead of at the time of offending.

As I have said before in this place, we must do all we can to work together to stop child sexual abuse. The statistics say it all: one in five children will be sexually abused in Australia. This is utterly unacceptable. It is appalling that I have needed to sit here and listen to Labor choose to play politics on this topic, which our community expects us to work together on. This is a no-brainer; there is no reason to play games with safety. I am keen to get on with this and other changes as soon as we can so that more South Australian children can grow up safely.

I commend the member for Bragg for her relentless hard work in leading the implementation of these legislative changes to hold perpetrators of all types of abuse to account, to increase the harshness of consequences for those who sexually abuse children and to help victims to be better protected while giving evidence and to seek justice. I commend this bill to the house and thank the Acting Attorney-General for taking carriage of this bill.

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:40): In the interests of expeditiously passing the bill, I wish to speak very briefly. In doing so, I thank the member for Reynell for her contribution, and I thank the member for King for her contribution to this debate and for her sustained interest in this important area as it is expressed in her remarks just now.

As is clear, the passage of this bill indeed marks another important step towards acknowledging the issues that were raised in the royal commission, but it also importantly will now put in place reforms that will further address and alleviate child sexual abuse and related matters in institutional contexts. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms HILDYARD: I have just two questions in this section. First of all, given the royal commission released its finding four years ago, why is this bill only being introduced now?

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: I just indicate to the member for Reynell that one factor of significance was the work of the working group, particularly with respect to uniform Evidence Act states, which considered significant aspects of the outcome of the royal commission. Its work continued for some time and has been the subject of consideration by the Law Society, among others, earlier this year. So I just emphasise the extent to which there has been national consideration of reforms required following the royal commission and I just highlight the work of the working group in particular—but here we are.

Ms HILDYARD: A supplementary to that answer, thank you, minister: when did the working group complete its work?

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: I have referred to that work insofar as it related to the uniform Evidence Act states. I have an indication of a draft having been produced late in 2019 that may be of relevance, and I would refer further to deliberations that ensued, including the consideration of the Law Society, to which I have referred already, that was before the Attorney earlier this year. I am being advised that a report of the working group was reported back in September 2019 also.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, why exactly was there a three-month delay in bringing this bill on in this place, when it clearly had the support of the opposition, and what would have happened to this bill should parliament have shut down last sitting week?

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: Member for Reynell, those questions are on the record. I perhaps regard them as largely rhetorical and the answers I think speak for themselves: here we are progressing the bill.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 17 passed.

Clause 18.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, this is in relation to the insertion of part 7, division 11—Religious confession. Given the proposal will mean that information from a confession is not prevented from being admitted at trial, how exactly is that prevented right now?

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: There might a multifaceted response, in that it is perhaps not possible to generalise in this sense. What I can say that will apply across the board is that the amendment just makes clear that no matter what the denomination there will be no confessional privilege applying. It really makes clear that that is the case and, just to be clear, that is with respect to any criminal or civil proceedings relating to the child sexual abuse, and sometimes we will see one or both of those.

I can add further, and I think this is information that has been previously provided in response to inquiries, that it is unclear in Australia whether or not there is such a privilege in common law. The royal commission reported that a number of jurisdictions internationally have recognised a common law priest-penitent privilege for religious confessions and that the position in Australia is not clear. There is no case law in Australia deciding whether or not there is a common law confessional privilege, so there are no cases in which this privilege has been relied on. The clause is a belt and braces provision, making it absolutely clear in that context.

Clause passed.

Clause 19.

Ms HILDYARD: For avoidance of any confusion, does this deal with the multiple offences and/or offences that may include multiple instances of offending, e.g. in cases where there is persistent sexual exploitation of a child?

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE: Perhaps if I can answer it this way: the provision makes it clear that wherever a single sentence is to be imposed, then it is really a provision requiring that there be an indication as to what would have been imposed in respect of each such offence had that single sentence provision not been applied. It is a spelling out of the seriousness, I suppose, of the individual

offences, notwithstanding the possibility for the imposition of a single sentence. I am not sure if that is completely responding to the member for Reynell's question.

I am advised that it applies to any offence, and so in relation to the matter of persistent sexual exploitation to which the member for Reynell refers then, yes, it would apply, I am advised, in that way. It is really a question of where there are different victims and where a single sentence is proposed and in relation to potentially multiple offences. I do not know that I have added a great deal to what is on the face of the provision.

Ms HILDYARD: I was just going to say that if there is any more clarity, can you please let me know and I would appreciate your answer.

Clause passed.

Clauses 20 to 23 passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.B. TEAGUE (Heysen—Minister for Planning and Local Government)
(17:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL

Final Stages

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

At 17:56 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 December 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***COUNTRY HOSPITALS**

872 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (26 October 2021). What was the total expenditure on locum doctors in country hospitals over the past three financial years (2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21)?

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

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Total Expenditure	\$21,735,921	\$24,382,722	\$30,980,844

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

873 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (26 October 2021). What was the expenditure on locum doctors in country hospitals broken down by local health network over the past three financial years (2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21)?

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

LHN	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
BHFLHN	\$2,000,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000
EFNLHN	\$3,048,000	\$3,712,000	\$5,258,000
FUNLHN	\$5,301,384	\$4,884,279	\$7,043,275
LCLHN	\$6,143,537	\$6,298,443	\$6,228,569
RMCLHN	\$1,313,000	\$1,998,000	\$3,771,000
YNLHN	\$3,930,000	\$5,890,000	\$7,080,000

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

874 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (26 October 2021). What is budgeted for locum doctors in country hospitals for 2021/22, broken down by local health network?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised that the following budgets are available:

LHN	2021-22
EFNLHN	\$7,763,000
FUNLHN	\$2,027,700
LCLHN	\$1,801,000
YNLHN	\$6,750,000

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

875 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (26 October 2021). How many days of locum coverage were there across country hospitals, broken down by hospital site, during 2020-21?

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

Regional hospitals routinely contract some or all of their medical services from locums.

COUNTRY HOSPITALS

876 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (26 October 2021). For which hospitals in 2020-21 were there days of no medical coverage (either locum or local on-call doctor), and how many days of no coverage for each hospital?

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

Hospital Site	Number of days during 2020-21
Glenside Hospital	2
Bordertown	4.5
Naracoorte	27

Hospital Site	Number of days during 2020-21
Penola	21
Cooper Pedy	0.5
Balaklava Soldiers' Memorial District Hospital	2
Booleroo Centre District Hospital	2
Central Yorke Peninsula Hospital (Maitland)	1

PORT PIRIE HEALTH SERVICE

877 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (28 October 2021). For the period of 1 January to 30 September 2021 in the Port Pirie Regional Health Service:

(a) How many shifts occurred where there was not the required number of nursing staff to meet necessary staffing levels?

(b) On how many occasions was there requirement for nursing staff to carry out a 'double shift' to ensure that there was a full complement of nursing staff?

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

(a) Port Pirie Regional Health Service (PPRHS) monitors staffing levels as per the Nursing and Midwifery Enterprise Agreement 2020. Staffing levels are required to be monitored as an average over a 14-day period. It is not possible to breakdown data into individual shifts.

(b) There were 53 occasions where staff worked 'double shifts' for the period 1 January 2021 to 30 September 2021, to cover unplanned leave.

PORT PIRIE HEALTH SERVICE

878 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (28 October 2021). For the period of 1 January to 30 September 2021 at the Port Pirie Regional Health Services accident and emergency department, how many times were locum doctors unavailable to fill all shifts in a 24-hour period?

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

For the period 1 January 2021 to 30 September 2021 at least one shift within each 24-hour period was covered by a locum general practitioner.

PORT PIRIE HEALTH SERVICE

879 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (28 October 2021). For the period of 1 January to 30 September 2021 Pirie Regional Health Services accident and emergency department:

(a) What were the waiting times for patients seeing a medical doctor? (please provide average time per month.)

(b) How many patients waited more than 30 minutes to be seen by a medical doctor?

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

Port Pirie Regional Health Service monitors the time to treatment as per the Australian Triage Scale (scale of care urgency) and does not specifically monitor time to review by Medical Officer.

PORT PIRIE HEALTH SERVICE

880 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (28 October 2021). For the period of 1 January to 30 September 2021 at the Port Pirie South Australian Ambulance Service:

(a) How many shifts occurred where the operation was impacted due to the inability to meet required staffing levels?

(b) On how many occasions was there a requirement for staff to work a 'double shift' to satisfy required staffing levels?

(c) On how many occasions have staff been unable to take a required break during their shift?

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

(a) For the period of 1 January 2021 to 30 September 2021, there were 35 shifts or a portion of a shift that were impacted due to the inability to meet required staffing levels.

(b) On six occasions staff members worked two consecutive active ambulance shifts (not on-call shifts) to satisfy required staffing levels. On 65 occasions, staff performed an active overtime shift during the day, which is followed by the on-call shift overnight, also at overtime rates.

(c) SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) is unable to verify any missed meal breaks in the requested time period.

SOUTHGATE INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH, SOCIETY AND EQUITY

882 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (18 November 2021). What effects will the Flinders University's proposed closure of the Southgate Institute for Health, Society and Equity, along with the disestablishment of its key senior staff, have on South Australia's contribution to international and national public health research and development?

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

The Southgate Institute for Health, Society and Equity is a highly regarded research institute throughout Australia and internationally which makes a high-quality contribution to public health research being a World Health Organization Collaborating Centre to support international research and knowledge translation on social, political and commercial determinants of health equity.