

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 4 May 2022

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.

Bills

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (COVID-19) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the South Australian Public Health Act 2011. Read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (10:32): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the South Australian Public Health Act (COVID-19) Amendment Bill to pass through all remaining stages without delay prior to the Address in Reply being adopted.

Motion carried.

Second Reading

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill before the house today seeks to amend the South Australian Public Health Act 2011 to maintain important measures to manage ongoing COVID-19 transmission in the South Australian community.

The major emergency declaration under the Emergency Management Act 2004 has been in place since 22 March 2020. This is by far the longest emergency declaration in the state's history. The major emergency has been extended via the cabinet and the Governor 28 times since then.

The current 28-day extension of the declaration ceases on 28 May 2022. The government has indicated its desire to not have further extensions of the declaration beyond 30 June 2022. This bill, with the support of the parliament, will allow for the expiry of the major emergency by ensuring that the key protections can stay in place.

Following the expiry of the declaration, it is important to ensure continuity of some baseline measures to help manage the pandemic and protect the most vulnerable members of our community. With COVID-19 transmission continuing in South Australia, there remains a need to maintain some targeted measures to monitor the incidence and prevalence of the disease and mitigate transmission.

Isolation requirements for cases will be essential into the winter months to limit transmission of COVID-19 into the South Australian community and reduce the risk of overwhelming the healthcare system. Infection prevention and control measures, including mask wearing and staff vaccination requirements, will still be important in high-risk settings, such as residential aged-care, disability and healthcare settings.

The objects of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011 are to protect individuals and communities from risks of public health. While it effectively does so for the most part, there are also limitations in that the current provisions only provide the means to effectively deal with individual cases of disease. This has served us well prior to the global pandemic but will not provide the

capacity to practically manage COVID-19 at the scale required where we have seen and will continue to see thousands of cases a day for the foreseeable future.

This has led to the use of the Public Health Act having limited applicability during the course of the pandemic. This Public Health Act (COVID-19) Amendment Bill 2022 has been developed to address the current limitations of the act to deal with COVID-19, as well as provide for the ability to transition a limited number of current requirements made under the Emergency Management Act 2004 to sustain their operation once the major emergency declaration ceases.

The bill ensures that oversight of the issuing of directions requiring isolation of cases or quarantine or other mitigation measures for close contacts is by the elected government through the Governor. The government has announced its policy of utilising the Emergency Management Council of cabinet that includes key ministers, as well as the Chief Public Health Officer and the State Coordinator, who is also the police commissioner.

The bill will ensure that specific requirements for high-risk settings are retained to effectively protect more vulnerable members of the community, including mandatory vaccination, contact tracing, mask wearing and other infection control measures. This includes areas such as hospitals, health care, aged care and disability.

To highlight the key features of the bill, it establishes a new part 11A that establishes the power for the Governor, by notice in the *Gazette*, to issue directions imposing requirements including isolation and quarantine on people. This is only for those who have been infected with COVID-19 or who are close contacts. The provisions have been drafted so that these requirements on close contacts and people positive with COVID-19 can have appropriate application and can include the necessary requirements to be effective.

Part 11A also provides the necessary powers for authorised officers to enforce the requirements of any direction made or transitioned under the new part and allows for the expiry of a direction or a specific provision of a direction, which must be no later than six months after the commencement of the part. This ensures the new part's time-limited application. Importantly, if these requirements are needed beyond six months, the government will need to return to the parliament to consider them again.

Part 11A also disapplies provisions of the act relating to specific principles, section 14(6), (7) and (9), and Magistrates Court appeals, section 90(3), (4) and (5), where a public health emergency would need to be declared under the act. This ensures that, should a public health emergency be needed only in relation to COVID-19, these provisions of the act would not impede effective public health measures or their enforcement at scale.

Part 11A establishes transitional provisions under schedule 1 to transition any remaining directions under the Emergency Management Act to give them effect under the South Australian Public Health Act to sustain the requirements once the major emergency declaration ceases. The Department for Health and Wellbeing is currently reviewing the existing directions in force with a view to providing advice to the State Coordinator as to their ongoing maintenance at the time of transition. These will primarily relate to high-risk sectors, such as aged care, hospitals, health care and disability care.

Importantly, this bill is limited in scope and will not allow for the imposition of restrictions, such as lockdowns, hospitality restrictions and general mask-wearing provisions, except if there was a declaration of another emergency either under this act or under the Emergency Management Act. If there was the public health need for such significant restrictions again, then the declaration of a new emergency would need to be considered at that time.

Health is the number one priority of the new Malinauskas Labor government, and ensuring that we have important measures in place to respond to the transmission of COVID-19 throughout our community forms a key part of the government's health plan. This is combined with the need to end the declaration of a major emergency and ensure that those remaining targeted public health measures transfer to a new legal framework through this parliament.

In conclusion, I want to thank again all of the incredibly hardworking public servants of all descriptions who have been involved over the past two years in the course of the pandemic and in

particular I would like to thank both the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens, and the Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier, for their incredible work, both of whom will continue to play key roles, as part of the Emergency Management Council, in guiding the state's management of the COVID-19 pandemic.

This is certainly something that has been worked on through Health and with SA Police over the past few weeks to make sure we keep these important baseline restrictions in place. It is something that I know that the police commissioner and State Coordinator, Grant Stevens, is certainly supportive of—making sure that we keep these baseline restrictions in place and that we are able to transition away from the continued use of the Emergency Management Act. I really want to put on the record once again my thanks to them for their incredible work over the past two years, and I commend the bill to the house. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

These clauses are formal.

2—Commencement

Part 2—Amendment of *South Australian Public Health Act 2011*

3—Insertion of Part 11A

This clause inserts a new Part in the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011* as follows:

Part 11A—COVID-19 arrangements

90A—Interpretation

This section contains definitions for the purposes of the Part and also provides that powers under the Part are in addition to, and do not limit, any other power under the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011*.

90B—Directions

This section provides that the Governor may issue directions imposing requirements in relation to persons who have tested positive for COVID-19 and close contacts of such persons. Such directions could, for example, include directions requiring isolation or quarantine.

Directions of the Governor under this section may not come into operation, or continue to operate, if a declaration under section 23 of the *Emergency Management Act 2004* in respect of the outbreak of COVID 19 within South Australia is in force (but could operate concurrently with a declaration of a public health incident or public health emergency under Part 11).

90C—Enforcement of directions

This section provides for the enforcement of directions issued under this Part and, for that purpose, empowers emergency officers to exercise any power referred to in section 25(2) of the *Emergency Management Act 2004*.

It will be an offence to, without reasonable excuse, refuse or fail to comply with a direction issued under this Part or a direction or requirement of an emergency officer given for the purposes of this Part. The maximum penalty for the offence for an individual will be \$20,000 or imprisonment for 2 years and for a body corporate \$75,000 and expiation fees for the offence will be \$1,000 and \$5,000 respectively.

It will also be an offence to hinder or obstruct operations carried out under, or for the purposes of, this Part. The maximum penalty for the offence will be \$10,000.

This section also provides for criminal liability for directors and managers of bodies corporate guilty of an offence against the section. Each director and the manager of such a body corporate will be guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty for the principal offence when committed by an individual unless they prove that they could not by the exercise of due diligence have prevented the commission of the offence.

This section also provides that an emergency officer may require a person who the officer reasonably suspects has committed, is committing or is about to commit, an offence against this Part to state

the person's full name and usual place of residence and to produce evidence of the person's identity. A failure to immediately comply with such a requirement will be an offence with a maximum penalty of \$5,000.

90D—Expiry of directions etc

This section provides that the Minister—

- (a) may, by notice in the Gazette, fix a day or days, on which a direction under section 90B, or specified provisions of such a direction, will expire; and
- (b) must, by notice in the Gazette, fix a day on which section 90B and all directions under that section will expire.

The day fixed by the Minister for the purposes of paragraph (b) above, to expire section 90B and all directions under that section, must be not later than 6 months after the day on which this section came into operation.

90E—Modifications of Act

This section provides that, if a public health incident or public health emergency is declared under Part 11 of the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011* in respect of COVID-19, the following provisions of that Act do not apply to a direction given in relation to that emergency:

- (a) section 14(6), (7) and (9);
- (b) section 90(3), (4) and (5).

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Interpretation

This clause contains definitions for the purposes of the Schedule.

2—Continuation of directions

This clause provides that, on the cessation of the last relevant emergency declaration made under section 23 of the *Emergency Management Act 2004* in force immediately before the commencement of this Schedule, a direction in force under section 25 of that Act continues in force as a direction under section 90B of the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011* (as inserted by this Act).

This clause further provides that any approval or exemption granted under a direction continued in force under this clause also continues in force as if it had been granted under the direction as continued.

3—Emergency officers

This clause provides that a person who was an authorised officer under section 17 of the *Emergency Management Act 2004* immediately before the cessation of the last relevant emergency declaration made under section 23 of that Act will, on that cessation, be taken to be appointed as an emergency officer under the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011*.

The SPEAKER: I am informed that the lead speaker for the opposition is the member for Frome. It is the practice of the house to allow new members to make their first speech during the Address in Reply debate. Having regard to standing order 113, members giving their first speech may speak for up to an hour. Prior to making a first speech, the Chair will usually remind the house to extend the traditional courtesies to new members of being heard in silence without interjection. There is no formal prohibition on new members making a contribution to other business prior to making their first speech. The House of Assembly practice is for new members to ask questions, and there are examples of new members giving a grievance contribution before their first speech.

The member for Frome, of course, is required to make a contribution on this occasion because of the importance of this matter, being brought on after the suspension of standing orders, and the circumstances which befall the house and particularly the member for Schubert, who is unwell with COVID, the subject of this bill. Member for Frome, please do make your contribution. I make no criticism of you, and the house makes no criticism of you in these circumstances.

Ms PRATT (Frome) (10:42): Thank you very much for making that allowance, Mr Speaker. I rise to speak on the South Australian Public Health (COVID-19) Amendment Bill 2022 and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. The bill seeks to amend the South Australian Public Health Act 2011—the Public Health Act. The opposition will be supporting the bill in the House of Assembly, reserving our right to further consider matters and raise them in the Legislative Council.

The opposition received a copy of this bill on Monday afternoon, less than two days ago. The minister only provided the second reading speech to us last night. I note that the bill was draft No. 13, prepared on 28 April 2022, yet there was no advice to the opposition that a bill was coming and, in particular, that the bill would require urgent consideration.

The bill seeks to put the management of the COVID-19 pandemic back under the South Australian Public Health Act 2011. This is not the first time during the pandemic that the act has been used. On 15 March 2020 a public health emergency in relation to the transmission of COVID-19 was declared in South Australia pursuant to section 87 of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011.

The pandemic escalated quickly. On 22 March 2020, the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens, declared a major emergency under section 23(1) of the Emergency Management Act 2004 in respect of the outbreak of the human disease named COVID-19 within South Australia. Since that time, the major emergency declaration has been extended 28 times by the Governor. The declaration was most recently extended on 30 April 2022 for a further 28 days, and the major emergency is due to lapse on 28 May 2022.

The government does not intend to renew the declaration under the Emergency Management Act. There are currently 18 directions in place, in addition to three declarations relating to the major emergency itself. The government is putting forward this bill in anticipation of the expiration of the declaration to keep in place, under the Public Health Act, the current COVID response. In particular, the bill seeks to maintain existing directions under the Emergency Management Act. Without the bill, upon the cessation of the declaration, the current rules and, in particular, requirements for COVID-19 positive cases and close contacts would lapse. The bill allows for the COVID-19 directions under the Public Health Act to be terminated within six months.

It is important that this state maintains agility; the pandemic is not over and it is not predictable. The government and community of South Australia have constantly needed to pivot in responding to COVID-19, and we will need to do so again. South Australia continues to record thousands of positive cases every day and our active cases are over 24,000. Significantly, on the very day the government provided the opposition with this bill, the Chief Public Health Officer advised the government that two new variants of COVID-19 have been identified in South Australia. We are going into our first flu season in over three years.

The government has advised that, if new restrictions need to be imposed in the future, a new major emergency would need to be declared by the State Coordinator under the Emergency Management Act. The Minister for Health has advised that the bill is supported by the State Coordinator, Commissioner Grant Stevens, and the Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier.

On its second day in the parliament, this government has tabled this bill as an urgent bill. Let's consider the urgency. Under the Marshall government, a number of COVID bills were brought before the parliament, putting in place protections as the state prepared for the onset of COVID-19. There was an urgency to put them in place to increase the protection of public health. Without these bills, our COVID-19 response would have been impaired.

Given that there are only two sitting weeks before the major emergency declaration is due to lapse, the bill is being treated as an urgent bill. The government has advised that they will seek to have the bill pass the House of Assembly by the end of the morning session today. We have had no indication from the government as to what their plan is for the other place.

The major emergency declaration has been extended 28 times before, for one month on each occasion. The government could have extended the declaration for a 29th time. Nonetheless, the opposition believes that this bill can be considered in the time frame and intends to support the bill. However, we will take the opportunity to explore issues in committee and indicate to the government that we will seek further briefings and discussions between the houses. The opposition is determined to protect the rights of citizens, from the right to be protected from disease to the right to free movement and association.

The Public Health Act embodies a set of eight overarching principles. Under section 5, in the administration of the Public Health Act, officers are required to have regard to both the objects and the principles of the act. Section 5 provides:

5—Principles to be recognised under Act

In the administration of this Act and in seeking to further the objects of this Act, regard should be given to the principles set out in the following sections (insofar as may be relevant in the circumstances).

One of the principles is the proportionate regulation principle, which provides:

7—Proportionate regulation principle

Regulatory measures should take into account and, to the extent that is appropriate, minimise adverse impacts on business and members of the community while ensuring consistency with requirements to protect the community and to promote public health.

Public health officers are required by law to minimise adverse impacts on business and members of the community. Similarly, the participation principle speaks to individual freedoms. Section 11 provides:

11—Participation principle

Individuals and communities should be encouraged to take responsibility for their own health and, to that end, to participate in decisions about how to protect and promote their own health and the health of their communities.

It is noteworthy that the Emergency Management Act is not subject to these such principles. These provisions may provide enhanced grounds for judicial review of public health decisions. The Public Health Act also has specific appeal provisions.

The opposition is concerned that in this bill the government is proposing to limit appeal rights, for example, in the exclusion of appeals under section 95 of the act. We also question the six-month time frame for the expiry of directions. We would like to discuss the merit of a three-month time frame. The opposition will be looking closely at the enforcement provisions, which carry both imprisonment penalties and expiation fines. We want to make sure that penalties are reasonable and necessary and that they are applied equitably.

The opposition is committed to a bipartisan response to the pandemic. I look forward to further consideration of the bill in committee and in the other place to deliver the best health and other outcomes for South Australians in this pandemic.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (10:50): Can I thank the member for Frome for her contribution. It is clear that she and her colleagues in the opposition have given this important matter a lot of thought and consideration, and of course my colleague the Minister for Health looks forward to engaging on those important issues the member raised that they would like to discuss further in the committee stage of the bill.

As the minister has already said, and as the member for Frome has highlighted, this is an unusual situation, in terms of not just the haste in which this bill is being brought before the house but also the environment in which this bill is being brought to this place prior to the house hearing the Address in Reply contributions from members, including new members and including the member for Frome. We only do so, of course, because of the speed at which this issue must be dealt with.

If we were to wait for the normal course of events, where we would perhaps spend, at the very least, the remainder of this sitting week considering the Address in Reply contributions and then the following sitting week with any remaining Address in Reply contributions, and then take this bill through its normal course, we would simply not have enough time in order to give these amendments the chance to be considered, passed and come into effect. In that regard, we are grateful for the opposition's consideration and willingness to deal with the bill in this manner and also their offer of a bipartisan approach. That is gratefully received by the government.

Both the minister and the member have made the point that we have had a succession of these declarations made, and of course the community is at the point now where it is very much looking forward to the time when these declarations are not required to continue. I think it has been a great relief for a lot of members in the community to see some of the restrictions and impositions on the community gradually lifted, over the last six weeks in particular.

Importantly, this bill strikes the right balance by giving the government the capacity to maintain a level of restrictions or to ease restrictions but not re-impose restrictions or impose other restrictions. I think that is a way in which we seek to deal with this which should provide some comfort and certainty not just to the community but also to opposition and other members who are concerned about how this new regime will be used in practice.

It has been for many people an extremely challenging time. It has been for many people a debilitating time. I am sure a lot of members have had a cursory glance at SA Health's COVID dashboard. It shows not only the extraordinary number of South Australians who have been infected with COVID and had those cases reported but also the more serious cases, the ones that have required hospitalisation, including serious hospitalisation, and of course, very sadly, people who have passed away from this. Those case numbers are reflective of a very broad impact across the community.

As other members have said in previous debates, and as the minister and the member have made reference to in their contributions, we also think particularly of those members of our community who have principally been responsible for managing COVID. They are not just our health workers but also other professions, including teachers, police, transport workers, retail workers and workers within industries that have been affected most substantially by the imposition of restrictions or prohibitions on certain activities.

The isolation and the quarantine requirements, the imposition of density limits in retail and hospitality businesses, the restrictions on activities and the restrictions on travel, all have come, depending on your perspective, at varying costs to livelihoods and freedoms that we would otherwise enjoy, and they are not lightly imposed on the community, as we have debated in this place. So it is with perhaps some view to the future that people have some positivity that, if we can have a regime in place where these restrictions can continue to be gradually and appropriately withdrawn from the community and managed in a way that is not so difficult and imposing on the community, that would be gratefully received.

As the minister has pointed out, we have also fundamentally changed how the government considers and manages these issues internally. The previous government had a transition committee principally comprising the State Coordinator, the police commissioner; the Chief Public Health Officer; and key government department heads. Notably, it was to the exclusion of the Premier and other senior decision-makers, other ministers, in government.

As we got closer and closer to the state election, and the then opposition leader now Premier, the member for Croydon, made it clear that that would not be the regime a future Labor government would continue with, that was abandoned and instead a COVID-Ready Committee was established and fortunately this time included elected members, including ministers responsible to this house, so that they could be involved in decision-making. That is an important change.

What we have sought to do since the election is go back to the structures that have always been in place in South Australia. Those members opposite who have been ministers would know, for example, as they get their minister's guide to emergencies, for example, that there is effectively—I will not say a standing committee—a committee that immediately comprises the Emergency Management Committee when the state faces the sort of emergency that we would regularly be used to, usually a bushfire or a flood or some sort of natural disaster that we were otherwise not expecting, but in this case an ongoing emergency that is dealing with the pandemic.

We have gone back to that well-known, well-articulated process of dealing with these decisions, receiving advice from within all areas of the public sector and also from outside the public sector so that a considered judgement not only can be made by elected members and those who are ministers but importantly we can be held to account for them in this place. That is an important and significant change that I think has also been broadly welcomed by the community. Those people at the recent state election who have chosen to represent their views in this place are once again responsible for the decisions that affect their day-to-day lives and we can be held to account for them, and that is an important distinction.

I do not take any umbrage at this, but I also note the member's comments about how much time the government was able to give the opposition for this bill and how it would be handled. The

member for Frome is absolutely spot on. This is not the first time we have had to swiftly consider legislation, but I would say this is one of the more timely ways in which a government has engaged with the opposition in dealing with this legislation.

We can recall, for example, when the Hon. Kyam Maher, then shadow attorney-general, would call the then Attorney-General—when I say that, I mean the member for Bragg, not the member for Heysen—about whether there would be any changes to this legislation. In the days towards the end of the week before a sitting week, there would be either a negative response or no response, and then as we came into the chamber on a Tuesday for the beginning of a parliamentary sitting week we would have something dropped on our lap.

I am aware that the Premier, the Minister for Health and, I also believe, the current Attorney-General have sought to engage with their counterparts as early as possible, including before this sitting week, about this prospect and have sought to engage with the opposition on how this could be managed in the most effective way. We certainly have not sought to dump it on the opposition as a *fait accompli*.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, we are grateful for the consideration of the opposition. It is clear from the member for Frome's contribution that the opposition has put quite some diligence into considering these matters, thinking about those that require ventilation in this place and also those on which they want some clarification from the government. That is a very good thing.

I want to make another couple of reflections on the lingering impact in the community from the pandemic. Notwithstanding what the member for Frome points out, that the Chief Public Health Officer has been in the media in the last 24 hours pointing to further variants that are now starting to show up in South Australia—we all hope that they do not eventuate with the same force as we have seen with previous strains of the virus, of course—we would all like to think that we remain on a trajectory out of this pandemic.

In doing so, we must ensure that we remain aware of the lingering impacts on those people who have been affected by the pandemic. I am talking about those people who have caught COVID and have lingering health impacts. To varying extents, some people have got off pretty lightly with it, including some members in this place, but not only have other members of our community passed away after contracting COVID but other members of our community have very significant lingering health impacts as a result of contracting the virus. They will need to be managed.

I am also thinking about those frontline workers who have been responsible for shouldering a much heavier load than normal during the course of the last two years. I cannot imagine how unpleasant it has been for those members of the South Australian workforce generally who have had to show up to work day after day, week after week, month after month, having to go through their entire working day with a tight-fitting mask on, for example, all the while having to conduct their regular duties, some of which have become far more difficult for them because of the restrictions or the requirements that have been imposed for COVID.

We immediately think of health workers, but we also think of, as I mentioned before, police officers. We still have an issue with COVID in our schools for teachers and even students. We think of our transport workers, particularly public transport workers, taxidriviers and rideshare drivers, private bus and coach line drivers and so on. People who have been affected working at our airports, effectively losing their livelihoods for well over a year as travel restrictions have been imposed, come back to work and confront either themselves or colleagues being infected by COVID or being impacted by close contact rules, so fewer workers are having to do the same amount of work. All of this is extremely difficult on those workers. It is the same again in the retail and hospitality industries as well.

Some retail outlets have done exceedingly well over the last two years. Supermarkets, for example, have done very well as we have changed our spending habits, generally speaking, and spent more proportionately on groceries and less on other areas of discretionary spending, but other areas of retail have done it extremely tough. You only need to be a small business, main street or high street retailer, for example, to know just how crippling economic conditions have been over the last two years.

The same goes with all the different areas of the hospitality industry, whether it is a local coffee shop, a cafe serving food, a restaurant, a hotel or a small bar. All of them have been impacted really significantly. Many of them have suffered through it and many of them have continued trading, even though they basically knew they were not able to derive an income from their operations. They did it just so they could support their workers, just so they had a reason to continue paying the weekly salary of their workers. I do not say that that happened just in hospitality; I should also point out that it happened in many other areas of the small business community.

That has put extraordinary financial burdens on part of our community which quite often was already significantly geared in the first place, having made an investment in order to establish their business themselves. They have continued to do that, even after federal government support schemes such as JobKeeper were removed more than 14 months ago. Rather than get a wage subsidy so that they can pay workers who are not effectively able to productively work because there is no custom for their business, they have continued to pay them out of their own pocket.

Some of that is a function of the relationship that employers have with their workers. Some of it is a function of the fear with closed borders, internationally in particular, that if that worker leaves that business they will not be able to get another worker at all, let alone one who is as skilled or capable of doing the work. So there are very significant financial impacts that will take a long time to recover from.

I do estimate that for the hundreds of thousands of workers across South Australia who have been responsible for dealing with this pandemic, I really do wonder about the lingering mental and emotional impacts of what they have gone through over that period. The phrase that has been used by many people in the media and by public commentators is that if COVID was the earthquake, then a mental health crisis will be the tsunami afterwards. I think there is a lot in that that we need to reflect on: not just for the impacts, of course, on our health system (public and private) and its capacity to deal with that but for the mental health burden that people are shouldering and will need a lot of assistance in dealing with over the future.

Articles have been written by demographers and economic commentators about changes in working habits, where people have dedicated so much time and effort—so much of their mental and emotional and perhaps even physical resilience—to getting through the last 18 months that they will probably say they have simply had enough in working in that course of employment in the future. That is going to present not just employers but communities and their governments really significant challenges going forward.

I make those comments in the context of this bill. We hope not only that this gives us the right governance arrangement to continue easing ourselves out of restrictions and requirements on the community but that we have an appropriate process to manage that. Even if we are lucky enough to transition now out of this pandemic—and we hope that these new variants etc. do not impact us in the future in the way that others have—we have a long and what will be at times a very difficult road ahead of us in making sure that those people in the community who have been mostly impacted by this have all the support and help that they need into the future. With those comments, I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (11:09): I rise to make a contribution on this really important public health amendment bill 2022. I think there is not one person in this place who has not seen the impacts and effects on our communities of the dreadful consequences of the COVID pandemic which we have seen in various iterations. It has been, for all of us, an extremely challenging time to be in a position in our communities where so many people have reached out to us for help and support with heartbreaking stories. Our office has been no different from a local community point of view. I felt very lucky to have contracted COVID—

The Hon. C.J. Picton interjecting:

The Hon. N.F. COOK: —yes, you would not stop the sentence right there, would you—after being triple-vaccinated. I am an intensive care nurse by trade, and over many decades of looking after extremely unwell people in the clinical setting I certainly had a great insight into the consequences of this awful virus and what it does, from a pathophysiological point of view, to the body of the person who contracts the virus.

I think what that did for me was to (a) give me a bit of a different lens on this and (b) also make me quite frustrated to hear the deniers and the people opposed to vaccination imparting their views on others who are easily influenced, perhaps because of their own lack of understanding of science. It is not that I do not and have not respected people's choice—after all, I am pro-choice on matters to do with one's own body—but when it comes to imparting views on others in respect of a deadly virus in a way that is misleading and has a lack of scientific rigour, I found that extremely worrying and I still do.

When I contracted COVID, thanks to the generosity of the community and perhaps my own, at times, feeling that maybe we were over this hump, I felt unwell but not to a point where I could not function to some degree. I had what felt like a mild case of a flu and managed to continue to function, but on reflection after recovery I have lost some memory of the week that I was unwell and some of the detailed conversations that I had. People would perhaps be aware that I had COVID in the week I became the Minister for Human Services, so I had begun to use my time to read many documents and briefing notes. I have had to go over them all again, many times, to absorb them. I have been a bit of a crammer in my life in terms of studying and, in that particular period, clearly, my brain was not able to operate as such.

I felt lucky I had been triple-vaccinated and did not suffer serious febrile consequences. Coffee tasted awful, which was a terrible thing for me. My husband contracted it, but my nine-year-old son did not, all in the same house. I did laugh and joke for people (and the Minister for Child Protection should close her ears) that if someone had visited the house and seen the yellow food and the self-care that my nine year old was undertaking, they would have thought it was some kind of disastrous child protection rort that was going on.

It was, 'Stay down the other end of the house,' 'Don't come past here,' 'You get your mask on,' 'Now you can come in; we've wiped the kitchen down,' all of those things. We did everything we possibly could and he did not get it, even though he is double-vaxxed, because he is not eligible for a booster at this point. He was double-vaxxed. He did not contract COVID. I still did not want him to get it and take the risk that he would be one of the people who still gets very unwell in spite of being double or triple vaccinated.

I think part of the frustration for me is that some people have been exposing themselves to COVID just so they get it over and done with, or are not worrying about the consequences of the illness. I have looked after many people throughout my clinical time, people who have suffered a similar type of virus. We know coronavirus is not new. It has been around a long time, and I have nursed people through swine flu and the bird flu period.

We started to get innovative with health so that we could give their lungs a rest. Because their lungs were no longer able to oxygenate across the membrane, clinicians and scientists started to use what was called ECMO, which is ostensibly a bypass machine: the blood comes out of the body, goes through the machine, gets all the oxygen put into it and then it is put back into the body, in the role that your lungs would normally have but because they are so damaged cannot.

That, at the bedside, became innovative, groundbreaking and life saving for a range of people. It was a demonstration of great agility in a time when the science was suddenly able to keep up with the medical need and desire. I know that through this recent and current COVID pandemic ECMO has started to become a life-saving modality in intensive care units, including our intensive care units in South Australia, in the Royal Adelaide and Flinders, and the clinicians are doing such an extraordinary job.

We talked, and other members have spoken, about some of the precautions that have had to be put in place throughout this period of COVID, in particular the personal protective equipment: the masks, the gowns, the shields, the gloves, and the need for clinicians to wear these for 12 hours, working very hard. They do not just stand and watch; they are physically doing a whole range of things, and at pace and en masse at the bedside. Often, you would have 10 or 15 clinicians required to save someone's life when it is in the balance.

We all know what it is like to wear a mask and have glasses. All these people have the masks on, the glasses and the shields; there is the heat, the hot head. I loved my job. I loved being able to be there and provide something for people that contributed towards saving a life, but I just cannot

imagine wearing that PPE, the shields and all, for 12 hours or longer, because you do not leave the bedside. If someone is tipping over the edge, you stay on. I just cannot imagine what it would be like to be so hot and sweaty, with all the fogging up that happens.

For the general public under these orders—in retail, transport, disability work, a whole range of other sites where people provide close contact support and service to people—now having to wear PPE and go through that experience, it is quite difficult for them and a massive challenge. You can feel quite unwell. Even at the bedside and counters, workers have not been able to have a drink. You cannot have a drink container sitting there and then remove your PPE to take a drink safely because you cannot be certain what is going to happen to you in terms of contracting—and I welcome again an Acting Speaker to the chair.

The empathy I have for people who are subject to orders under these acts is huge, as well as the sympathy and understanding I have for people who have been going through this condition. That translates to an urgent request for people to vaccinate, to listen to the health experts and scientists and not Dr Google and, in terms of moving forward, to follow those public health alerts as we transition through a phase where, while we might not be under an emergency act, we continue to listen to the health advice.

Yes, COVID is still there, as has been rightly pointed out by several members who have spoken on this before, and there are new variants, and I know there are many people in the community who are very concerned about the new variants and how the current vaccination protects them. Well, we follow the health advice. We know that the vaccination—two doses and a booster—is gold standard. We also know there are experts in the field currently working on whether there should be more boosters and on who should get another booster, and we know that some people are getting an extra booster. I urge people to listen to the health advice. That is exactly what we, as a government, are doing.

I understand and acknowledge the statements made by the member for Frome—who I welcome to the chamber and I look forward to working with—around timing and appreciate the thought and the commentary in the member's speech. We have brought this to the chamber as fast as we can and have provided as much notice as we can, giving the time it has taken for us to get our own advice. We hope any questions will be able to be answered in a fulsome and timely way so that we can get this piece of legislation through both houses.

I understand it will likely be debated next sitting week; I do not know the exact timing, but that is generally the pattern. That will give the opposition a week in which to get answers and work together on proceeding with this piece of legislation in a timely, informed and, hopefully, by the end point, bipartisan way.

I have spoken at length about healthcare workers, and I have mentioned other workers in the community, and it would be appropriate to use this time as an opportunity to reflect on and offer support to a range of other industries. The hospitality and tourism industry has been decimated by COVID. This is no-one's fault, and it is no reason to criticise settings that have been in place. These have been absolutely essential.

If we had not had a range of measures put in place such as quarantine, mask wearing and isolation, life would have been worse for these industries. The path we have gone down over time has been one that I have worked with and supported. I think where we are getting to now, given that we have such good compliance with adult vaccination—and, as I said, I would encourage people to continue that, particularly children getting their second doses to their course of vaccinations—we need to see that.

I think it is highly appropriate that we, as an incoming government, have responded to the many people who contacted us prior to the election to talk about the confusion that reigned across the states. Having myself travelled interstate, I found myself on a tram or in a cab or somewhere and some people are wearing masks and some are not and you have to think to yourself, 'Well, is that because there are some people who are concerned about contracting the virus so they are optionally wearing masks, or is it actually a rule?'

You find yourself constantly googling, but the signage is not always right. You are following your rules as per South Australia but you are in another state wondering whether that is actually the case. I applaud the Premier and the health minister for working together with other ministers around the cabinet and the Emergency Management Council that has been put into place to make sure that we are trying as best as we can to match other states.

Of course we know that WA has been a bit special and it has been a bit different in terms of some of the border regulations and such and good on them. They are doing what is right for their community, as we need to do what is right for our community.

I do see light at the end of the tunnel. I see light at the end of the tunnel which I hope should never see again so many people like nurses who were casually employed in hospitals, for example, who were subject to being stood down because of the cancellation of so much elective surgery. If we remember back it seems like so long ago, remember all the casual nurses who were not getting any work when we were in the middle of this pandemic starting up.

Life is so very different now and I hope that we do manage to progress with good health advice, standard types of rules across different states, some certainty for hospitality and some certainty for tourism. No more should we ever see, and we should never have seen, abuse hurled at retail workers who were simply trying to ask people to put their masks on and protect each other. I hope that our community is now at a point with this, with moving forward, so that we can again be united and respectful about choices in regard to all of this.

I think it has been really difficult, a really difficult two years, although, as I said, it feels like it has been a much longer period of time. It seems to have taken forever. I would also like to use this as an opportunity to say thank you to the Chief Public Health Officer, Nicola Spurrier, and her deputies.

I met both Nicola and Emily Kirkpatrick personally and I have to say these are medical specialists. They are not comms officers, they are not comms experts, but they have been able to come out and they are engaging. You hear their voices and you want to listen to the advice; it is easy to understand. They have been able to educate an entire community about epidemiology, a complex, complex issue. So thank you to them and all their staff and thank you to Grant Stevens, our Commissioner of Police. He has done an extraordinary job and I hope that this will make life easier for him.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:29): Without repeating what the member for Frome as our lead speaker has raised in her contribution to this debate—and congratulations, Penny, on that contribution and your lead for the opposition in this bill—who would have thought that when we first heard of this COVID-19 virus overseas in, I think, February 2020, when some of the reports were coming in from overseas about this virus, within a month or so the South Australian cabinet would have daily cabinet meetings about how we could manage this situation that was evolving here in South Australia?

Obviously, every day there was new information coming in. It was a brand-new virus. There was no vaccine. I think the biggest difference between now and two years ago is the fact that we now have a vaccine and there are also treatments becoming available, but it does not mean that we can go on pretending that it is gone, that the peak has finished, that there will not be any more variants. We know from what we have learned as laypeople that there are always new variants of viruses and the way to stop those variants is through vaccination, not just vaccination in wealthy countries but it is very important that we have vaccinations around the world.

We have seen a world effort for these vaccinations to move all the way around the world, although there was a stage where there was competition between countries for the limited vaccination that was available. When it first became available towards the end of 2020, we saw an order prepared for Australia, for example, a reneging of that order and that order sent to another customer in Europe. That was a well-documented instance of how desperate the whole world was about this unknown virus that has changed everybody's life forever. It is certainly not over at the moment—and that is what this bill is about, of course. This bill is recognising that the COVID-19 pandemic is not over; it is just in another phase and it is about managing that phase.

There is no doubt that there were plenty of opinions in the community about the medical basis of viruses and about the suitability of the vaccine for the COVID-19 virus. We see a lot of vaccine hesitation, even though we have very high vaccination levels here in Australia, but it is hard to understand why we are not seeing a lot more children being vaccinated at the moment. We have seen a slowdown in recent times. I think I read in the paper that there were only about 1,000 kids who used the school holidays to get vaccinated to start their vaccination programs.

We know that there are tens of thousands of kids who qualify for those vaccinations. My advice to parents is to take your kids for all their vaccinations when they are infants, when they are born. We do not have things such as polio in the world anymore. We know that kids do not die from chickenpox anymore. There are so many other childhood diseases that used to see the mortality level of Western countries much higher than it is now. Of course, there are some countries that do not have the luxury of the vaccination access that we have here in Australia.

It is hard to understand why there are members of the community who are calling this vaccine experimental simply because it comes from a new mRNA base, a new technology that has been introduced into vaccines. We know that the TGA here in Australia is extremely thorough, extremely reliable and has kept Australians safe for decades with the introduction of new drugs being circulated in the community.

I find it very frustrating when those who are opposed to the vaccination programs or raise concerns about the vaccination read material that they see online. Anyone who knows how the analytics work on Google searches knows that you can have a husband and wife, for example, sitting on identical computers with identical software and they could google the same search on vaccines, or whatever it is, for the first time and they will get the same search results to choose from. But from the minute they make their first choice as to what they read, the analytics kick in and the next time they google about that their search results will be tainted towards the choices they made when they made that selection from the many things that were on the internet.

If, for example, they decided to go down a rabbit hole and read about concerns about vaccines, that will be much more dominant in a second or third search. We have seen people yelling out at crowds, 'Do your research! Do your research!' but, of course, they are relying on the analytics of internet searching and they are getting reinforcement of what they were first interested in and relying on that more and more, so they become more convinced that there is a conspiracy and that there is a concern or issue with that process.

The other thing that I think was a very first for governments around the world—and certainly we experienced it here in South Australia—was that you based your decisions on the advice that you received from the experts. We have very highly skilled medical experts in South Australia, but it is the first time they have come across such a situation. No-one around today was alive when the Spanish flu killed 50 million people in 1920. If you have a look at the history of that, it was a process of at least two years, and there is some suggestion that some strains of the modern flu today have their origins in the Spanish flu. There is no-one around today who has experienced the type of health pandemic that the world is going through with COVID-19 at the moment, so it requires decisions to be made based on the information, but that information can change when that information is new.

Again, going back to the conspiracy theorists, when a direction changes based on new information, while it is fair enough for people to ask for justification, the conspiracy theorists do not believe that justification. They think that something has been made up simply for the sake of it, not the fact that it has been a change in why a direction has been implemented. We all know—or certainly those who have been paying attention know—that we are learning more about the virus every day. That is why Professor Nicola Spurrier was able to tell us, through the genomic testing that they have done recently, there are two new variants that have made their way into South Australia from overseas.

Consequently, we need to be nimble. We need to be able to protect South Australians. We are very much about freedoms, and I am very proud that the Marshall government did not overdo the mandate process in South Australia. We rely very heavily on South Australians working collaboratively to protect ourselves and others from the pandemic and from catching the virus, of course, and that worked. We have kept our numbers very, very low.

Our economy is moving extremely well. I heard the Premier recently say that South Australia is punching above its weight in the economy—completely opposite to what he was saying before the election, of course—and that did not happen in the last month; that has been happening for years under the Marshall government. We have been punching above our weight in South Australia and that is because of our response to the pandemic, both our health response and our economic response.

There are some questions that I know the member for Frome will be asking during the committee process. I have some questions as well, so I certainly look forward to moving into the committee process. Unlike the two previous government speakers, I will not be taking the full 20 minutes. I know that there are guests who have arrived to hear some maiden speeches, so I hope we can get through this relatively quickly.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): The member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:41): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I salute your re-election to this place and the high office you are holding momentarily. I rise to speak to the South Australian Public Health (COVID-19) Amendment Bill 2022. I will not hold the house long because I know we want to get to committee and I know that we have Address in Reply speeches to be given by new members to this house and others, but I want to talk about COVID management in relation to someone representing a border community.

To say it was difficult for border communities would be an understatement, and difficult for a range of reasons, because police only manage their side of the border. There are a lot of things I learnt during the pandemic. Perhaps I should have known some of these.

The border station at Pinnaroo—I used to represent right out to the border at Pinnaroo—is a kilometre inside South Australia. These are the little intricacies you learn and there were a range of other intricacies, especially with lockdowns. There were seven biosecurity staff who lived in Murrayville across the border. There were schoolteachers and schoolchildren who lived across the border who needed to get through to Pinnaroo Primary School. There were a range of other workers. There were people who lived in Murrayville who owned and operated businesses in Pinnaroo, so it created a whole range of different scenarios, such as whether they could even come to work if the place was locked down for a week or whatever the time line was.

My boys both play for Peake in the Mallee Football League, so I am well aware of what goes on. I am a sponsor of Peake. Everyone was doing their best to make sure that Murrayville could keep playing because the season before the Mallee Football League could not function because of COVID. There were some different views on what happened towards the end of the year. This is just an example of how COVID can affect a cross-border community. There were different effects right up and down our borders with the implications of shutdowns and whatever.

We were in the finals series, both netball and football, and Murrayville was involved. On the Saturday, the finals were in Lameroo and the next day they were in Pinnaroo. During the Saturday, Victoria went into lockdown, but their people were in South Australia. I contacted my local police superintendent to see how to deal with this and the message I got back, which was absolutely valid, was, 'Well, we can't because they are Victorians. We don't have jurisdiction over them,' but essentially they should have gone home.

The story was that allegedly they did not go home; they stayed and played in the finals the next day. I think the grand final was the next week, and they were obviously locked out, so I acknowledge Murrayville's frustration. I think some people there thought that the South Australian teams were trying to lock them out, but from the conversations I had with the local footy league as the local member they were doing all they could to make sure that the finals worked to full capability, so everyone with eligible teams could play.

It created a lot of difficulties. There were talks about whether it was the netball or the football club of Murrayville suing the league, and all sorts of things. I was talking to the SANFL at high levels, I was talking to Netball South Australia at high levels, and it just gives another insight into what happened, and this would have happened right up and down the border. This is just along the Mallee, and I know it would have happened down around the Mount Gambier and Naracoorte communities

for the member for Mount Gambier and the member for MacKillop, and obviously for the member for Chaffey up around the Riverland.

Aside from all those difficulties with sport, which is very important for regional communities, were the impacts on farmers. For many farmers the border is just a fence or there may not even be a fence. One farmer was that concerned about whether or not he would be able to harvest so he called me in. In the interests of what needs to happen in the house, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Adelaide makes remarks, I remind the house that this is the member's first speech, and the member's first speech of course means that she should be accorded the normal courtesies and respect afforded to new members on this important occasion.

I also acknowledge the presence in the gallery of former members of the house, the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith and the Hon. Pat Conlon, and Gay Thompson, all former members, and, of course, other distinguished friends of parliament and members here present to watch her first speech. The member for Adelaide has the call.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:48): I move:

That the following Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech be adopted:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's desire for our deliberations to serve the advancement of the welfare of South Australia and all its people.

I would like to acknowledge that the land we meet on today is the land of the Kaurna people and pay our respects to elders past, present and emerging. I am proud to be part of a Malinauskas Labor government that will deliver a state-based Voice, Treaty, Truth for Aboriginal people led by our Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Kyam Maher.

My connection with my community began more than 22 years ago, and it started with a bottle green door on Hutt Street. That door, hidden among the cafes, small businesses and historic buildings on Hutt Street's leafy green boulevard, is a door to my past and why I value the things that I do.

The door led to an apartment: it was support accommodation organised by a social worker from the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It was to become a home away from home for my family during the most difficult time of our lives. But for us, home was Naracoorte in the state's South-East, a town known for its farming and its fossils, where I was raised by my mum, Penny, and stepdad, Patrick. Patrick worked at the local men's clothing store, Heard Brothers in the town's main street. Everybody loved Patrick. He was a gentleman with a wicked sense of humour. He was incredibly smart, even though he did barrack for the Bombers. He was a self-taught French cook and dreamed of opening his own restaurant with mum, herself a fantastic baker.

My mum, Penny, worked at the Longridge Retirement Village, first as an aged-care worker and then as a lifestyle coordinator. Her role was to interview the aged-care residents, find out about their interests and their hobbies and ensure their lives were enriched by social experiences, connection and joy. It was the perfect role for someone of mum's empathy, genuine interest in people and her ability to make everyone feel like they matter. It was where I would spend hours after school and during the school holidays, playing the piano for residents or just sitting with them and listening

to their life stories. It was the greatest privilege, and it was while sitting with those residents that I began to consider a career in journalism.

Our family home was on Naracoorte Creek, where my brothers and I would kick the footy and climb the gum trees. We would come home to Van Morrison or Billy Bragg playing on the CD player. Patrick was always in the kitchen, standing with his blue and white striped apron on, underneath his saucepans and frying pans that hung above the kitchen bench. One of mum's cakes or puddings would be baking in the oven. We were a 'dessert every night' kind of family.

On Friday nights, my dad, Robin—yes, that's Robin Hood—would pick us up for pipe band practice at the local Catholic church. Together, the Hoods made up about a third of the Naracoorte Highland Pipe Band. My grandfather Lindsay, my dad and oldest brother Ben all played the bagpipes. My brother Toby played the snare drum and I played the tenor drum. From the age of seven I played in the band at ANZAC Day marches across the Limestone Coast, in Christmas pageants and country shows. Our Scottish heritage is important to us, and I wore our Wallace tartan with pride. I never did make the Edinburgh Tattoo, though, although I did come second in the state pipe band championships held at Adelaide High. I should probably mention that there was only me and one other drummer in the category.

After pipe band practice, my brothers and I would spend weekends on my father's farm at Bool Lagoon. Robin Hood, like his namesake, would give you the clothes off his back or his very last dollar. From him I learnt the importance of helping a neighbour, a mate or a stranger. One of my favourite memories was spending time in the Mary Seymour Conservation Park at Bool Lagoon with my brothers and my nanna Bobby. It was the best of nature playgrounds.

We would also spend hours climbing the beautiful old mulberry tree on our farm. We would eat all the berries and climb down covered head to toe in purple mulberry stains. We loved that tree, so much so that dad's farm was named after it, and that beautiful old tree still stands to this day on Mulberry Farm at Bool Lagoon. My grandparents, Lindsay and Bobby Hood and Lavington and Lois Fisher, were all farmers, and instilled in us the value of hard work, of rolling up your sleeves and just getting it done. While my grandparents' work ethic, love of community and giving back were identical, their politics were not. The Hoods were conservative Liberal farmers, while the Fishers were Labor voters.

Lavington Fisher, my pa, lived to almost 103, and something he told me always stuck with me. He said, 'Lucy, I don't just vote to make my own life better. I vote to make other people's lives better.' One of the greatest days of my childhood was when my baby brother Liam Patrick was born. He was the perfect baby, and to this day, even though he is now a schoolteacher and approaching 30, I still call him Bub. He is his own person, but I love how similar he is to his dad, Patrick.

My three brothers and I grew up with home-cooked food, music, sport, freedom to explore, community and fresh country air. Money was always tight, but we were wealthy in all the important ways. But life was to change one Monday night when our family doctor knocked on the door while we were sitting on the couch watching TV. It was not the type of news a doctor could deliver over the phone. He had come to tell us that Patrick had cancer.

That is when my connection with the Adelaide community first began and leads me back to that bottle green door on Hutt Street. We made the decision to seek support accommodation so we could be close to Patrick during his various rounds of treatment. My mum and I would take turns pushing Liam in his stroller down Hutt Street to the Royal Adelaide Hospital to spend the day with Patrick before walking back to Hutt Street in the evening.

I am thankful that we were able to move into this iconic main street. I never knew, as a country kid, that you could find little pockets of community, little villages, in the middle of the CBD, and it was a great comfort to mum and me. I believe the inclusivity of Hutt Street, a place where everyone is welcome, remains its strength today.

I was around 14 years old, but when you spend hours, days and weeks on ward D6, the cancer ward at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital, you grow up pretty quickly. You see a lot: how the human spirit can be pushed beyond anything you imagined was possible; how you can still laugh, even on the darkest of days; how tirelessly our doctors, nurses, allied health workers and hospital staff work.

As a public patient, Patrick shared a room with about four other patients. When the doctors told us there was nothing else they could do and it was time to take Patrick home to say our goodbyes, the only thing that separated the other patients and their families from our grief was a thin hospital curtain.

It is why I was so incredibly proud when Labor built a new Royal Adelaide Hospital, one where every patient has the dignity of their own room—to have treatment, to recover, to hope and in some cases, like my family, to grieve. Because the Labor Party is a party of dignity. We believe in the dignity of work, the dignity of a roof over your head, the dignity of a good education, the choice to die with dignity. And on 25 October 2000, as the sun set outside the Naracoorte hospital, we said goodbye to our incredible dad, an amazing husband and best friend. He was just 44.

After we lost Patrick, we clung to anything that reminded us of him. It is why I loved our family's letterbox—because Patrick had made it himself. It was in the shape of a little white house with a dark blue roof to match the colour of the roof on our family home. The summer after we lost Patrick, condolence cards were slowly being replaced by bills, and we were struggling. We went from a family who could afford to pay their bills to not being able to afford our schoolbooks, through no fault of our own, just like so many South Australians who have been hit by the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, rising cost of living and stagnating wage growth.

I helped mum where I could. I waitressed at Blacksmiths Cafe, I worked in retail every Saturday morning before netball and I became a lifeguard and swimming instructor, working at the Naracoorte Swimming Lake during the school holidays. One summer I even sold raffle tickets for the chook raffle at the sports bar at the Naracoorte Hotel Motel. There is no greater preparation for a life in politics than a country sports bar.

What I will never forget one summer is standing at the letterbox Patrick built and seeing the look of relief on my mum's face when we received the School Card. It meant we could afford to pay for my schoolbooks. I remember going to Naracoorte High School's library to collect my schoolbooks and seeing that there was one line for the School Card kids and one line for everyone else. It was while standing in that line that I understood the importance of opportunity, and I knew that I would never take my education for granted.

I had always been a studious kid, but I threw myself even further into school, sports and civics, from the Lions Youth of the Year competition to a week-long Rotary Adventure in Citizenship to our nation's capital. A few years later, while standing at that same letterbox Patrick built, I opened my year 12 results and found out I would be the first in my family to go to university. It was a bittersweet moment, as it meant leaving mum and Liam and my country town to move to Adelaide. My housemates Kate, Chantelle and I cried all the way from Naracoorte to Coonalpyn.

The thing you will learn about the Hoods is that we want things done yesterday. I did not want to wait to be a journalist, so two years into my double degree in journalism and international studies I began a cadetship at *The Advertiser* newspaper. I went on to become the education reporter, writing about the power of education through the stories of students and teachers. *The Advertiser* is where I also met my husband, Jarrad, a fellow cadet journalist.

Adventure would come calling and we moved to London in 2008, just as the global financial crisis hit. Journalists were being laid off all over the country, so a job in our profession was out of the question. Instead, we worked behind a bar, The Narrow Boat, in Angel Islington, a beautiful two-storey pub overlooking Regent's Canal. Before we knew it, I was managing the pub and Jarrad had become one of the chefs. It was a humbling experience. For Londoners, the pub is an extension of their living room, and standing behind that bar I was often the first person a Londoner would talk to after finding out they had been made redundant at work and no longer had a job. I offered a friendly face and a Foster's, and I listened.

My experience managing a pub during the global financial crisis had nothing on what our hospitality businesses have faced during the global COVID-19 pandemic. I am proud a Malinauskas Labor government will bring our city alive with events, festivals and live music that will fill our restaurants, bars and laneways once again. While we loved our time in London, there is no greater place on this earth than the most livable city in Australia, Adelaide. Jarrad and I came home to pursue our passions in journalism and politics and to settle down and start a family.

We bought our first home, an off-the-plan apartment in Sturt Street in the city, a stone's throw from Adelaide Central Market, and we welcomed our beautiful daughter, Audrey Scarlett, at the Women's and Children's in 2016, followed by our son, Ned Patrick, at the Calvary in North Adelaide. I have always wanted to live in a community where popping down to the street for a coffee, milk or a loaf of bread turns into a two-hour round trip. I found that in Prospect, in Walkerville, in Ovingham and in North Adelaide. I look forward to the next four years telling the stories of my wonderful community and the incredible people within it.

It has been 22 years since I first moved into the apartment with a bottle green door on Hutt Street, and 22 years later when I drive down Hutt Street I always look at that same bottle green door. It has become an anchor to me, a reminder of what is important and what I want to fight for, because it is these life moments that have determined the policies I fought for and Labor fought for at this election.

My family knows the importance of a strong healthcare system. That is why I stood on the side of the road, week in, week out, holding a hand-painted sign that said 'hospitals and ambos over a basketball stadium'. That is why I am so proud that a Malinauskas Labor government scrapped the stadium and will invest every single dollar in our health system instead.

As a country kid, community is in your DNA. That is why I fought for a new Adelaide Aquatic Centre, to keep our community active and connected. That is why we will bring back a community hub at the former Walkerville YMCA site and invest in our iconic main streets like Hutt Street and Melbourne Street. As a School Card kid, I believe every child deserves access to a good education. That is why I am proud to be part of a party that is investing in the early years, building five new trade schools and delivering the very best teachers.

My days proudly wearing the Wallace tartan in the Naracoorte Highland Pipe Band and climbing the mulberry tree on Mulberry Farm instilled in me the importance of heritage. That is why I am proud a Malinauskas Labor government fought against the previous government's rezoning of Pinky Flat, Elder Park and the river itself and will restore full protection to Helen Mayo Park and return the National Trust to Ayers House.

As a parent of two young children, their future and the future of my grandchildren will be dependent on the health of our planet. That is why I am proud a Malinauskas Labor government acknowledges the climate emergency and will take action on climate change by establishing a green hydrogen industry.

Never underestimate the power of what Labor governments can do. The policies, the infrastructure we build and the decisions we make have such a profound impact on everyday families like mine, because I am the proud product of Labor governments. I am a public school kid who, with the support of the School Card, became the first in her family to go to university. I am a mum of a baby girl born under the incredible care of staff at the public Women's and Children's Hospital. As a first-home owner, I would never have been able to buy my first home without the policies of the former Labor government.

I also would not be standing here today without the support of so many people. First, thank you to my beautiful community for putting their faith in me. I know that by voting for me many voted Labor for the first time in their lives, and I will work tirelessly to prove myself as their local member.

To my all-female Adelaide Hoods campaign team, led by the formidable the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC: I will never be able to find the words to express how I feel about my tireless campaign manager, mainly because they would be unparliamentary. She is our queen, our Wonder Woman, our Energizer Bunny. They did not have time to break the mould when they made Emily because she had already broken it herself in the rush to start the next campaign or idea. In all seriousness, in the entire two years of campaigning with Emily by my side we never had a cross word. She is my lifelong friend and the most remarkable, hardest-working woman I have ever met.

To my volunteer coordinator, Ella Shaw, along with Lydia Heise and May Harrington: the talent you possess at such a young age is mind-blowing. Emily and I are like proud mother hens clucking around you. We cannot wait to be knocking on doors and wobble boarding for you one day. You are three rising stars of our movement. Thank you also to Daisy Miller, who took a leap of faith

from restaurateur to political adviser—from the frying pan into the fire, some might say—but like a flambé she has shone and she is a bright spark within our movement.

Thank you to our fellow Thursday morning wobble boarders, Joel Wemmer and Bazz Sherwell, for their support and friendship. I want to thank all of the Adelaide Hoods incredible volunteers, in particular those who spent hours every weekend knocking on doors and letterboxing, in particular Jordan Mumford, Dante McDonald, Toby and Lachlan Priest, Leah Sham-Shure-Rin, Lucas Fragnito, Bridget Price-Brooks, the amazing Shaw family, especially Sandy Shaw, and my parliamentary colleagues, Lee Odenwalder, Nick Champion and Nat Cook.

To the many, many young Labor volunteers who week in, week out, spent their evenings and weekends letterboxing, making phone calls and folding letters: they did this without the expectation of acknowledgement or reward. They do it because they believe in a cause greater than themselves. Thank you so much. None of this would have been possible without you.

To our leader, Premier Peter Malinauskas, a person of intellect, work ethic and empathy for all South Australians, I think your greatest attribute is that you listen intently and genuinely care, from the baggage handler at the airport to the teacher in the classroom, the orderly in the hospital or the brickie on the worksite. You are a once-in-a-generation leader and I am so proud to be part of the government you lead. You are also the hardest-working man I know and on those long and sometimes lonely days knocking on doors these past few years, it was your voice ringing in my ears like *Game of Thrones*: one more door. Thank you for the trust you have placed in me.

I am proud to be a member of a strong union movement that fights for our frontline workers in retail stores across our state. I want to thank SDA Secretary, Josh Peak, for his unwavering support and putting his faith in me, along with Tom Carrick-Smith and Jennifer Allison and the rest of the SDA team for your friendship and support, and for the important work you do.

Thank you also to the TWU team led by Ian Smith and to my extended Labor family, Nimfa and Don Farrell, Sonia and Dan Romeo, John Bistrovic, Rik Morris, Stephen and Antonia Mullighan, Andrea Michaels, Chris Picton and Connie Blefari, Nick and Fiona Champion, Marielle Smith, Adam and Alice Todd, Amanda Rishworth, Anthi Koutsantonis, Reggie Martin and Shannon Sampson, Michael and Victoria Brown, Mark Butler and Daniela Ritorto, and our secretary Aemon Bourke and the Bourke girls, little Lucy, Maddie and Anabelle, Peter Geytenbeek, Pam Perre, James Agness and Minh Tham, Peter Chataway, along with the Adelaide sub-branch.

To my mentor Tom Koutsantonis: your unwavering belief in me is one of the reasons I stand here today. Tom has taught me the importance of loyalty and backing yourself in. Working with you, Tom, to help deliver three budgets has been the highlight of my career. I am proud of what we achieved in our years in Treasury, from undertaking significant tax reform, increasing the threshold of the School Card and investing in our public schools and, with Emily, establishing the community infrastructure program Fund My Neighbourhood.

To my other boss, who I still call boss to this day, Patrick Conlon and one of the smartest and funniest people you will ever meet: thank you for your and Tania's friendship, your wisdom and support, and for making the best salt and pepper squid in Australia. To the former members for Adelaide, Jane Lomax-Smith and Kate Ellis—who are both here in the gallery today—thank you so much for your guidance and support, and thank you to former premiers Mike Rann and Jay Weatherill. Also in the gallery are my adopted uncle and auntie, Roger and Rosey Currie, who are such dear friends, along with all my Meals on Wheels volunteers and beautiful clients. Thank you.

Thanks to my dearest friends Simonne and Ben Whitlock, Blair Boyer and Cath Kleinitz, Chris Burford and Lucy Wozniak, Emma Schwartz, Sylvia Rapo, Cressida O'Hanlon, Nikki Smart, Naomi and Damon Barrett, Nick Henderson, Joanna Vaughan, Phil, Sam and William Catley and the Saturday morning coffee crew at Cibo Prospect. To my other brother Matthew Clemow, to Satu Teppo, Ryan Liddell, Alicia Genet and my beautiful best friend, Jess, we are the family we choose for ourselves and I love you so much.

I am so grateful to my mum and father-in-law, Jacqui and Mike Pilkington, my sisters Rhiannon, Tegen and Gemma, along with my brother-in-law, Michael Case, and my adorable nephew, Rory. It takes a village and I am so grateful they are mine.

My best mate, my brother Ben Hood, and sister-in-law Elle are unfortunately in isolation back in Mount Gambier and could not be here today. Some might say Ben would do anything to avoid sitting on the Labor side of the house today. It is no secret that Ben and I come from different sides of politics, but we remain best friends. I often joke that he stole all the good genes and left my brother and I to fight it out for the rest. He is annoyingly good at everything he does except for which political party to run for. Ben has been our family's rock through the rockiest of times. We would be lost without him. To Ben, Elle and my nieces and nephew, Neave, Piper and Arlo, I love you and I wish you were here.

To my two other best mates, my brothers Toby and Liam (Bub) who are here in the gallery today: I am so proud of you both. Toby works in Western Australia in the mines and Liam is a maths teacher at Scotch College. You are such incredibly hard workers and brilliant at what you do. You are the most supportive brothers and I am so lucky to be your sister.

To my beautiful mum and stepdad, Alan, who join me in the gallery today: mum is my biggest cheerleader. Just ask the voters at the Melbourne Street booth who crossed paths with her on election day. We won that booth by two votes—thanks, mum. Alan, my stepdad, is the kindest man you will ever meet and I love that mum and Al have already become great friends with the catering staff at parliament. It is just the people they are.

To my husband, Jarrad, my best friend, my teammate, my everything: I love you and I could not have done this without you. In London, we would finish our working week on Sundays at the Narrow Boat and we would always sit together to have a Sunday night roast and a cider. Every Sunday, to this day, Jarrad still makes me my Sunday roast.

To my beautiful children, Audrey and Ned: you are the light of daddy's and my life. While I might not always be home before bedtime and a story, know that I am in this chamber fighting to create a brighter future for you. I love you more than life itself.

Last but not least, I would like to recognise that the 2022 election was just not a victory for the Labor Party and the values we hold dear but for women too. Some 128 years ago, South Australian women were the first to be given the right to vote and to run for parliament and for the first time in the House of Assembly, the government has a majority of female MPs.

I want to thank the women who came before us, who shattered the glass ceiling and walked over the shards of glass, clearing a path for those of us who follow in their footsteps: women who will not be lectured, not now, not ever; women who recognise a side eye is not a side step; women who smile because they want to, not for civility's sake; and women who understand that sometimes being the opposite of polite might just save their life. Thank you, Molly Byrne, Anne Levy, Julia, Jane, Kate and Dr Susan Close.

Thank you to the many, many women who came before them, the brave fearless women who first placed their names on the ballot paper but who never took a seat in this chamber. We stand on the shoulders of these women who paved the way for my fellow female Labor MPs here with me today, the seven, the class of '22: the member for King, the member for Newland, the member for Elder, the member for Davenport, the member for Waite and the member for Gibson. What an honour to stand with you and now sit beside you. We are sisters, daughters, mothers, friends and parliamentarians.

But please do not ask who is looking after our children because they are loved and they are proud, growing up in a world where it is completely normal that mums run for parliament. Do not ask if we are too young, because wisdom is not always created in the years lived but by the living of those years. Do not ask if our skin is tough enough, because it is. Instead, ask our opinion and let us speak. To the girls and young women in classrooms all over our state: remember a woman's place is in the house—Parliament House—and my door will always be open to you.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Hammond, I acknowledge, too, the presence in the house of Ms Kate Ellis, the former federal minister and federal member for Adelaide, and of course Emily Bourke, joining us from the other place. Earlier, I acknowledged friends of the parliament also in the gallery for the Address in Reply and for the member's first speech.

*Address in Reply***ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Debate resumed.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:18): It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak to the Address in Reply. I have been fortunate to have been elected five times to this place. Cognisant of new members and their initial speeches, I will make sure I do my best to work around those time frames.

It has been a real privilege and, I guess, the biggest privilege. Sadly, I have only had one of those terms in government—I served three terms in opposition, and some of my friends served four terms—but it was pleasing to have that opportunity, even if only for too short a time, to help run this state.

Notwithstanding what happened at the recent election, I am very proud of what the Marshall Liberal government achieved right across the state and right across regional areas, and certainly in my seat of Hammond. A massive uplift of \$17.9 billion was allocated for infrastructure, and there has been a massive spend on schools, roads and health right across the state. I am very proud of what we did in those four years, and there is still work ongoing right across the state from commitments that we made that will go on for quite some time—into the years, in fact—especially when you look at the South Road modernisation and the tunnelling that has to be done there.

I want to reflect on some of the money that was spent, some of the investments that were made across parts of my electorate. Obviously, things change as time goes on. We have redistributions all the time. In fact, at the moment, it is the first time I have been redistributed outside of my electorate. I live 50 kilometres from the Murray Bridge council boundary between Murray Bridge and Coorong council at my farm at Coomandook but, be that as it may, it is a bit hard to just uplift to 1,200 acres.

I would like to acknowledge some of the funding that we put into the electorate of Hammond in those four years, including \$20,000 for the Milang butter factory facade restoration. That went alongside a lot of federal money that came in as well. I must admit that people come to me and say, 'We need to get a grant, we need to do this,' and I say, 'Well, you need to talk to Karen down at Milang because she knows how to write a grant application because she knows how to get money.'

The Hon. K.A. Hildyard: She does; she's excellent.

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely. That is a great restoration happening down there. We invested in a couple of wineries, including Bremerton Wines (\$400,000) and Lake Breeze Wines at Langhorne Creek. Langhorne Creek is often the forgotten wine sector in the state, but as soon as people go there they remember it and always come back. It is a beautiful area. Both wineries have done some magnificent upgrades. I think about a million dollars odd was spent at Bremerton, and close to \$2 million was spent at Lake Breeze with their wine barrel room. They did a magnificent build there.

There was a \$3 million upgrade to the Eastern Fleurieu school at Langhorne Creek. This will be ongoing, with near-new transportable rooms put in as classrooms to update the rooms. When you visit the primary school children there, you could put a pencil on one corner of a desk and it would just roll down the desk because the stumps of the room have sunk into the ground. So they are having a massive change there with buildings replaced, which is going to be great.

The Callington Recreation Community Centre received \$197,500 for a build at the Callington Oval. It is a great community centre encompassing a clubroom-style atmosphere for the football and cricket that is played there, and obviously for the Callington Show. It has bar facilities and meeting

rooms, and a great kitchen. Alongside the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, former premier Steven Marshall put \$4.55 million into the \$16.8 million new visitor Monarto Safari Park Visitor Centre, built on Monarto Road. It is a fantastic design and the architects did a great job. I know that builders do not like building around circles, because everything is square usually, but they did a magnificent job of incorporating in a circular style the architecture of the new visitor centre and kept it on time and on budget.

The Old Murray Bridge upgrade has just begun in the last couple of weeks, with \$36 million to refit pylon work, drainage works, light works—a whole range of works—to make sure that bridge serves us for decades to come.

With the Thomas Foods infrastructure, which is very vital to the community, we put \$14 million into community infrastructure, alongside \$10 million of federal funding for road infrastructure, for power infrastructure, gas infrastructure and water infrastructure. I know that the 2.2 kilometres of road that is the public road that leads off the Murray Bridge-Mannum Road and the road train access that was built on that road cost \$14 million in itself. I am very proud of that: for those 2,000 jobs that are coming, alongside the 4½ thousand jobs behind that, and the many, many hundreds of millions of dollars that Darren Thomas and his team are investing in our area. It is so pleasing to see.

We have invested another \$7.5 million into facilities at the Gifford Hill Racecourse, Murray Bridge. There is going to be an equine swimming pool and a private vet clinic built there and we have done some upgrades of the tracks with the inside running track. Murray Bridge is becoming a real centre in the country. Anyone who visits the racecourse really gets a good look. New training stalls are going in. A South African trainer is coming in; he is going to have 80 stalls there after they have got through all the kerfuffle with planning laws, as you do. Everyone blames each other: the councils blame the state government, whichever colour they are at the time, and the government—well, as the local member I get frustrated with some of the planning decisions that come out of councils, but that would be an endless conversation. However, they are finally building these training stalls.

One I am really proud of is one I campaigned with for four years: the Murray Bridge Soldiers Memorial Hospital emergency department upgrade, which was \$7 million. While that was going on, there was \$3 million spent on the operating theatre upgrade. It is a great uplift in emergency consultation. I sympathise with the story that the member for Adelaide told about having basically a fabric screen between patients, and that was the emergency department in the old days. It was quite dangerous, in fact. There are now many separate rooms, making it a lot safer for staff and an excellent place for patients if they do need that vital health care.

We invested \$20 million in the Murray Bridge High School. I know members on the other side were in Murray Bridge the other day. Of the \$20 million, I think \$12 million was spent on new school facilities and the high school bringing year seven into high school. It has magnificent rooms and a magnificent approach to learning. We spent \$5 million upgrading the Murray Bridge North Primary School opposite my office. We put \$360,000 into the Murray Bridge Regional Rowing Centre, alongside about \$500,000 of federal money, and the local council put in about \$1.7 million. We put \$1 million into the Murray Bridge swimming pool upgrade.

We were also funding a greater Adelaide freight bypass planning study for \$5 million. Certainly, freight and where it goes is a much-discussed issue, but we do have to remember that the South Eastern Freeway is a freight route. At Truro, everything above a B-double literally has to go up the Sturt Road bypass for heavy vehicles. I know there are thousands of tons of freight that are going around the top road, as I call it, through Mannum, Sedan and the Halfway House corner to go up that road. I acknowledge the \$200 million that has been set aside by both federal and state governments to work on the Truro bypass. Anything above a B-double—B-triples, B-quads, AB-doubles and road trains—has to go that way because they will not let them come down the hill.

The Murray Bridge South-East links business case, which includes the duplication of Swanport Bridge, was \$5 million. I will take note of the current government to see if that planning still goes ahead, because that is vitally needed. We put \$2½ million into the Jervois Plant upgrade at Beston Foods to assist with their lactoferrin plant which is great value-adding for that works. Taillem Bend netball courts: \$99,350. I am going to have to push through this a bit out of respect for the next speaker. We also funded:

- the Taillem Bend new CFS station, \$1.061 million;
- the Karoonda Swimming Pool, \$1.6 million, and I could do a 30 minute speech just on how we got that, but I do not have time today;
- the Karoonda Districts Football Club upgrade, \$258,000, and it was great to see my boys have a win there the other day;
- the Lameroo Swimming Pool regeneration, \$850,000;
- Zerella Fresh and the Pye family at Parilla, \$2 million for a new packing facility to be included in a \$40 million to \$50 million plant;
- the Browns Well Highway and the Ngarkat Highway upgrade, which I am really proud of, bringing them up to 110 km/h between Loxton and Bordertown, \$42 million;
- the Kalimna Hostel, Strathalbyn, redevelopment, \$3 million, and I will be watching closely what the new government does with the allocated \$3 million;
- the Strathalbyn and District Aged Care Facility upgrade, which was 36 beds, 24 of them being memory beds, \$16 million. It is fantastic from all reports. I have not had the opportunity to go there;
- the Mannum Community College's new STEM building, CAD lab and senior school upgrade, \$3.9 million;
- the Eastern Fleurieu School Strathalbyn Campus upgrade, \$1.8 million;
- the Mid Murray Murraylands Road upgrade, \$1.5 million;
- the Coorong District Council high-risk intersection upgrades, \$900,000;
- the Murray Bridge Basketball Stadium, \$1.5 million;
- the Swanport Road recycled water pipeline project, \$540,000;
- the Knights Well Road upgrade project, \$300,000;
- construction of a tennis court at the Borrika Tennis Club, \$25,200;
- construction of a multiuse clubroom at Purnong Road, Caurnamont, for the South Australian Barefoot Waterski Club, \$17,900;
- assistance in building the new drag strip at Taillem Bend, \$2 million;
- the Bowhill township power upgrade and other facility work, \$347,000;
- the Karoonda Business Park, \$125,000;
- the Big 4 Caravan Park at The Bend, \$500,000;
- the Taillem Bend Netball Club, \$99,000;
- the Mannum Harbour tourist grant, \$105,000;
- Murraylands Multisport, \$200,000;
- Sporting Shooters at Tungkillo, \$171,000;
- the Imperial Football Club, \$49,750;
- the new Strathalbyn SES station, which is being built, \$2 million;
- the Strathalbyn Ambulance Station, which is currently being built, just off \$4 million;
- the Kanmantoo Copper Mine, \$2 million;
- the Pinnaroo Electric vehicle charging station (wow!), \$1.3 million;
- the Mallee Community Playground trial project, \$648,000; and

- the on-farm emergency water infrastructure rebate scheme, \$449,917.

The total in just that list—and a few were missed—is more than \$214 million. In the interests of time, and acknowledging that there is another speech about to be made, I just want to acknowledge everyone who worked on my campaign to get me here: my campaign team, my volunteers, my supporters and my family. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Hammond for assisting with time for a member's first speech. Before I call the member for Newland, I remind the house that this is the member's first speech, and that she should be accorded the normal courtesies and respect afforded to new members on this most important occasion. The member for Newland has the call.

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (12:33): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I congratulate you on your re-election to the role. It is a great privilege also to speak after the member for Adelaide, and I congratulate her on her resounding success.

It will be the greatest honour of my life to have been elected the member for Newland, and I would like to acknowledge former members for Newland, particularly Tom Kenyon and Richard Harvey, for their service to the people of the north-eastern suburbs and the Adelaide Hills. To Dr Richard Harvey the outgoing member for Newland: Richard was an incredibly warm and fair opponent in the campaign period, and he has been gracious and humble in defeat. Richard and I have a similar sense of humour and we have always got along.

As South Australians, we live in the best state in the best country on earth. Dr Harvey and I also live in the best electorate on earth, and I believe that the civility of our democratic process is a true testament to that fact. Dr Harvey's personal kindnesses, however, are a testament to no-one but himself, and I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

I would like to congratulate Her Excellency the Governor on her opening of parliament yesterday and thank her for her service to South Australia. Her Excellency outlined Labor's ambitious policy agenda, one that I am so proud to have campaigned for. I congratulate the Premier on his astounding success. We were elected by South Australians with a clear mandate to deliver that agenda, and that is in no small part thanks to the Premier and his steadfast leadership.

On a personal note, I would like to thank both the Premier and the Deputy Premier for not only their leadership but their warmth. I have felt supported by both Pete and Susan every day since my preselection, and I thank them for their unwavering endorsement of not only me but my agenda in the north-eastern suburbs. Pete and Susan are kind and compassionate and two of my biggest fans, and to me that is true leadership. I am so proud to be part of their team, and thank you for allowing me the privilege.

The seat of Newland was created in 1976, replacing the abolished district of Tea Tree Gully. I would also like to acknowledge the first and only member for Tea Tree Gully, who was also the first female Labor member in the South Australian parliament, Molly Byrne. It is an incredible privilege to stand on the shoulders of not only a giant of the Labor Party but a giant of suffrage in SA. Thank you, Molly, for your service to our state, our movement and the people of the Gully.

Newland is now an entirely metropolitan seat in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. We take in half of Modbury North—we had to give the other half to the member for Wright—as well as Modbury, Hope Valley, St Agnes, Ridgehaven, Yatala Vale, Banksia Park, Fairview Park and Tea Tree Gully, right to the edge of the Adelaide Hills near Houghton. The entirety of the seat of Newland is in the City of Tea Tree Gully council area and includes the Tea Tree Gully historical precinct.

In 1907, Modbury was described as a quiet little country village with a store, machinist's shop, chaff mill, Methodist church, schoolroom and hotel. In a book named *The History of Tea Tree Gully*, it was remarked that the reporter might have written an identical report at the end of another 50 years, as in 1957 there were still only 62 houses in Modbury. In the years that followed, our community was built. Today, there are over 7,000 houses in Modbury and it acts as our business precinct. The council's civic centre was built in 1967. In 1970, Myer Tea Tree Plaza opened, and in 1973 Modbury Hospital, our hospital, was proudly opened by Premier Don Dunstan.

All three of those locations are cornerstones of our community, and all of them play a role in my story as well. Tea Tree Gully is my home. I grew up in Highbury and today I live in St Agnes. In

year 8 and year 9, I attended Kildare College in Holden Hill. My best friend Ashleigh and I spent our Thursday nights on the 506 bus to Tea Tree Plaza and our weekends at her family home in Modbury North. I got my licence at Modbury Service SA—albeit it took me multiple attempts—and I have been to Modbury Hospital for a burst appendix, a concussion and not one but three anaphylactic reactions. My brothers learnt to swim at Paragon Swim Centre, which is still right next door.

Through uni, I worked at 42nd Street Cafe, Tea Tree Plaza, which became my second home. Throughout the campaign, I was reunited with so many of my old customers, and even on polling day had not one but three residents tell me that they recognised me not from the campaign but from serving them at the Plaza some eight years ago.

In 2018, I was elected as a ward councillor for Balmoral ward in the City of Tea Tree Gully. Balmoral ward includes the Newland suburbs of Modbury, Hope Valley and St Agnes, and I thank those residents who have continued to support me from my council campaign. I am lucky to have had the support of Tea Tree Gully council staff and councillors throughout the campaign as well, and thank CEO John Moyle, as well as my former colleagues and elected members. Particular thanks go to deputy mayor Lucas Jones, his wife, Chloe, and my surrogate niece, Charlotte. Lucas, you have taken me in from the day we first started working together at the Newland electorate office and made me part of your family. I thank you for your support.

My time on council gave me a particular understanding of, and appreciation for, the Tea Tree Gully CWMS network. The city is home to 4,700 septic tanks, with around 76 different systems of septic pipework. Out of the 4,700 tanks, roughly 4,000 are in Newland.

I was recently gifted a book from a resident, titled *From Settlement to City: a History of the District of Tea Tree Gully* by Ian Auhl. The book was gifted to me by John and Pat Wilson, local authors from Banksia Park, and I thank them for joining me online today. The book was published in 1976 and discusses the issues of deep drainage, common effluent and sewerage in Tea Tree Gully. Forty-six years post publication we are transitioning the Tea Tree Gully CWMS network to SA Water management.

It was Labor who fully committed—and first committed—to a transition to SA Water, and only Labor who ever committed to scrap the CWMS levy. On 1 July this year, thousands of residents in the seats of Newland, Wright and Morialta will no longer pay a \$745 service charge to the council for their sewerage services. Our government will continue to deliver the Sustainable Sewers project for our community.

It is by far my proudest commitment. It is one that affects over a third of electors in the seat. Residents have been on the CWMS network for upwards of 40 years. There are septic tanks in people's bedrooms, under their swimming pools and, at one beautiful house that I doorknocked in Banksia Park, at the bottom of a creek beneath a bamboo forest. I thank the Tea Tree Gully councillors for their work on this issue, as well as the CWMS Action Group, particularly Rose Morton and Adla Mattiske for their years of continued advocacy.

I come from a long line of strong, independent women. Each one of those women has been a single mum with an insecure job, with insecure housing, and has lived with the traumas of mental illness, addiction, domestic violence and sexual abuse. Despite all of that, each one of those women is loud, intelligent, vivacious, hardworking, charismatic and, best of all, inherently political. In our family we do not let our experiences define us. We were bred to be fighters, and no-one tells us what to do.

Today, I thank my village of strong women, in particular my mum, Rachel Koopmans; my nan, Sarah Courtney (who joins us today); my aunties Catherine Zengerer and Fiona Killick-McKinnon; my cousins Isabelle Zengerer (who also joins us); and Courtney Oswald. I also thank Matthew Zengerer and Stewart Henderson for often being the sole males in a pack of very strong, loud women. My family means the world to me.

My mum is no stranger to adversity. When I was three my mum and stepfather were married. My younger brother, Benjamin Isaac Koopmans, was born on 24 September 2000 at 24 weeks' gestation. He was born awake but later that day died in my mother's arms. His death changed the

course of our lives entirely, and I say his name today for the record to acknowledge in this place the identities of babies born still and the gap left in families like mine by their passing.

His death shaped my childhood and, unfortunately, my memories of being a four year old are somewhat tarnished by memories of alcoholism and domestic violence that followed. At one stage my mum, older brother and I moved into a shelter run by the Lutheran Church. I still remember getting ready at the shelter for my first transition day to reception, and my brother telling me that I could not tell the other kids where we were living.

Many of my beautiful cousins have also lived with the perils of addiction. My mum and my beautiful Aunty Bianca acted as kinship carers to my cousins on and off for many years. I worry every day about their opportunities post those placements in foster care, residential care and kinship care. I know I cannot change their circumstances and I cannot write their stories for them, but I can stand in this place, even when it is incredibly difficult, and use my experiences to guide my decision-making.

I am a member of the Australian Labor Party because I believe in equal opportunity no matter your circumstances, and I will fight for those equal opportunities for the rest of my life. My mum is the pillar of that belief system. She has taught me always that our experiences should not dictate our opportunities and that our traumas do not define our worth.

My mum has chased every single one of her goals. She is smart, she is dedicated and she would do anything for anyone. She is a small business owner, a theologian, an archaeologist, a collector of any bird that flies into her garden and the life of any dance floor. To mum: you are the strongest person I know. At times you have suffered greatly, but you light up every room with your charm, wit and enormous heart for others. You have made me strong and that has not always been easy, but I owe you so much and love you dearly.

To my dad, Michael Savvas: my dad is a truly gifted academic and wordsmith. He makes everything sound beautiful. My dad brings magic to everything he touches. He finds beauty in the otherwise banal and can make anything into an adventure. If my dad finds out something strange is happening, he has to be there for it, which makes him the best and most interesting person you will ever meet. My dad has been known to watch court proceedings for fun and to set out on the solo task of solving otherwise unsolved mysteries.

He is smart, he is dry, he is charismatic and he is my very best friend. Weekends with my dad and my sisters were always like a holiday. My dad is the dad who took us for outings to the Elizabeth Ageing Festival and the Kilburn Dog Show, making sure every weekend with him was filled with activities. He made incredible sacrifices for me and my sisters and continuously pushes us to be the best versions of ourselves. My dad is my biggest fan and our connection is so special.

It brings me great sadness to know we are not joined by my grandma today, Carlene Savvas, but I feel her presence in everything we do together, dad, and I hope that you do too. To my stepdad, David Koopmans: when I think of you, I think of Neil Young playing in the back shed at Windsor Gardens or teaching me the words to *Chuck E.'s in Love* by Rickie Lee Jones on the drive home down Grand Junction Road.

You were the one who took me to McDonalds every Friday for a small fries reward if I got 10 out of 10 on my spelling test, to which I always did, and the one who stayed up late into the night helping me study for my year 12 exams. You have always told me how proud you are of me. You have been affronted by a terrible affliction and that, at times, has been unspeakably hard but I want you to know that I think of you with nothing but love.

To my siblings Michael, Zachary, and Elijah Koopmans and Chelsea and Taylor Fernandez: nothing makes me prouder than being your big sister. My brothers and sisters are the most important people in my life and every day I continue to marvel at their intellect and their strength. I love you all dearly and I thank Chelsea for joining us today.

To my extended family on my dad's side, most notably my great-auntie Lesley Murphy, who joined me yesterday and Uncle Bob Murphy: they have taken me in as a surrogate granddaughter and never looked back. To my cousins Robyn and Chris Hambour and their kids Grace and Henry, and to Bec and Steve Murphy and their kids Sarah, Zac, Billy and my beautiful goddaughter Abbie: thank you for your love and your laughter.

There are a number of people I would like to thank from my second family, the South Australian branch of the ALP. I first got involved in Labor as a bright-eyed 17-year-old at the 2013 federal election. I officially joined the party in October 2015 and I have never looked back. To Reggie Martin, Aemon Bourke, John Bistrovic, Rik Morris and the entire team at CHQ, winning an election off a first-time government is no easy feat and your team ran an incredible, united, relatable campaign. I thank you all for your tireless efforts and unending support.

To all my parliamentary colleagues in both places: I thank you. From the other place I would like to make particular mention of Emily Bourke for her love and friendship over many years, Clare Scriven for all her support, as well as Tung Ngo for personally letterboxing half my electorate with addressed mail.

In this place, I congratulate each of the newly elected members on both sides, especially the members for Elder, Waite, Davenport, Gibson, Adelaide and King. I would also like to mention Michael Brown, Zoe Bettison and Lee Odenwalder for their assistance during the campaign. To Nick Champion: for 2½ years I sat in the front desk of your federal electorate office in Munno Para. Not too many years later, we stand here together as colleagues in state parliament. Nick, I will never be able to thank you enough for everything you did to ensure I could enter this place. You had so much faith in me when I had little to no faith in myself. You are a true friend and I thank you.

To Blair Boyer and his beautiful family: Blair has spent the last eight months campaigning across not one but three marginal seats—well, at least he referred to Wright as marginal, though the verdict is out on that one—and also doing everything he could to ensure the north-eastern suburbs were back in Labor hands. I am so proud to see you become a minister and so lucky to have had you on my team.

To the newly minted member for King, Rhiannon Pearce, not many people go to work every day with their very best friend, but I get to seven days a week. Rhiannon started as a colleague and became a sister. She is the most selfless person I know. She checks in every day and never complains about herself. Just this morning, she texted at about 7am randomly offering to go to the chemist and pick up some medicine for my nerves. She is fun, she is fearless and she is a bit of a dog. The people of King are lucky to have her represent them and I am lucky to have her in my life.

To my federal colleagues, particularly Senator Marielle Smith, Amanda Rishworth and Tony Zappia: I thank you for all your support and your advice over the campaign period. To Senator Don Farrell and Nimfa Farrell, I thank you both for your service to our state and our movement over many decades. Senator, I am incredibly cognisant of your role in the Labor Party and thank you for paving the way for so many others. Your personal support of me means the world. Nimfa, you have a heart of gold and I am so lucky to have you in my corner. Thank you for joining me today.

To the Newland campaign team, Peter Geytenbeek, Alex Pados, Suzanne Kellett, Eloise Atterton, Ulian Cox, Sean Hill, Victoria Brown, Mikaela Wangmann and many others, every day of the Newland campaign I was astounded by the incredible belief you all had in me and the lengths you were willing to go for our cause.

To Peter Geytenbeek: it was nothing short of a privilege to have been given you as my campaign manager. Over the last eight months you managed my campaign as well as my personal life, social calendar and occasional emotional outbursts. Managing a marginal seat campaign with an eight-month lead time is no easy feat, and the work you put in, particularly in those first few weeks of my preselection, was flawless. Every day I woke up in awe of the work you were doing for me and for our movement. In fact, for the majority of the campaign I felt quite guilty for not working anywhere near as hard as you were and feeling as if I did not take on the burdens of the campaign in the way that you did. I now know that that is because you were not letting me, and I thank you for that.

Running in a three-cornered race without an 18-month campaign like the other marginal seats, we often felt the odds were against us. Despite that, we were always on the same side and you always told me you knew we could do it. Whenever anyone asks if we worked well together, I answer by saying this: we did not have a single argument from my preselection to election day. That is not a testament to me, because there were certainly times when I was worth arguing with, but to you and indicative of your enduring patience and commitment to our goal. Everything fazed me in the campaign period, so your response was to let nothing outwardly faze you.

I will always remember a particularly stressful campaign meeting in Parliament House. I was really struggling with the enormity of the task ahead. You took me across to La Moka for a coffee and sat with me while I cried. You showed me immense kindness for a minute or two, and after I finished my coffee I remember you distinctly saying, 'You're okay now. Go knock on some doors.' That is Pete: all hard work and no fuss.

Pete, you are an asset to our group and we are all better for knowing you. I wish you so much goodness in your career and would like to offer a special congratulations to you and beautiful Millie for your wedding a few weeks ago. In addition to taking on a marginal seat campaign, you were planning a wedding, and I am so glad Millie still likes me even so. Thank you both for being here with me today.

To Alex Pados: you are one of a kind. You are the most loyal soldier I have ever had the pleasure of knowing, and I hope that every late night spent doing mailouts and exporting data in a very particular way was worth it, not only so that we could see Newland represented in this place but so that each and every doorknocking letter I sent out was addressed to the household's dog. I met many a constituent at the pre-poll and on election day who thanked me on behalf of their dog for those letters, so from me and those dogs, I thank you.

To Sean Hill: you are bright, strategic and have the biggest heart for working people of anyone I know. Sean is the kind of guy who will message you out of the blue just to tell you he thinks you are brilliant. He has an incredible eye for detail and ran my corfluting expeditions with military precision. Sean, I thank you for your friendship and your tireless work in the labour movement.

To Ben Rillo: anyone who knows Ben knows he is incredibly dedicated, unbelievably hardworking and a brilliant, strategic, political mind. More significant than that, however, is his painstaking loyalty. Ben puts himself second to the needs of the party always and seeks no recognition or reward. I truly believe that our branch of the ALP is a better place because we have a loyal soldier like Ben in our membership and I am incredibly lucky to have him in my corner as not only a colleague but one of my very best friends. Ben, I thank you.

To Jennifer Allison: you are the sort of friend who shows up at 8pm with a bag of groceries and stays listening to you complain until 3am on a Wednesday morning. Jen calls every day. It does not matter what is going on in her own life, she will always find the time to check in with me. At Christmas time, when I was struggling more than ever, she bought me a print entitled *Sunshine After the Rain*. Jen loves and loves and loves, and I think of Jen as my personal sunshine on hard days, so thank you.

To Tara Fatehi: particular thanks go to you and your family for acting as a corflute home base for many months. Tara, you are selfless, you are fierce, you are strong and you are brilliant. I hope one day to see you in a place like this one. To a number of Labor women who have backed me from day one: I cannot name you all but thank Meagan Spencer, the true definition of a woman who backs a woman, Amy Ware, Sarah Huy, Ella Shaw and many others. I cannot wait to see where the movement takes you all. To my staff, Sav Ly, Ulian Cox and Ella Corcoran: thank you for bearing with me in the transition period. I am looking forward to seeing what we can do and what we can achieve in Newland over the next few months.

A number of my personal friends provided both campaign support and emotional support throughout the campaign too. To Ashleigh Bradshaw: you are a sister to me and my biggest ally. I would not have got through the last eight months without you and I will be forever grateful. To Elizabeth Stankevicius, Sam Green, Isabel Bollen, Giulia Sciancalepore, Edwina Lane, Ciara Fanning-Walsh, Jack Dart, Lucy Lokan and Miranda Traeger: I thank you for not giving up on our friendship, even when I was absent. I cannot assure you all that all of a sudden I have more free time, but I can assure you that I am incredibly grateful to have you in my life and I will try my best.

Finally, to the union movement, to the Transport Workers Union and the Financial Services Union who supported me during my very short period in the corporate sector: I give my thanks to TWU secretary, Ian Smith, and FSU secretary, Jason Hall. Next, I want to thank my union and the union of over 200,000 retail and fast-food workers across Australia. Working in the union movement grounds a person in a certain kind of way. It not only taught me the value of secure well-paid work but instilled in me the inherent dignity of the opportunity to access stable working conditions.

Throughout my life, my relatives have fought their way through insecure jobs. Almost every person on my mum's side of the family has relied on Centrelink at one time or another and tried their hand at casual work or insecure contracts for short periods of time and little pay. Permanent secure work was a foreign concept to me, as was home ownership, my mum being the first and only person in her family before me to have purchased a home.

Not only did working at the SDA teach me about the dignity of secure work through our members but it gave me dignity in what I did as well. Before I worked at the SDA, I was working 30 hours a week in hospitality for \$10 an hour. I was studying full time and often struggling with my subjects, unable to keep up with uni and, having to pay my own way, often being unable to pay for petrol, car registration and my phone bill.

The SDA gave me a job and they gave me a chance. They gave me dignity in my profession and the opportunity to be more than I thought I could be. Becoming a union rep at the age of 20 defined the rest of my career. I had a secure well-paid job and because of that the ability to succeed. They supported me then and they continue to support me now and I would like to thank Josh Peak, Sonia Romeo, Tom Carrick-Smith and the entire SA/NT branch of the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees' Association for giving me the great privilege of joining the shoppies family. Without that family, I would not be standing in this place and I thank them for everything they have done for me and the retail, fast-food and warehousing workers across the state.

Today, I stand beneath a tapestry celebrating women's suffrage and can see the words, as mentioned by the member for Adelaide, 'A woman's place is in the house'. I am incredibly cognisant of the privilege to be the youngest woman ever elected to this place and the responsibility that comes with that privilege. I am someone who often feels she had to grow up too early. I would do anything to go back and tell a very scared four-year-old girl that in 21 short years she would be a member of parliament, but I cannot. Instead, I will make it my mission to tell every other young boy and girl that, no matter their circumstances or their postcode, they can.

So, to the many young girls and boys who have shown an interest in my campaign, this is for you: to Amelia of Tea Tree Gully, who made it her mission to meet not only the three Newland candidates but the Premier as well; to Shubh of St Agnes, who made a Labor corflute in his year 4 class; to Emily of St Agnes, who felt she could run for school president because I was elected; to Suzanna of St Agnes, who made me a picture that said, 'Olivia is the government'; to Patrick of Tea Tree Gully, who asked me to ask the Premier and Scott Morrison if we can have three-day weekends; and to Aaliyah of Tea Tree Gully, who wrote to me saying, 'I'm glad Labor won. I know with more hospital beds we will have a good state'.

To each and every one of you, and every other young person in this state who wants to represent their community, you can, no matter where you come from, and I promise to do everything in my power to ensure that you do.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Cowdrey.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I recognise the presence in the chamber of the Hon. Emily Bourke MLC, representatives of Tea Tree Gully Council, friends of the parliament, the Hon. Reggie Martin MLC and representatives of the union movement.

Sitting suspended from 13:05 to 14:00.

Bills

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Message from Governor

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

*Ministerial Statement***COVID-19 SCHOOLS**

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:23): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: This week, our kids headed back into the classroom for the start of term 2. As we know, COVID-19 caused disruption to some of our schools, preschools and children's centres in term 1. We thank our teachers and support workers for navigating the challenges of COVID-19 with patience, flexibility and professionalism.

We have prepared for term 2 and we are doing everything we can to minimise the disruption to our staff, students and their families. Our focus is keeping kids learning at school and preschool. Face masks will remain in public education for the first four weeks of the term and will then be reviewed. Masks will be:

- required for all adults, including visitors, except if it interferes with teaching or interacting with children;
- required for students in years 7 to 12; and
- strongly recommended for students in years 3 to 6.

Restrictions around some higher risk activities will be reviewed at the end of week 2. This includes large indoor assemblies and dorm-based overnight camps. All schools and preschools will continue to be supplied with surgical face masks and rapid antigen tests at no cost to staff or the school. We have a well-practised outbreak management plan for dealing with high numbers of cases of COVID-19 in specific classes and schools. The education department monitors cases and works closely with schools and preschools and SA Health to work out what action is needed. This might be classroom-level PCR testing or short circuit-breakers in classrooms to limit exposure.

Across the department, more than 95 per cent of our workforce is vaccinated against COVID-19. A vaccination policy for Department for Education staff and people who work with children in our schools and preschools came into effect on Monday. This policy allows unvaccinated workers back in the workplace with appropriate safety measures. The policy has been developed alongside SA Health following a consultation process.

We want to see as many young South Australians as possible vaccinated against COVID-19. On 27 May, we will be starting a vaccination program in 40 primary schools across the state. These will be in targeted areas with low vaccination rates. This program will make it easier for kids and parents to get their jab and will also support vaccination for the broader community. We are speeding up work to improve natural ventilation in hundreds of schools and preschools. We have also bought 1,000 more air purifiers and they are being delivered to schools where they will make the most difference.

All these measures have been developed with the guidance of Professor Spurrier and SA Health, as well as the Emergency Management Council. Our goal is to make our schools and preschools as COVID-safe as possible. It is about finding the right balance between limiting transmission and prioritising kids being in the classroom and learning face to face. I thank our dedicated education workforce for all they did in the face of the extraordinary challenges they were presented with last term, and I look forward to a successful and hopefully less disrupted term 2.

WEST BEACH TRUST BOARD APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (14:26): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The West Beach Trust is a statutory authority created under the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act 1987 to manage the reserve and its associated facilities.

The West Beach Trust Board comprises representatives of three local councils and independent members. It covers 135 hectares of beachfront land and comprises two accommodation properties, two public golf courses, diverse competition-level sporting facilities, meeting and event venues, a boat haven and a broad range of lessees.

Upon being sworn in as Minister for Planning, recent appointments to the West Beach Trust Board were brought to my attention. It appears the former Minister for Planning, the member for Heysen, made three new appointments to the West Beach Trust Board during the caretaker period. New members to the board were appointed for terms to commence on 1 March 2022 and are set to expire on 28 February 2025. On 9 March 2022, the West Beach Parks issued a news release titled 'West Beach Parks welcomes three new board members'. It is interesting to note that the news release claims the new members were appointed prior to caretaker; however, on the advice provided to the incoming government there does not appear to be any record of this.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet's 'Guide to caretaker conventions and pre-election practices 2021' states:

Governments should avoid making significant appointments during the caretaker period, and should also avoid making appointments in advance of the caretaker period that will commence during the caretaker period or after the election.

Further, the 'Guide to caretaker conventions and pre-election practices' advises:

If deferring the appointment is not practicable ... there are several options:

- make an acting appointment, where permissible
- make a short-term appointment, ending shortly after the end of the caretaker period, or
- if these options are not practicable, the responsible minister could consult with the relevant Opposition spokesperson regarding a full-term appointment.

The term provided—a period not expiring until 28 February 2025—appears to breach the practice limiting any appointments to government boards and committees of six months. To the best of the then opposition's knowledge, no consultation occurred with the former shadow spokesperson with respect to these appointments, as is again the convention for any appointments to government boards or committees in the lead-up to an election.

Upon further investigation of these appointments to the West Beach Trust Board, advice received from the Attorney-General's Department and the Cabinet Office suggests that neither the department and its executive, nor Cabinet Office, were consulted or notified of the appointments to the West Beach Trust Board.

Given the peculiar nature of these appointments, the government will seek Crown law advice and investigate:

- the legitimacy of the process undertaken to appoint these new members;
- the appropriateness of these appointments to the West Beach Trust, given the apparent failure to consult with the respective government departments and the then opposition;
- the merit of the appointments of the West Beach Trust Board; and
- the legality of the appointments to be made under caretaker provisions for a period that breaches the convention of appointments.

Upon receipt of the advice, if appropriate the government will table the advice received and action accordingly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for West Torrens, order!

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:30): I bring up the first report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

S.E. ANDREWS: I bring up the second report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time***OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG**

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:33): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier accept the findings of the Ombudsman's report tabled in this house yesterday?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:33): The Ombudsman released a report yesterday that was referred to him by the previous parliament, and it is interesting reading. I also remind the house and the members that the select committee that referred Ms Chapman to the Ombudsman for investigation—indeed, including the former Premier—had terms of reference much broader than just conflict of interest. They also included a select committee to investigate misleading parliament.

The Ombudsman has no power to investigate whether this house was misled; that is a matter for the parliament. In a parliament where the Labor Party had only 19 votes, the parliament found overwhelmingly that the former Deputy Premier and Attorney-General did indeed mislead the parliament, was found guilty of contempt of misleading the parliament and suspended for misleading the parliament. Those offences stand, and nothing that the Ombudsman reports—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry? I can't hear you.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a point of order. The member for Heysen has the call.

Mr TEAGUE: I will repeat the question: does the Premier accept the findings of the Ombudsman's report tabled in the house yesterday? It is quite straightforward, and standing order 127 prohibits digression. It is clear there is a range of subject matter associated with this, none of which is associated with the answer that the member for West Torrens is—

The SPEAKER: I hear the member for Heysen. There is some force in what he says. We are early in the minister's response, and I will be listening carefully.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are in a situation now where the Ombudsman has made a finding that is different from what the select committee found. I suppose, given the shadow attorney-general's concern, he will be resigning his position immediately and allowing the former Deputy Premier to return to her post as the shadow attorney-general. No doubt the shadow deputy leader will be resigning his post and reinstating the member for Bragg.

We didn't sack her: you did. I didn't have the power to sack the Deputy Premier, I didn't have the power to sack the Attorney-General, I didn't have the power to stand her down. That was done by the former one-term Premier, the member for Dunstan. If a former one-term Premier decides—

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. I imagine the member for Heysen returns to his earlier point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: It is standing order 98 now. Standing order 98 prohibits debate.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: It is a straightforward question to the Premier. The member for West Torrens, the Minister for Infrastructure, is entitled to answer it if that is the government's wish. He is not permitted, however, to breach standing order 98 or standing order 127.

The SPEAKER: I have the balance of both standing orders in mind, particularly 98, which you emphasised, member for Heysen, on this occasion. Standing order 98 brings me, and therefore the house, to turn to the substance of the question, and I ask the minister to do so.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. I read the report last night. It was very interesting reading, and I'm sure the Deputy Premier, who received a preliminary report some weeks ago, was very pleased with the outcome of the Ombudsman's report. We now have this situation where we have two opposing reports. The Ombudsman is independent, and I think it is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Dunstan!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —a reflection on the character of the then opposition that we were prepared to refer that matter to an independent officer to make a report. The question now becomes: now that report has been tabled, what does the opposition do about their actions when they have removed the member for Bragg from the positions she held?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Reinstate her.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I will hear the point of order. I understand it is 98.

Mr TARZIA: It is clearly debate: 98.

The SPEAKER: Well, 98 has been emphasised. Minister, I draw you again to the substance of the question. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I accept that the Ombudsman's report is independent. I accept that the Ombudsman's report has—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Colton, there have been a number of points of order and they have been ruled on. We now return to the minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We followed the advice, on the committee, of the counsel assisting, a learned QC in Dr Rachael Gray.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Dr Rachael Gray said that the committee was open to find these matters. I understand the Ombudsman has found an alternative view. There are now two independent officers who have given us two sets of advice. If the opposition feels aggrieved, I encourage them to—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —reinstate the member for Bragg as deputy leader and shadow attorney-general, and I look forward to her, until 31 May, sitting here on the front bench, being the reinstated deputy leader and reinstated shadow attorney-general. Of course, they won't, because they unceremoniously sacked her and secretly can't wait for her to leave.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Following the report of the Ombudsman, will the Premier withdraw the allegation he made in this house on 18 November last year that the then Deputy Premier and Attorney-General had a conflict of interest, which she did not declare, in relation to a port development on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:38): The Fifty-Fourth Parliament, which was controlled by the former government, the members sitting opposite, found that the former Attorney-General had a conflict of interest. That vote goes unchanged. If members are unhappy with that, they should consider how it was that they lost that vote and who it was who caused them to lose that vote.

Mr TARZIA: Point of order, sir: the minister is reflecting upon a vote of the house.

The SPEAKER: I am reminded that of course it's not a vote of this session, but I will keep the point well in mind. I recognise the member's position as a former Speaker and the intelligence that he brings to the points of order raised.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The house reflected on an independent report from a select committee. The select committee, which had a minority of Labor members on it—

An honourable member: A minority.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There was a minority of Labor members. There was a majority of non-Labor members on that committee.

Mr Cowdrey: Who chaired it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If the non-Labor members on the committee wanted to select a Labor chair, well, who can blame them? I would ask members opposite to reflect on how a majority Liberal government could see their Deputy Premier and Attorney-General subjected to a select committee and then have their Premier—their Premier—strip her of her deputy premiership, strip her of her portfolios and now complain afterwards about the injustice of it all. If it is unfair and unjust, reinstate the member for Bragg. It's very simple.

Instead, what's happening is my phone is ringing hot with people saying, 'Can you believe what Vickie is doing? Can you believe what she's up to?' Well, have the courage to get up in the house and do it in front of everyone, instead of ringing us up behind her back and instead of ringing journalists behind her back. If there has been wrong done to the Attorney-General, only those who did wrong to her can reinstate her and that is members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —starting with the member for Dunstan.

Mr COWDREY: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. I will hear the point of order. I must give precedence to the point of order.

Mr COWDREY: If the minister is not finished, the question was directly to whether the Premier withdrew his assertion. Any reflection on the Liberal Party's make-up or otherwise has nothing to do with that question.

The SPEAKER: I understand the member for Colton is raising with me standing order 98, rules applying to answers. This is ground I'm sure that in the course of this parliament we will traverse well. The standing order does emphasise that the substance of the question must be responded to in the substance of the answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The votes were taken in the previous parliament, in a parliament that the then opposition was in minority. That vote stands and the only people who can rectify what they perceive to be an injustice are not the government, because we are not going to

make the member for Bragg Deputy Premier. We have a very good one right now. We are not going to make her Attorney-General. We have an excellent one now. If members opposite are unhappy with the outcome of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament's vote, that the member for Bragg was in contempt of the parliament for the most grievous offence of misleading this place, let's go through what that misleading was.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Transparency doesn't want to hear about the misleading of parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: The question was a very straightforward question to the Premier. It asked the Premier: would he withdraw the allegation he made in this house on 18 November? The government is entitled to choose its spokesperson in response, but it must direct its response to the question.

The SPEAKER: Very well. The member for Heysen has provided submissions to me in relation to standing order 98. It's a standing order I have earlier emphasised to the minister. I will be listening carefully. Of course, it's a question that of itself may require some reflection on ancillary matters and some context might be introduced. I think we might have reached the point where some context has been introduced.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suppose the point I am trying to make to the house is that it's a bit rich for those who aren't prepared to reflect on their own actions to call on us to undo a vote of the previous parliament. As I said earlier, the parliament has no power to remove a commission. We passed a motion of no confidence in the then Deputy Premier. That was unprecedented in the history of this parliament, in my understanding. The then one-term Premier, the member for Dunstan, refused to act on that and then ultimately did and, when he did, he did so because he felt there were reasons why the Deputy Premier should stand down as Deputy Premier.

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I would ask the—

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Dunstan! I will hear the point of order from the member for Unley. The minister will be seated.

Mr PISONI: Thank you, sir. You have already advised the minister that there has been sufficient background and now we are waiting for the answer, sir. The question was: will the Premier, who was then the opposition leader, withdraw the comments he made about the then Deputy Premier?

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Seriously, mate, are we there yet?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson! The member for Mawson is called to order. Thank you, member for Unley. I have to give precedence to the point of order that's been raised. Minister, we must now come to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Before we do, sir, a point of order: the member for Dunstan accused me of misleading the parliament. I would ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Member for Dunstan.

Mr MARSHALL: The member for West Torrens has repeatedly asserted to the house that I sacked the member for Bragg from her role as the Deputy Premier. This is simply not correct and I ask the minister to withdraw that allegation. It's completely untrue.

The SPEAKER: Now we have duelling suggestions that matters be withdrawn. For the sake of convenience, because I am going to have to rule first in relation to the matter that has been raised by the Leader of Government Business, member for Dunstan, do you withdraw?

Mr MARSHALL: I have stated to the house the reasons why I am asking the minister to withdraw the statement: it's simply untrue.

The SPEAKER: I appreciate that, but I have to give precedence to the point of order that's been moved or, rather, raised with me first by the Leader of Government Business. I will come to your point of order second. The question first is whether you withdraw in relation to the matters raised by the Leader of Government Business.

Mr MARSHALL: I don't think I can based upon the reasons that I have outlined to you, sir. Unless you are asking me to, in which case I will, but for the reasons I have outlined the point that was made and asserted by the member for West Torrens is completely untrue, and he has repeated it now thrice in the parliament which you are presiding over.

The SPEAKER: Now we are engaging in debate and, of course, these are matters that to some extent invite debate. I think the easier thing to do here is to ask the Leader of Government Business whether he can foreshadow whether he will withdraw and, if he foreshadows that, then you might choose to withdraw.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: He does foreshadow that. Member for Dunstan, do you also withdraw?

Mr MARSHALL: As I said, if you are directing me to, then that's what I will do.

The SPEAKER: I understand that you are withdrawing, member for Dunstan. Very well. I understand you also raise a point of order with me as to whether the Leader of Government Business withdraws.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will withdraw, sir, for the good order of the house.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given that the former one-term Premier said 'thrice', it's the number of elections he has contested as leader and lost two of them. But anyway—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There's a point of order. The member for Dunstan.

Mr MARSHALL: As I was saying—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the member for Dunstan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: As I was saying, the minister made these allegations. He needs not only to withdraw but also to apologise to the house.

The SPEAKER: I am advised by the Clerk that it's up to me whether I insist on the apology. The matters have both been withdrawn. I think they are at rest unless they are raised again with me.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So the former parliament's decision stands. Members voted with their conscience. The former Deputy Premier was found to have misled the parliament, was in contempt of the parliament and suspended by the parliament. Nothing changes that, unfortunately for the member for Bragg or members opposite. The only way to remedy this for members opposite is to reinstate her. Of course, they won't; they can't wait for her to leave.

The SPEAKER: Before I turn to the member for Newland, I might reflect briefly on the matter rightly raised with me by the member for Hartley in relation to reflections on proceedings. I draw the member for Hartley's attention to standing order 118:

Debates of the same session not to be referred to

A Member may not refer to a debate on a question or Bill of the same session unless that question or Bill is presently being discussed.

There follow some guidance notes. As well, however, the member for Hartley being learned as he is may also wish to refer to standing order 119, which doesn't reference the same session in the house.

LAND TAX

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:48): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on the current status of the 2019 land tax reform and the delays in issuing bills?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:49): I am very grateful to the member for Newland for her question and her interest in this. I know that, like many of us in this place, her constituents have been badly affected by these reforms of the former Liberal government.

As we were canvassing yesterday, at the 2018 election the Liberal Party promised lower costs to South Australians, yet there they were 18 months later imposing what they initially claimed was a \$40 million tax increase on property owners here in South Australia. These changes were part of a budget which included a total \$500 million increase in state government taxes, fees and charges over a four-year period. It took an immediate public outcry from property owners and complaints about how many people would be impacted by these changes until the then government finally woke up to the fact that they needed to do some work about these changes.

Think of that: a tax reform goes to a cabinet without ministers knowing how much revenue would actually be raised and how many people would be impacted. Once the former Liberal government had that extra work done it soon became clear that the impost on South Australians would be over \$100 million a year from these changes. There began a series of changes to the bill.

Finally, in version 7 tabled in this place in November 2019, the government was forced to cut their top marginal tax rate for land tax for property owners with more than \$1 million worth of land. The net effect of these reforms was that property owners who owned more than \$1 million of land would be trousering a tax cut of more than \$50,000 a year, which was to be paid for by family businesses, other small businesses, self-funded retirees and families who had the temerity, according to the former Liberal government, to have an investment property. It is absolutely extraordinary.

Remarkably, hundreds of these land tax payers that benefited from the cut to the top marginal tax rate reside both overseas and interstate, meaning that South Australians are paying for a tax cut for people who live outside our own state. That is the record of the former Liberal government, but of course the difficulties didn't end there. It soon became clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley! The acting leader of the opposition is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. It soon became clear that not only did the government not initially know how much they would raise and from how many people it would be raised from, they didn't actually know how to raise it. They couldn't actually issue the bills to the community, so this egregious tax increase could be harvested from hardworking South Australians.

The government was forced at that time to come into this place, in May 2021, and change legislation to give themselves more time in order to give effect to these land tax changes. I can report to the house that from the last two financial years impacted by these land tax increases there are still

more than 5000 bills to be issued from the 2020-21 financial year and 2021-22 financial year. At one point, more than a quarter of the 55,000 land tax bills were late. That is why we make commitments to the people of South Australia not to make tax changes unless they are signalled well before an election.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:53): My question is to the Premier. Will his government accept that it is important for the house now to address the report of the Ombudsman to protect the economic reputation of our state and therefore provide the time tomorrow for the matter to be debated? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: Senior Counsel assisting the select committee, Dr Gray QC, stated in her closing statement to the committee that the existence of a conflict of interest had the potential to undermine investor confidence in South Australia, with associated negative consequences on employment. On 18 November 2021 in this place, the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, said:

...the Attorney-General did have a conflict of interest. The Attorney-General did not declare the conflict of interest. The Attorney then acted in accordance with the conflict and rejected a private sector development...The consequences of the Attorney's actions are grave...the committee itself finds, and I quote: 'The existence of a conflict or bias has the potential to undermine investor confidence in the State, with associated negative consequences on employment and development...The case is clear. The minister must resign.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:54): And the minister did resign. The minister did resign. She resigned as Deputy Premier. She resigned as planning minister. Those powers were taken up by Transparency Teague, who then used those powers to appoint people during the caretaker period.

The whole point of the investigation into the KIPT timber scandal of the last government was that decisions were being made where a select committee of this parliament found that there was a conflict of interest, therefore risking private investment in South Australia. There is nothing that this government has done that risked private investment into Kangaroo Island. There is nothing that this government has done that has risked private investment into South Australia.

What we are doing is making sure that the rule of law applies, and the rule of law has applied, and it was applied by the previous government—brutally—to the then Deputy Premier. It wasn't us. We had no power. There were only 19 of us, out of a parliament of 47, in this last parliament. We had no power to influence the outcomes of what occurred in the cabinet. We couldn't advise the Governor to remove the commission, something the former one-term Premier made very, very clear.

He made it clear in this house that the Governor takes advice from the Premier and, after making that statement, the former member for Bragg—slash former—Deputy Premier and Attorney-General ceased being Deputy Premier and a new Deputy Premier was elected. That wasn't our doing: that was members opposite's doing. They are the ones who did this, not us. We did our job. We were Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. We saw a scandal, we pursued it, we established a committee with the help of members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We hired independent counsel, and that could have gone either way, because Dr Gray—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The shadow treasurer says there was no scandal. Well, this house voted overwhelmingly that the former Deputy Premier had misled this place, and I will give you some of those details just to refresh your memory. The select committee found that the former Attorney-General misled the house and recommended that this house 'find the Attorney-General guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading Parliament'—

Mr Cowdrey: Are you going to read the dissenting statement?

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If the member for Colton wants to provide the person who wrote it for him, I am happy to read it out, because I know that he didn't write it. Recommendation 1:

- (a) find the Attorney-General guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading Parliament, following its factual findings that Statement 1 (relating to property and pecuniary interests) was false and was known to be false by the [then] Attorney-General at the time each of those statements were made and was intended to mislead [this] House [in the last parliament];
- (b) find the Attorney-General guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading the Parliament, following its factual findings that Statement 2 (relating to proposed transport routes) was false and was known to be false by the Attorney-General at the time each of those statements were made and was intended to mislead the House...

And, for her conduct, 'suspending the Attorney-General from the service of the House for a period of no more than 11 days'. Further:

- (c) find the Attorney-General guilty of contempt for deliberately misleading the Parliament, following its factual findings that Statement 4 (relating to a government report on alternative wharf sites) was false and was known to be false by the Attorney-General at the time each of those statements were made...

Members interjecting:

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

Mr TEAGUE: Time has expired.

The SPEAKER: Very well. The member for Heysen has emphasised that time has expired.

TAFE SA

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister update the house on TAFE SA courses being returned to metropolitan campuses?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:58): I thank the member for his question, and I of course thank him for his very long advocacy for public training in South Australia. This is a very important topic and one I am very pleased to have the opportunity to stand as the Minister for Education, Training and Skills and address. I think it goes without saying that what we have inherited on this side of the chamber since coming to government is a TAFE system that is on its knees. For the four years of the previous Liberal government we saw courses cut, we saw staff sacked and we saw campuses closed, including the campuses at Port Adelaide—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —Tea Tree Gully and Parafield. I think I can characterise the former government's attitude towards TAFE as basically ideological warfare.

Fundamentally, this was a government that did not believe in a public training provider. This was a government that spent four years doing everything in its power to cut TAFE off at the knees to make it uncompetitive and reduce it to a niche provider of training services. I tell you what,

Mr Speaker, the only thing that stopped them achieving it was the victory that this Malinauskas Labor government had on 19 March, because I can tell members that there were plans afoot for more cuts to follow.

However, I was very pleased on 21 April to join the Premier at the CBD TAFE, where we announced and delivered very early in the piece one of our election commitments to return three of the courses that were cut from metropolitan TAFEs in 2020. Incredibly, those courses included individual support in ageing, individual support in disability and early childhood education and care.

These are the courses which train the workforce which cares for some of this state's most vulnerable people. I know that I speak for everyone on this side of the chamber when I say that it was shocking and it was galling that those opposite chose to cut courses like that mid a national royal commission into aged care, which made, of course, some shocking findings about neglect and mid the terrible case of neglect we saw here of Annie Smith.

Amidst all that, they chose to cut the public training courses that would train the workers to look after people like Annie Smith. We have drawn a line in the sand very early in the piece, and we have delivered already on returning those three courses to metropolitan TAFE campuses. I am pleased to inform the house that from now prospective students are able to enrol for term 2. I encourage all members in this place to tell their constituents that those courses are going to be back at campuses such as the Salisbury campus, Regency Park and Noarlunga.

I alluded before to the fact that there were some other cuts and other attacks on TAFE that were afoot before the most recent state election. In fact, when I sat down with the head of TAFE and the head of the Department for Innovation and Skills to discuss how we could go about delivering on the election commitment we made here, I was informed that there was a secret list. There was another list sitting there with 14 more courses on it that were going to be cut.

If those opposite had been successful at the last election there were more courses that were going to go, but don't worry, Mr Speaker, don't worry. It wasn't as though they were in any kind of areas where we have a boom or a shortage: no, they were just in building and construction, education support and dental assisting. They were going to cut these courses, but I can tell members this: we have delivered already. In the first few weeks of this government, we have drawn a line in the sand. We believe in a public training provider here, and we have already started to work to rebuild TAFE and to repair the damage that you have caused in four short years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has the call.

BROMPTON GASWORKS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:03): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier declared a conflict of interest following the government's decision to review the nomination of MOV Corporation as the preferred proponent for redevelopment of the Brompton Gasworks site? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: The now Premier condemned the former Attorney-General falsely, as the Ombudsman's report has exposed.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Heysen, please be seated. I will hear the Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 97: questions not involving argument, sir. That involves argument.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps I will hear the question again and also the facts that may follow, and that will also give the opportunity to the member for Heysen to rephrase if he wishes.

Mr TEAGUE: I will concede that if what we have heard is a vote of no confidence in the Ombudsman, then let that be said very clearly, otherwise I maintain that it is a matter of fact that the Ombudsman's findings have exposed that the Premier's condemnation of the former Attorney-General was false.

The SPEAKER: I understand—

Mr TEAGUE: If it is not to be maintained—

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand there may be now duelling points of order. The Leader of Government Business on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm not sure what that was, sir. It wasn't a question. It seemed like an impromptu speech to the parliament. If the member has a question, ask it. I simply say that by saying 'falsely' in his question he was breaching standing order 97 and I ask you to rule. If you rule it's not argument, then we move on. I'm not sure what that was, other than frustration.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr TEAGUE: By leave, I will repeat the explanation. The Premier condemned the former Attorney-General falsely, as the Ombudsman's report has exposed, for not declaring a conflict of interest over a property because it was in close proximity to a timber plantation. I understand the Premier's residential property is less than 600 metres away from the Brompton Gasworks site.

The SPEAKER: May I say, member for Heysen, it is a difficult matter to rule on. I am myself still absorbing the report that has come to hand and also matters that were raised in the relevant committee. So it may be that I give general guidance to the house that, in relation to these matters, it would be best for us to avoid argument. In any event, in order for us to proceed with question time, we have the question. I note the point of order that has been raised by the Leader of Government Business. I actually think there is quite some force in that. In any event, I will turn to the government side for a response.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:05): I thank the member for Heysen for his question. The answer to the member for Heysen is, of course, that on this side of the house we seek to uphold the highest standards when it comes to disclosure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and transparency. We seek to uphold the highest standards—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Colton is on one warning.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to ensure that all appropriate probity measures are applied in the good judgements made particularly by those who occupy the privilege of sitting on the front bench and making decisions in relation to the Crown. Of course I won't be taking my guidance when it comes to the declaration of conflict of interest from those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I won't be taking guidance from the member for Bragg—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —or the former Deputy Premier in respect to how one should conduct themselves when making big decisions. I am very happy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Dunstan, member for Hammond! The member for Hammond is on one warning.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I am very happy to disclose to the member for Heysen that all judgements that we make are done in the best traditions of transparency and making appropriate declarations, which of course means that when decisions have been brought before the cabinet, if someone looks at the possibility of standing accused of a perception of a conflict of interest, that informs us making the appropriate judgements, including myself.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Badcoe has the call.

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Ms STINSON: I'm sorry, Mr Speaker, do I have the call?

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe, please be seated. There is a point of order and I must give precedence to that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens! Member for West Torrens, you will know that there is one warning.

Mr TEAGUE: It is a point of order pursuant to standing order 98. I fear that in the time it took for me to get to my feet the Premier might have concluded his answer. He has failed so far to answer what was a simple question about a particular set of circumstances.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, the time to raise that point of order has passed.

PASTORAL LANDS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:08): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier provide details on the South Australian government's approach to pastoral land management?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:08): It is a delight to answer this question about the pastoral lands, often also referred to as the rangelands in South Australia. Just to give some context to my answer, the rangelands cover some 40 per cent of South Australia. They are over 39 million hectares of South Australian land and are used for a variety of important purposes.

There is grazing that occurs, of course, on lots of pastoral leases. There is tourism, there is mining, there are Aboriginal lands and Aboriginal values and heritage values, and of course they provide a very important wildlife and ecosystem service. The rangelands matter and the rangelands are fragile. It is a dry part of our state and it is absolutely threatened by climate change.

Given that context, what did the previous government propose to do with the pastoral lands? They proposed to essentially abandon any idea that these should be managed from an environmental perspective. They proposed to bring in a piece of legislation that would remove the requirement to prevent degradation, that would remove the requirement to have a maximum stocking rate. You can have as many stock as you like on it: go for your life, as many hooves as you like.

They proposed to remove from the objects of the act any reference to managing appropriately, to avoiding degradation, to sustaining the resource. They were just going to remove that from the act. They also proposed to make conservation leases unlawful, so there are many of the leases—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

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

Mr PISONI: The Deputy Premier is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: I will continue to listen carefully to the Deputy Premier's answer.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: There was also the proposition that conservation leases would no longer be lawful. Some of the land—a bit over two million hectares of the pastoral lands—is under a lease for conservation purposes which you would think, if you understood how the environment works, is about strengthening the rest of the lands by keeping the ecosystems intact. They proposed to move from 42-year leases to 100-year leases, effectively—

Mr PISONI: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Are you raising a point of order, member for Unley?

Mr PISONI: I am calling a point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Perhaps you would raise that at the start. A point of order, I will hear it.

Mr PISONI: Thank you, sir. The Deputy Premier continues to debate the question rather than discuss the content of the question.

The SPEAKER: I have listened carefully so far and I'm afraid I can't see any debate in the answer.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: They also proposed to no longer do any on-ground assessments. The way the pastoral lands are managed is it's a 42-year lease, but every 14 years—ideally, every 14 years—you get a renewal of your lease based on having had people go out, have a look, check how the land is going. If it's being well managed, another 42 years, so rolling leases. They proposed to move that to 100 years and not have any on-ground assessments. In the process of doing that, they of course failed to speak to any significant Aboriginal groups, any significant traditional owner groups.

What is it that we will be doing? Well, first of all, none of the above. We are not going to let 40 per cent of the state go to rack and ruin. Incidentally, the pastoralists didn't ask for this. The pastoralists didn't support having the stocking rate lifted. The pastoralists weren't asking for this kind of intervention on their precious land.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: What we will be doing, and have done, is bring it back into the environment department so that it can be appropriately managed. We are going to add a million dollars so that they are able to maintain the on-ground assessment at appropriate pace. The pastoralists were rightly frustrated at the slowness of the pace in the last few years of the assessments, so we are adding a million dollars to pick up the pace—

Mr Patterson: What about the other 16 years before that? There was none done.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: —to make sure that that rolling assessment is able to be done. Importantly, we will ensure that carbon offsets can be part of managing the pastoral lands. The government tried to use that as an excuse for why they were making the changes. It was a spurious excuse. We will make sure that the range lands are protected and there are multiple sources of income, including carbon offsets.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Heysen, the member for Hartley yesterday addressed to me a question in relation to the use of papers in the house. That matter was resolved by the tabling of those papers by the minister. I refer to Blackmore's commentary on House of Assembly practice at page 322:

It is obviously right that the House should have access to the same sources of information as a Minister, if the latter makes statements, or bases arguments, or asks the House to accept conclusions, founded upon Public Papers which he quotes. But the rule applies to public documents only, not to private letters, or even memoranda.

Of course, the matter was resolved in that instance by the tabling of papers, and I acknowledge the former Speaker's erudition in relation to matters of this type. The member for Heysen.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:14): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to you. What was the bill to taxpayers for the fees and costs of Dr Rachael Gray QC, counsel assisting the select committee on the conduct of the then Deputy Premier regarding the KIPT and related matters and her three instructing solicitors? With your leave and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: I put this question to you Mr Speaker because, as I understand it, the engagement of Dr Gray QC of Victoria Square Chambers as Senior Counsel, and LK Law—as I understand it, as her instructing solicitors—required your authorisation.

The SPEAKER (15:14): Thank you, member for Heysen, for the question. I will take it in hand and return to the house with an answer in due course.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:15): Mr Speaker, my further question is to you. In view of the findings of the Ombudsman pursuant to the report that you tabled in this house yesterday, do you accept that your authorisation of payment of the fees and costs of Dr Gray and her instructing solicitors was a waste of taxpayer money, given that the Ombudsman has exposed many serious flaws in the advice of Dr Gray to the committee which was, as we have just heard at some length, accepted by at least the majority of committee members?

The SPEAKER (15:15): Member for Heysen, as you are well aware, any Speaker acts of course in accordance with instructions from the house. I will review the material that you have referenced, and I will return to the house with an answer in due course. I do emphasise to you—and of course you know this as a former Speaker—that a Speaker will authorise expenditure, if that Speaker is required to, in accordance with actions of the house, and must do all things reasonably necessary not to impede the house in the conduct of its duties.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE VIGIL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Can the minister explain the importance of tonight's Domestic and Family Violence Vigil 2022?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:16): I wholeheartedly thank the member for this question and also for her tireless advocacy around the prevention and eradication of domestic violence. Today is the day that sadly we again commemorate, honour and pay our respect as a community to those we have lost to domestic and family violence. Tonight at 5.30, South Australians will meet to remember the women killed in acts of domestic violence: women who should still be with us today, who should be with their families, who should have been safe in their homes in a community that is free from the scourge of domestic violence.

The annual vigil brings our community together and provides us with a chance, together, to acknowledge our grief and to acknowledge our relentless anger that far too often we seem to hear news of South Australian women dying at the hands of a partner or former partner, or to hear seemingly endless stories of harm that has been caused by the experience of domestic violence. Tonight, we remember women, we honour them, and together we will commit to doing whatever we possibly can to ensure that there is not one more.

The vigil is usually held in the city, often at Elder Park. However, tonight it will be held at Christies Beach, and together at Christies Beach at dusk we will remember the mothers, the sisters, the daughters, the aunts, the friends and the grandmothers that South Australians can no longer hold in their arms as a result of domestic violence—families who have been affected by tragedy that could and should have been prevented, families whose lives will never again be the same.

I hope that tonight this gathering will bring some comfort to families or at least some knowing, that together as a community we stand with them, together with them we remember their loved ones

and share in their desire to never let them be forgotten. Tonight is also about making sure that any woman lost to domestic violence is never just a statistic.

As we have grappled with the pandemic for the last two years, Embolden have convened these vigils virtually. However, as I said, tonight at Christies Beach we will meet together at the Place of Courage. The Place of Courage was envisaged and developed by an incredible woman, Helen Oxenham OAM, who convenes the organisation Spirit of Woman.

Many decades ago Helen Oxenham, together with her friends, worked to set up the very first women's shelter here in South Australia, at the back of her husband's shop on Beach Road. She has worked incredibly hard with community members, with Rotary, with the City of Onkaparinga, with all involved in domestic violence prevention here in South Australia, to erect what I understand is the very first domestic violence memorial in Australia.

That memorial is an incredibly important place for our community, and I was honoured to MC the opening of that memorial at the end of last year. That memorial enables us as a community to gather, to remember and to reflect on those we have lost. Importantly, it enables us to engender the conversations that we simply must continue to have until we do not hear of any more tragedies related to domestic violence.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Following the report of the Ombudsman, will the minister withdraw the allegations he made during a hearing of the select committee on 3 November last year about conflicts of interest? With the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TARZIA: While the former Attorney was giving evidence to the select committee, the minister said the following:

I put it you, Attorney-General, that if you are running a business directly opposite a forest that's being milled, and you're running a business, an Airbnb business opposite a forest that's being milled, it would impact your ability to rent out that property...

The statements to parliament where you said you had no interests in land near or adjacent to any operation by KIPT is pretty clearly wrong...

I think any fair-minded person looking at this would just think you didn't want anything near your land changed and therefore you did not approve this port.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:21): I stand by all of that, every single word of it, every sentence, every syllable of that. I stand by it because it's true. There was a forest that was going to be contracted to KIPT that was—

Ms Chapman: What?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There was a forest that the committee found was going to be contracted to KIPT—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry, the way I viewed it, my memory of it—and if I'm incorrect I will correct the record—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My memory of this is that the forest adjacent to your property, the timber would have been contracted to KIPT. KIPT executives gave evidence to the committee saying so. I hope the Ombudsman wasn't told something different, because that's what we were told by KIPT, so I stand by that. That property was being used as a business—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Dunstan!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And I also say—not thrice, just once.

An honourable member: One out of three ain't bad.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I also point out that the former Deputy Premier told this house that the proposed freight routes did not go past Mayor Pengilly's house. That wasn't true: they did. That's why the former Deputy Premier was found guilty of misleading the parliament and, in an unprecedented way, had a no-confidence motion passed against her and subsequently was no longer the Deputy Premier or planning minister. She resigned those positions—not sacked; she just came to that conclusion herself, apparently.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. There is a point of order. I will hear the member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: Point of order: with respect, this is now debate, so 98, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley draws standing order 98 to the attention of the house through me. I will listen very carefully.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I stand by those statements, absolutely I do. If those statements are incorrect, I invite members opposite to ask for a privileges committee to be established. I encourage you all to move as many motions as you like because, I have to say, when we were accusing the then Deputy Premier of misleading the parliament we didn't control the chamber. We had only 19 votes. We were the opposition, and because we were the opposition we couldn't govern we couldn't take away her commission. Members opposite saw to that.

I say to the Deputy Dufont aspirant, when he eventually builds those two votes to get a majority of nine, is it—what do you need, six?—to become deputy leader, you can fall on your sword and allow the member for Bragg return to her rightful place. In the meantime, the only member for Bragg that I will be ever apologising to is the former one who joins us in the gallery, a fine representative of the Liberal Party and of the eastern suburbs, the Hon. Graham Ingerson, who upheld the finest traditions of the Liberal Party.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:24): My question again is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Following the Ombudsman's report, will the minister withdraw the allegation of corruption he made against the former Attorney in this house on 25 August last year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:24): I don't think I ever made an accusation of corruption. I might have asked the question, but I don't think I ever said the member was corrupt. I would not do that, even with privilege.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who was giggling? You haven't got much to giggle about, mate, seriously.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know it's a bit soon, but if I were you I would keep the giggling to a minimum.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The giggling is a bit much given what you have done.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: With the damage you have left, I wouldn't giggle.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would just perhaps apologise to your colleagues and just keep quiet.

The SPEAKER: I'm not sure what one does with an interjection of that type, but the member for West Torrens shouldn't do anything with it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But, no, I do not think that the member for Bragg is corrupt, and I don't think I ever made that accusation. I might have posed the question: is it corrupt? But if the member for Hartley has evidence that I said that she was corrupt, yes, I will withdraw that because I don't think the member for Bragg is corrupt. I do think she had a conflict of interest and I do think she misled the parliament, but I don't think she was in this for the money.

LOT FOURTEEN

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Can the minister inform the house about London plane trees located on Frome Road at the Lot Fourteen precinct?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (15:26): I thank the member for Adelaide for the question and would like to congratulate her on a well-deserved victory and an excellent first speech advocating for her constituents in this house. I am very proud to serve with her.

During the recent election, the now member for Adelaide brought to the attention of many—I was going to say sitting on this side of the house, but I'm sort of over your side, aren't I—the issue of a pair of century-old London plane trees being slated for removal due to their location at the entrance of Frome Road at Lot Fourteen. The reason given for the removal was to manage the safe passage of trucks entering the Lot Fourteen precinct. A district-wide traffic management assessment had found that sight lines entering gate 7 were compromised due to the location of the plane trees.

The loss of trees should always be taken seriously when making these decisions, especially due to the age and location of these trees. Frome Road is one of our leafier streets in the CBD and, where possible, every effort needs to be made to preserve these mature trees.

The member for Adelaide didn't waste any time contacting me about saving these trees. She has publicly stated, 'You've got to be sitting at the table and talking to the people that have the answers,' and I fully agree with that. I asked Renewal SA to immediately investigate alternative options with a view to saving these trees.

I am happy to inform the house that these important century-old London plane trees will now be kept and that alternative arrangements have been made to access Lot Fourteen. This is just a case of working smarter and not taking the easy option, which I know was the hallmark of the previous government. This solution was found with an activation of a one-way traffic flow through the precinct, entering at gate 9 and exiting at gate 7. This option was possible due to the upcoming road modifications linked to the construction of the Frome Road Bikeway.

The new road design will allow for a wider turning circle into gate 9, mitigating the need for the trees to be removed. We haven't forgotten about pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle safety too. Design options will be undertaken on traffic sequencing and the right-hand and left-hand turns into Lot Fourteen to ensure that everybody is kept safe throughout this process.

As Lot Fourteen is developed over the coming years, over 400 trees and smaller vegetation will be planted, which will create a new pocket of greenery within the Adelaide CBD. It's important to recognise that that good work is occurring. I would like to thank the project team at Lot Fourteen and the Adelaide City Council, who came together to give us this workable solution, and I would also like to thank the member for Adelaide for her advocacy in this matter.

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:29): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Following the report of the Ombudsman, will the Deputy Premier withdraw the accusation she made against the former Attorney-General, Deputy Premier, in this place on 18 November that in stating neither she nor any family member owned property near or impacted by KIPT forests the former Attorney and Deputy Premier made an untrue statement? With your leave and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: In paragraph 195 of his report the Ombudsman advises that at the time the former Attorney and Deputy Premier was considering this project KIPT did not have a contract to harvest a plantation near the property she owned.

The SPEAKER: Before the Deputy Premier or any other minister answers, there's a matter that does occur to me, and that is that there has been, as I understand it, a suggestion that a false statement was made to the house. But, of course, at the time the statement was made certain materials were then before the house and before the member, and I think the effluxion of time is relevant to the answer the Deputy Premier may give. It's also relevant to any question that might be raised as to argument within a question. The Deputy Premier, or a minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:30): We can go around this as often as members opposite like. The Ombudsman is an independent statutory officer. Everyone in this chamber—everyone in this chamber, from what I understand—respects Mr Wayne Lines. He is someone we all hold in very high regard. I hold him in very high regard.

In fact, can I say that during the last four years, during the period that the former opposition was in opposition, we relied on independent statutory officers to do their jobs. As far as I was concerned, the opposition was their ally. We did everything we could to make sure that they were resourced, that they got what they needed. Often, the Ombudsman would come to the committee that I was on, the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, to seek support, to seek protection, because he didn't have enough funding to do the reports he wanted to do.

This idea, this line of questioning, where we are being asked to, firstly, adjudicate between statements on the basis of a select committee report and votes of a parliament and an Ombudsman's report when they are in conflict is to say that one is right and the other is wrong. That is not the case. The Ombudsman has done his own work. The Ombudsman has come up with his own set of findings. I also point out that he did not investigate whether the former Deputy Premier misled this house; that was a matter for us. That's been settled: tick, misled the parliament, penalty imposed.

The next question becomes about the conflict. The select committee made a view about that. There was a minority dissenting report in a parliament where we only had 19 of 47 members. The house agreed with the committee. That stands. Nothing is going to change that. So asking us to say, 'Who do you trust more, the parliament or the Ombudsman?' is ridiculous. Of course, we accept what the Ombudsman is saying. He has done his own investigation. He is independent.

But also criticising a select committee and someone who is a member of the independent bar—imagine if I got up here today and said that the former Attorney-General, the member for Heysen, is making criticism, under privilege, of a member of the independent bar. Of course he is not. That's what he is implying, that Rachael Gray got it wrong. The fact is you can have two legal officers look at the same thing and come up with different points of view, and it happens all the time; hence, we have appeals—all the time.

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas: It's a feature of the system.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's a feature of the system, and it's a good system. The parliament made its point of view. After the parliament spoke, the Liberal Party acted and acted decisively and brutally, and the member for Bragg was no longer Deputy Premier or had her other portfolio responsibilities, but somehow was still Attorney-General but on the backbench, and then parliament expelled her from the parliament as punishment for misleading the parliament. If the Liberal Party and the member for Heysen think the member for Bragg has been hard done by,

reinstate her, bring her back. If she has been hard done by, return her to the job she was taken out of, make her deputy leader, make her shadow attorney-general. Until then, it's just hypocrisy.

Grievance Debate

OMBUDSMAN INVESTIGATION, MEMBER FOR BRAGG

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:34): We have just heard from the member for West Torrens in relation to a difference of opinion in relation to two different processes that have been undertaken in the course of recent months. Speaking for myself, I readily and immediately accept the Ombudsman's findings that are the subject of the 2 May report.

In saying that, I turn to address the remarks that I made in this place on 18 November last year, and that is not so as to rehearse matters with a view to saying I told you so, but simply to highlight how glaringly obvious it was that we were heading on a path towards the outcome that we have seen, the subject of the Ombudsman's report tabled in this place yesterday.

The Ombudsman has criticised the ham-fisted way in which the matter was referred to him. It is not otherwise his task to critique the parliament's process. That is my task and it is our task in this place to reflect upon two different processes that in all of the circumstances have traversed similar subject matter. The short point is: shame on those. Shame on those who orchestrated this process. Shame on those who led what was a partisan attack under cover of a committee process to bring down a member of this house, the then Deputy Premier of the state of South Australia. It is a matter of concern to all South Australians.

I said in this place on 18 November that at that time, and without the benefit of all that we have seen in the months since, the committee—it was readily apparent—did not inquire in any meaningful sense into the facts. The Ombudsman has now determined that that is precisely what occurred.

Secondly, with respect to the impugned statements, I expressed the fact that in light of the committee's process it was obvious that the committee did not undertake the sort of genuine inquiry that would have been necessary with regard to the impugned statements. The Ombudsman has said that that was glaringly obvious and has found precisely that.

Thirdly, with regard to the matter of conflict—and as I said on 18 November last year—far from 'blindly barrelling on' as Dr Gray characterised it in November, and rather pejoratively as I observed at the time, far from that, the Ombudsman has observed and has traversed in great detail the proper occasion that the Deputy Premier and Attorney-General took to turn her mind to matters of conflict, to address them and to deal with the decision properly and according to all of her duties.

What has emerged is what was predicted. Firstly, as the result of evident prejudice, a committee of this place has arrived at results that are wholly contradicted by a proper and independent process, the Ombudsman has just now determined. Secondly, the extension of the taint to a committee process of this parliament, insofar as it has allowed a prejudged outcome to be determined by a committee of this place, is a damning indictment on those who would use the committee process to achieve those ends.

The parliament is a serious place. We are entrusted to represent our electors and to serve our community. Our processes must be capable of standing up to scrutiny and characterised by integrity. The Ombudsman's report is devastating to the credibility of those who prosecuted the then Deputy Premier, exposing as it does the defective committee process, the kangaroo court. Shame on those who supported it. The Premier must apologise now.

XENOPHON, MR N.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (15:39): One of the communities of my former electorate and current electorate I have had the pleasure to deal with for a number of years is Adelaide's Uyghur community. Earlier this week, I received an email from a member of the community that I found quite powerful and moving, so I sought to contact them and speak to them about it. They indicated to me that they felt that it was appropriate for me to read out their missive to the parliament. I have confirmed with them their identity and that that is their wish. Whilst I do not intend to identify them, I do intend to read this out to the parliament. It says:

Dear...Member for Florey

My name is—

and they give their name—

and I have been living in—

part of my electorate—

for the past six years. I am writing to share my concern regarding Nick Xenophon running for South Australian State.

I was born in occupied East Turkistan...my family and I sought refuge in Australia in early 2009, and have been the fortunate few that managed to escape East Turkistan in time from facing the systematic ethnic cleansing that is taking place in my beloved country by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). My parents and their forefathers grew up in East Turkistan, they personally experienced the generational abuse that the Uyghur people living in East Turkistan faced from the CCP, and overcame many hurdles to give my siblings and I a fair chance in life. My parents sacrificed their entire life and the safety of our extended family and friends to escape the oppression from the CCP. After many years to healing from our trauma, I am proud to say that we have settled wonderfully into the multicultural and democratic Australia.

Now imagine our surprise and horror when someone like Nick Xenophon, who has taken an active role in contributing to the horrendous abuse that my people in East Turkistan are continuously facing by the CCP is now knocking at the door of our home, our new safe space, asking for our support to run for senate. Not only that, but seeing Nick's face on those billboard around my neighbourhood have brought back many flashbacks and fear for the future of Australia.

The current situation for Uyghurs in Australia has been very stressful, especially since 2017. There have been many occasions where Uyghurs in our community have felt unsafe even as they reside in Australia. The Chinese government has come after our families that are still living in occupied East Turkistan simply because we live in Australia and are an active part of the community. I personally have not been able to speak to my uncles, aunties, cousins and sister due to the communication restrictions that the CCP have forced upon my family. I, myself, grew up receiving many threatening phone calls from the CCP as a child, pressuring my return for the safety of my family. I can never explain the stress and pressure this has caused me as an individual. The new Chinese consulate that recently opened in Joslin has also caused stress in our community, as many Uyghurs feel unsafe with such a large consulate in a nearby neighbourhood.

The recent news of Nick Xenophon running for South Australian senate is a huge concern for the Uyghur community in SA. Nick Xenophon worked for Huawei for a number of years. Huawei has created and tested artificial intelligence face scanning systems that can recognise Uyghurs and alert Chinese police. Huawei has aided the Chinese government in arresting many of our loved ones and is complicit in the genocide of Uyghurs.

I ask fellow residents of Florey to stand up against this bully, and protect Australia from future threat of someone like Nick Xenophon can bring into our local government. I ask that my safe space, my home in—

and they identify their suburb—

continues to bring me peace and healing from my past trauma from living in an oppressive state.

They then say they are looking forward to hearing from me, and I took the step to contact them and ask them whether they wished me to speak in parliament.

Mr Xenophon's involvement with Huawei is well known. His attempts to persuade the public and the parliament for the benefit of this Chinese company are also well known. What is not known is the exact nature of his agreement with them or how much money changed hands or indeed how, where or in which country this money was paid. Questions also remain as to why Mr Xenophon feels that his lobbying efforts on behalf of a company that is ultimately subject to the direction of the Chinese Communist Party should be exempted from the foreign influence legislation.

Mr Xenophon has claimed that he was merely seeking to address untruths told about Huawei, and Mr Xenophon seeks the support of South Australians at the forthcoming federal election. He needs to come clean with all of us as to whether his advocacy on behalf of Huawei was done out of a desire to simply help a company—a Chinese company that has been involved in oppression—or whether he was merely seeking to cash in on his celebrity.

HAMMOND ELECTORATE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:44): I rise today to talk about the fantastic electorate of Hammond and about the things that have happened as a result of the different iterations with respect to redistributions. I was privileged in my first term in this place to look after the wonderful precinct of

Strathalbyn between 2006 and 2010 before it went into the seat of Heysen. At the last redistribution, just before the most recent election this year, Strathalbyn came back into Hammond, but it has been well looked after by two members for Heysen.

I want to reflect on some of the things that happened and some of the things that we have all advocated for in the district in recent times. Just before the 2018 election, the Labor government of the day decided that it would close down the Kalimna aged-care/retirement living facility and kick people out of what they believed were their homes.

They were distributed over tens and tens of kilometres around the Hills and other areas. They were taken out of their homes on the pretext that it was unsafe to stay. Kalimna is on land fundraised by the community, and it was a building that the community built. To have a government run roughshod and just walk in and kick out these locals from their homes was an absolute disgrace.

What I will say is that during the last four years of the Marshall Liberal government—and I know the member for Heysen advocated for this alongside me—we saw the upgrade of the aged-care facility in Strathalbyn with 36 new beds, with 24 beds to the memory unit and 12 extra aged-care beds. Everyone I talk to say that it is fantastic. I have not had the opportunity to view it myself.

I was really pleased to see that, in the build of this facility, the new kitchen was built underneath and that proper planning was involved. I visited a couple of times as it was being built, and it was built appropriately instead of trying to refit a kitchen underneath a build, which would have been at horrendous cost. I really commend that process.

Kalimna is still a question mark. I know that in our last few months in government the future use of Kalimna was being investigated. I know that plenty of other options were thrown around, but whether it is aged care or retirement living it will be in that sector. The best way forward may be to knock the building down and build something fit for purpose, but let's see where that lands. I urge the new government to make sure that it commits fully to that process.

Mr Teague: The money is there.

Mr PEDERICK: The money is there. We put in \$3 million. Something else I want to reflect on quickly in the last couple of minutes involving the Strathalbyn district is that I have been involved with the Strathalbyn Community Consultative Committee concerning the Terramin mine, which has not operated for about nine or 10 years now. It still has dust testing equipment on site and other things. Obviously limited staff are around because it has not operated for a while. It has the grinding apparatus there. I have been on that committee since before I was elected. I stayed on it for longevity through the time I did not actually look after the main part of Strathalbyn, but I looked after a lot of country around it.

I raise this today because my understanding is that that there has obviously been a lot of discussion and a lot of investigation into the proposed Bird in Hand mine at Birdwood, the old goldmine site. There has been a lot of debate either way, with a lot of to-and-fro between the Department for Energy and Mining, Terramin and other stakeholders, and a lot of consultation across the community. I would urge the department to get whatever advice moving forward on the future of the Bird in Hand mine.

The way in which it impacts Strathalbyn is that, if it is mined, the ore will be transported to Strathalbyn to be milled. If the Minister for Mining and Energy does get advice on the future of the Bird in Hand mine, I urge him to bring that to the house as quickly as possible so that the communities of Strathalbyn and Woodside know what is going to happen moving forward. It has been about eight years in the making and people need some closure of this issue.

Time expired.

BADCOE ELECTORATE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:49): Yesterday, I had the privilege of speaking with the house about some of the very big plans that the Malinauskas government has—unashamedly ambitious, is this side of the house—but I also mentioned that there are a few wrongs to be righted, with this incoming government solving some of the issues that were unfortunately imposed upon South Australians and, in particular, my constituents of Badcoe.

I intend to use the brief time I have to outline some of those and some of the progress that has already been made by the Malinauskas Labor government and our very talented front bench to try to address some of those issues that are affecting the people of Badcoe. One of them is the Mike Turtur Bikeway overpass. This is a project that actually started under the former Labor government. The former Liberal government did not manage to get it completed. Basically, the public found out shortly before the election what the plans were for this overpass. To say that members of my local community were dismayed is certainly an understatement.

The very active members of the Forestville community—of which I am a member as a local resident of Forestville—banded together and held quite a large rally to try to draw to the then government's attention the necessity of simply speaking with them, of talking with our local community about plans for what is a sizeable piece of infrastructure that will affect our local community and, in particular, the Forestville Reserve, which people in our community hold so dearly.

It is a little strip of green space that used to be a basketball stadium but was fought for tooth and nail by our community to preserve it as green space after that stadium complex was relocated. The reason people in our community are so passionate about this is it is obviously a large piece of infrastructure that will be serving cyclists, pedestrians, pram users and wheelchair users. It is obviously something that the local community wants to have a say in.

Also, this project requires the removal of around 50 trees, some of which are quite beautiful, along the reserve and along the creek line. If you look up into the trees of an afternoon, you will see some absolutely gorgeous koalas in them. That is not something that the people of Forestville wanted decisions made about without their input.

I am pleased to be able to update the house and say that I had the pleasure of taking the new Minister for Infrastructure and Transport down to the site recently, along with members of the hardworking Public Service, to have a look at the site and see what alternatives could be come up with and also to discuss the consultation that will now happen. I am pleased to say that there is now a community reference group, which is to meet very soon. Nominations for that closed only last week, I think.

The passionate members of the Forestville community, and also our cycling community and members of the community in the City of Unley more broadly, have nominated to take up those positions. I look forward to hearing what that reference group has to say about the alternatives that are available and hearing further input from those groups, in particular the newly formed Friends of Forestville Reserve, which has been formed in direct response to this issue.

I am also pleased to say that this government will combine the Mike Turtur Bikeway Overpass Project and what was to be a separate project of upgrading the Goodwood Railway Station. It really made no sense that those two projects were to be separate. We are really talking about the same users and the same community, so this government has listened to our community and said that we need to put those two together. We need to consult about those two projects together, and we need to find some workable solutions traversing that entire precinct that are going to work for everyone.

I am grateful to the minister for prioritising coming down to my community and listening to local people, and I know he is meeting directly with the Friends of Forestville Reserve shortly. I look forward to continuing to loudly and proudly represent the views of my community on this and many other matters and righting some of those wrongs that were done under the previous government to ensure that our community gets a fair go under this Malinauskas Labor government.

VICTOR HARBOR MAINSTREET PRECINCT

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:54): I rise to talk about the Mainstreet upgrade that will be occurring in Victor Harbor over the next few months. This is stage 4 of an upgrade that has been going on over the last four or five years. This next stage is the development from Coral Street through to Albert Place. For those who know the area, that is from the Grosvenor down to the Crown. This is the main hub of the activity in the Mainstreet.

In this part of the street we have Sportspower, multiple coffee shops, Victa Cinema, a men's hair salon—not a place I frequent very often—Sinclair Florist, an op shop, a couple of banks, a sweet store, shoe stores, a music shop selling old records, a homeware store, a bakery, and Subway. There

are also a few of the old-timers in the street: the original fish and chip shop, the Avondale Deli and the Tonkins Sports Store. These businesses are certainly going to need the community's support over the next six months. As we get towards the end of May, the council will be closing the street to vehicle access while the works are being done.

These are very extensive works that involve ripping up the existing pavements, redoing stormwater structures underneath and getting this area beautified and fitting in with the other stages that have already been done. Over \$3.3 million of government money has been put into this stage 4 project by the Marshall Liberal government. This is a fantastic project to beautify that end of the street and will fit in with work that has been done elsewhere. The first stage, which was done quite a number of years ago, was the intersection of Coral Street and Ocean Street, and then the northern end of the street was done as stage 2. Stage 3 was Coral Street itself, which was the street that intersected Ocean Street.

In more recent years, we have also seen the development of Railway Terrace, which is the next street over towards the sea, back towards the railway station. The state government put about \$2½ million into that project as part of stimulus funding in relation to COVID. Council did a fantastic job of upgrading Railway Terrace into a very usable, friendly place. This is some great work they have been doing in this area. This certainly continues that work, and we look forward to seeing it completed.

I am just making people aware that from the end of May through to September there are going to be major disruptions in this area, particularly for vehicle traffic, and also at Albert Place, which is the area that runs past the Crown and Subway and Nino's pizzeria on the other side. They are great establishments. It will be putting in lovely alfresco dining areas outside places like the Crown and Nino's that will be there for people to benefit from going forward.

I congratulate the Victor Harbor council on the work they are doing and look forward to seeing the outcome. I wish the businesses best of luck. I know some businesses are also taking an opportunity to invest in their businesses at this point in time while other works are going on, and closing for a period while they upgrade their own facilities, so best of luck to them as well. I congratulate all those involved.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE TOURS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:58): One of the great things that has happened this week is we have been allowed to bring tour groups back onto the floor of Parliament House, which is terrific. I remember coming in here as an 11 year old when I was at St Michael's College down at Beverley, which was in the seat of Albert Park, and Kevin Hamilton brought us in here. I remember sitting in the Premier's chair and thinking, 'I want to be on these benches one day.' It is a great motivator to get kids in here and to teach them about leadership and things like that.

This week, for the first time in two years because of COVID, we had a group of school students here from my local area. They were the Kangaroo Island kids in year 10 who are doing their careers week. Every year, they come over to do careers week, and they have to find their own accommodation with families in Adelaide. It is their responsibility to make their way in to meet at the pigs in the mall by a certain designated time every day that they are here for that week. They go off to the Zoo together, they come in here and they learn about careers and about the parliamentary process.

It was a great pleasure for them, sir, to meet up with you when we were in the chamber on Monday. Of course, Callum was sitting in the Premier's seat. He actually got to sit in the Premier's seat before Peter Malinauskas got to sit in the Premier's seat, so he was pretty pumped. Later that afternoon, we had another group of residents in. We had the Adams family—not that 'Addams Family', but the Adams family from McLaren Vale. They got to sit in there as well with their two young daughters, so that was terrific.

The really interesting thing about the year 10s from Kangaroo Island was that the very last group I brought through who were able to be on the floor of the house was the same group of students when they were in year 8. They came over on the year 8 camp and I brought them through. It was in late March/early April 2020, just weeks after the bushfires had devastated Kangaroo Island. Many of

these students had completely missed out on a summer holiday because their houses had been burnt down or because they had been evacuated. They came here and for many it was the first time they had ever been away from their parents, and they were all a little bit emotional.

I had my little mate Dusty the Kangaroo Island kelpie with me in the parliament; he was in the Old Parliament House. Three of those kids who came in as year 8s two years ago had sisters or brothers of Dusty, and he just worked the room, as he does—a great little pup. He worked the room and was getting lots of cuddles and pats.

These kids turned up on Monday, two years later, and their first question was not, 'Hello, how are you? Great to see you, human being, local member of parliament,' it was, 'Where's Dusty?' I had to break the news that a former Speaker had actually banned Dusty and all pets from parliament. They said, 'Well, that's not fair. Why is that?' I said, 'Listen, you are on careers week. The first job that I'm going to give you is to learn how to lobby for things. At 12 o'clock, the Speaker is going to be in doing a rehearsal for the opening of parliament, so we will be in there.'

Callum was sitting in the Premier's seat, we had people filling up all the seats and of course the Speaker innocently walked into the chamber and we said hello. I said, 'I've got a group of students and they've got a few questions for you.' They went hard, too, on the Speaker. We think we have seen some combat in here over the years, but there is no denying those year 10s from Kangaroo Island Community Education. They were straight onto it. They wanted to know why Dusty, the Kangaroo Island kelpie—their hero and one of the greatest living things ever to come off Kangaroo Island—is not allowed in parliament. I thought you gave a very good answer, Mr Speaker. You said that you love dogs and they took that, and then we moved on and went to the Legislative Council and had a look around over there.

It is really important that we get people into this house because it is not our house: it is their house and it is every South Australian's house. This was the second time this group of students had been in here, what surprises me when I get people in here who are in their 40s, 50s, 60s, 70s and 80s is that it is their first time into the house. So I pass on my recommendation to all members of parliament, particularly the new ones, to invite as many people as you possibly can to come in here and visit their house, particularly now that they can get in here and feel the comfy green seats. Who knows? There may be an 11 year old out there who will be motivated to work their way up to be elected as the representative of their local area, to be a state member of parliament, because I can tell you it is a very good and rewarding thing to do.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Mawson. Of course, it was an honour to join you and students from Kangaroo Island and to hear their concerns in relation to Dusty.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

The SPEAKER: We will turn in a moment to the member for Elder for her first remarks to parliament. I remind the house that this is the member's first speech and that she should be accorded the normal courtesies and respect afforded to new members on this very important occasion.

I also recognise the presence in the gallery today of Gay Thompson, the former member for Reynell; Rosemary Clancy, the past Mayor of Brighton; and Tony Clancy, as well as other friends of parliament joining us. The member for Elder has the call.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (16:05): I was elected and stand here today on the traditional lands of the Kurna people, land that has been cared for by those custodians for tens of thousands of years, land that always was and always will be Aboriginal land. I recognise our Aboriginal people's past and ongoing connection to place and country and understand sovereignty was never ceded.

I pay my respects to Kurna elders past and present and to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, and I am proud to be part of a government that will implement a state-based version of the Uluru Statement from the Heart, including Voice, Treaty, Truth, because, as Mickey O'Brien so beautifully put it at yesterday's smoking ceremony, 'Our faces show where we have been; our hearts show where we are going.' We must put our knowledge and wisdom into positive actions.

This first speech is my chance to reflect on the circumstances that made me the person I am today and the events in my life that have brought me to this place to represent the people of Elder. I believe it all starts with cans of tinned tomatoes. If you ever looked in the pantry of my childhood home, you would not find chips or lollies or chocolate—frustratingly so—but you would find a row of tinned tomatoes. As a child, they seemed almost magical.

Tinned tomatoes had the ability to stretch any dish for our family of six into dinner for anyone who needed it. They were like magic puddings, never running out no matter how many we used, because our home was a place where everyone was welcomed, supported and nourished. By opening up our home to people of varying cultures, abilities and life circumstances my parents, Tony and Rosemary—who are here today—showed their children the importance of looking out for one another.

We regularly had residents from Minda Home come by, dropping in to say hello, and no matter how busy our household was each person was welcomed in, given a cuppa and asked to sit down for a chat at our kitchen table. That is how I came to meet Benny and Graham. They had grown up at nearby Minda, and I grew up with them regularly around for dinner and at every family event. When they transitioned into a house in the community to live independently, my parents provided support for their big move. Sadly, Benny has since passed away, but Graham is still very much a part of our family—so much so that my niece called her doll Baby Graham.

Christmas was another time when my parents' kindness really shone through. Conscious that it can be a lonely time for some, my parents did their best to share the day with those with nowhere else to go. Our dining table would have two trestle tables added to it on Christmas Day, extending to the very edge of the living room. It was cramped but it was lovely, and it is still like that today. My family never excluded anyone, my family welcomed everyone and my family instilled these lessons in me.

In applying those lessons, I have grown up being conscious of those around me and their needs and knowing that not all of us have the same opportunities. That includes the opportunity of education. I had the opportunity to go to a public school with a great reputation, Brighton Secondary. Now, when I tell people which local primary school my daughter goes to, they say, 'Ah, that's a good school.' This does not make me proud. It makes me sad and it makes me frustrated because every single school should be a good school. By identifying some schools as good schools, we are acknowledging that we think some are not—and in almost every case these schools are in areas of disadvantage. This is not fair and it is not right.

Through my most recent work in the domestic violence sector, I came to understand that, for some children, school is their safe place. It is only when these children walk through the school gate in the mornings that they can exhale. School is a place where they can escape what is happening at home. It is a place where they feel safe. Ensuring those children are given the extra care they need to be able to also learn at school is vital.

Teachers, including my passionate, dedicated brother Ryan, who joins us in the gallery today, work their guts out to support these children and we need to support our teachers the best way we can so they can continue to help those children. Every child, no matter their postcode or their parents' income, should be able to go to a good school, and together we will work to make that a reality because good public policy has the potential to change lives, change communities and change our future.

We live in challenging times. While wages are stagnating, the cost of living is growing, and it is growing quickly. This pressure means many in our community are doing it tough and risk falling even further behind. This is what happens when governments allow free markets to run, believing the wealth will trickle down for all.

We believe government has a role to make sure the flow is evenly spread. Money does not care about people, and we cannot expect it to, but people care about people and the Labor Party cares about people. We believe that government is there to do the things the market cannot. When people's lives are made precarious by the unpredictability of capitalism, we do not shrug and declare it to be the natural order of things.

We, Labor, look for a better outcome because every South Australian, no matter where they live or their economic circumstances or their gender, sexual orientation, race, age, cultural background or ability, for that matter, should be given the opportunity to reach their full potential. This is why I have worked in the not-for-profit sector. It is why I volunteer in our community. It is why I became a foster carer and it is why I ran for parliament.

I would like to specifically mention my fellow foster and kinship carers. The love, compassion, comfort and support you provide to children in your care are invaluable. You are invaluable. Whether a child is in your care for a couple of days or a couple of decades, you open your hearts and your homes to them knowing the potential challenges and heartbreak and I thank you.

I hope that over time, through good policies, good governance and good relationships with service providers, we can work to address the challenges that often lead to children being removed from their biological families in the first place. I understand there will always be some children who cannot safely live in their family home. I also see there are situations where early intervention can help. We need to address the root causes: domestic and family violence, insecure housing, drug and alcohol abuse and poor mental health. We need to ask ourselves how we can address these issues so we can support families to stay together. If we do not, we will see the cycle of abuse and generational trauma continue.

Before winning the seat of Elder, I worked with Women's Safety Services SA, or WSSA, an organisation filled with dedicated people who go above and beyond to protect women and children. They are people who turn up to work every day with one aim in mind: to break these cycles. Every day they listen to the experiences of others and do everything they can to provide safety, protection and comfort. We need organisations like WSSA, which delivers services to people experiencing domestic and family violence, so they have options, and we need policies that support them and their work.

Speaking today as the member for Elder, I am genuinely overwhelmed with gratitude. I am grateful to our community. Thank you for putting your trust in me. Being your member of parliament is an incredible privilege that I will not take for granted. A woman leaving F45 South Road the other morning told me, 'I just became a citizen a few months ago and you were my first vote,' so some of you made me your first vote as an Australian citizen. Some of you put a one next to my name as an 18, 19 or 20 year old voting for the first time.

Some of you are staunch Labor supporters who backed me. Some of you chose to go Labor this time but do not always. Some of you took a chance on me and our team, voting Labor for the first time in your life, and some of you did not vote for me at all. That is what makes our democracy strong: regardless of where you sit in this list, I am here for you. I stand here ready to work for you and for our community.

I have spent the best part of the last 18 months—sorry, family—campaigning in the streets and communities of Elder. The most rewarding part has been connecting with and listening to you, members of our community. Listening to what makes you excited and listening to what keeps you up at night, finding out what is important to people and advocating for them, is what I love doing and I feel so incredibly lucky that it is now my job.

In tens of thousands of conversations throughout the campaign so many issues were raised. I cannot speak to them all today, but I would like to talk about one that came up more often than most, and that is mental health. It is an issue that has touched all of us in one way or another. Whether I was speaking with Claudia in Mitchell Park, who waited five months until she could get a mental healthcare provider appointment; Pat in Colonel Light Gardens, who works as a psychologist; a dad in Pasadena needing to see his son in hospital and struggling through COVID; or a retired mental health nurse in Melrose Park, the message was clear: there are not enough mental health supports available.

Through working at Headspace, the National Youth Mental Health Foundation and for Mark Butler as an adviser when he was minister for mental health, I am aware of the scale of this problem and what services have had success in the past. We need services that support people to manage their illness and live a good life. So many people suffering from mental illness only get care when they are in crisis, and it is not good enough.

I am really proud of our government's commitments in mental health. My dear friend Chris Picton, our health minister, will be delighted to know he will regularly have me in his ear sharing the experiences of our community to ensure we do better, and I will have the voice in my head of my fierce feminist friend Gina, who we lost to suicide in February. I will have her voice regularly in my head pushing me to do more because we have to.

Being able to do this job as part of a Labor government is an incredible privilege. We offered policies for the future, a plan for a better state. We offered hope, and I am so glad South Australians chose hope over fear. One policy area that made people hopeful was our plans for the environment. Labor has a proud record of delivering in this crucial area. From the banning of large-scale clearance of native vegetation in the mid-seventies to becoming a world leader in renewable and energy in the 2000s, we now have a government that will fight to protect the River Murray, something very close to my heart, with a dad who grew up on a fruit block in the Riverland. I cannot think of a better advocate for our river than the Deputy Premier, Dr Susan Close.

We have a government that will ensure greater tree canopy and green open space. Just as the previous Labor government did, we will invest in cleaner, greener energy. We know it is critical for us to reduce our emissions. We need governments that are prepared to act and, at least on a state level, now we do.

Back at Brighton Secondary, I remember listening to the charismatic Mr Lawrence, with his white moustache and matching white lab coat, in year 10 science. He was teaching us about greenhouse gases, the ozone layer and what was happening in our atmosphere. I remember assuming that the adults in parliament were just doing something about that. While I wish it had been happening more than 20 years ago, when I was in the classroom, I am glad I am now one of the adults in the room in this parliament as part of a government ready to do our bit.

As I stand here today with my colleagues, it feels fitting that directly across from me on the tapestry that hangs in this chamber are the faces of pioneer suffragettes Mary Lee, Catherine Helen Spence and Elizabeth Webb Nicholls. Without their relentless fight for women's representation, and that of the women who came after them, I and so many of my colleagues would not be here. But we are, and what an incredible group to be serving with.

The scale of this achievement was represented in a very physical way a couple of weeks ago. My dad—who pretty much knows everything about everything and is yet the most humble, kind man you will ever meet—was so proud not just of me after the election but of the achievement of so many new women being elected, and he wanted to honour us and our efforts.

He started to wonder: would it be possible to walk across Adelaide while only ever being in a seat held by a Labor woman? I am sure many of you have asked yourself the same question. My sister and friend Kendra, who has the best sense of humour—and is over there—and who for more than a decade has worked to support the most vulnerable children in our state, decided to join him. A route was planned, water bottles filled, gummy bears packed and this idea became a reality.

Two weeks ago, on Saturday at 7am they left Old Reynella in Reynell with two of my best and closest supporters, Katrine Hildyard and Nat Cook. Along with Erin Thompson, they made their way through Hurtle Vale and Davenport. They then walked through Gibson with Sarah Andrews before meeting with Catherine Hutchesson and a team of supporters in Waite—a win that I am very proud to say my brother, Don, was also a big part of, and he is over there in the gallery too. He never gave up. My dad and sister then entered Elder. I got to walk with my dad and my sister, and it felt so good to be part of such a positive event that my family had started.

My mum joined us for a portion on the Elder section and was a support crew for the entire walk, making sure that dad and Kendra had everything they needed. Mum is a good support crew to have. During my campaign, whether doorknocking, doing phone calls or making sure my clothes were ironed (I still need help with that), she was there. Even after ending up in hospital during the campaign, she made it out to polling booths in her Nadia's Mum T-shirt. At one point, she was wearing her T-shirt and dad was wearing his Nadia's Dad T-shirt and they went doorknocking together. I just do not think anyone could have refused them.

After Elder, they met up with my electorate neighbour Jayne Stinson, who for years shamelessly promoted me before I got the confidence to do it myself. They then worked their way through Adelaide to Parliament House, where Lucy Hood greeted them with Powerades, then to Andrea Michaels' Enfield and Torrens, where they stopped for a chat with Dana Wortley. They then met Olivia Savvas in Newland at the St Agnes shops before finally (or so they thought) arriving in King, where Rhiannon Pearce had plans for a well-deserved sit down and dinner.

But then everyone realised that Ramsay adjoins King and is only a short 6½-ish kilometres away, so dad and Kendra set off again and arrived to meet us for dinner with Zoe Bettison at 7.30, more than 12 hours and well over 50ks after they had begun. This mammoth effort was such a beautiful tribute to the achievement of Labor women, and I am so proud of my family and the women I share this achievement with today. They could not make it to Susan Close in Port Adelaide without breaking the chain of only being in a seat held by a Labor woman—watch out the seats in between!

Let me say here, Deputy Premier, that I am grateful for your constant support, time, honesty and encouragement. Thank you also to the Premier for asking me to be part of your team. Your steady, reasonable, compassionate approach to your position makes you a very easy person to get behind. Being a candidate can be scary. You are taking a huge gamble, putting yourself out there hoping that you do not, God forbid, make a mistake. But it is so much easier when you have an incredible team behind you and alongside you.

There are so many people to thank, and I will not name everyone, sorry, but if you knocked on doors, put materials in letterboxes, made phone calls, stood on a busy road wobbling a corflute rain, hail or shine, put up corflutes, pulled down corflutes, handed out at a polling booth, sent me messages of support, made a donation or sent me a gift in the last week—I really appreciated those—to spur me on, thank you. I am grateful for each and every one of you and I genuinely cannot thank you enough for backing me. I am determined to do you proud.

I have been incredibly lucky to have some wonderful mentors and employers since finishing my studies at the University of South Australia. Anne McEwen, Mark Butler, Kevin Rudd, Penny Wong, Karen Grogan, Elisabeth Tuckey and Maria Hagias, each of you has shown confidence and trust in me that have given me the confidence and courage to be here today, especially Karen, who believed in me long before I did.

To the Energizer Bunny Kyam Maher: you brought the fun and the impressive A-making skills, but you also brought a level head and a clear focus, and you got me through those pre-poll days. This is either despite or because of the fact that energy drinks and sausage rolls basically run through your veins.

To Rhiannon Newman: from the moment I was preselected back in 2018 for the federal seat of Boothby, you have been unwavering in your support. You are there for the early morning text or late-night phone call ready to talk things through. Emily, thank you for smashing your role and then stepping in and stepping up wherever and whenever you were needed. Josh, thank you for encouraging me to stop and take a breath when I needed to and for leading my team now. Thank you also to the rest of our new team, Alicia and Carol. You have all jumped right in ready to serve our community.

I was also fortunate enough—it is okay, I have not forgotten you—to have a campaign manager who worked in partnership with me and made me feel like I had the strongest safety net. I could not have done this without you, Hamish. Thank you for never ever giving up and giving it everything. We really bloody did it.

Thank you to the union movement, a movement that our party was built on and a movement that has fought for safer, fairer working conditions for centuries. I thank the United Workers Union for the work they do every day for their members and for the incredible support they showed me and my campaign, particularly Demi and Gary. I also thank Abbie, Scott and the rest of the Australian Services Union team for the important work you do and your backing. Shout-outs also go to the CPSU, AWU, AMWU, CEPU, SDA, CFMEU and UFU for your support (apologies for so many acronyms), and thank you to the Elder sub-branch for your tireless efforts.

I thank my friends—my friend Tara is here, but she is also wrangling three small children under six, so she might have had to pop out—and friends like Tara, who have not seen me all that

much over the past 18 months. These friends have known that if they did want to see me it could only be at a cafe, restaurant, pub or playground in the electorate. I love you all very much and fair warning: we will continue to eat and drink and play with our children in Elder because, really, where else would we want to be?

Thank you to my parents and my siblings Don, Ryan and Kendra for shaping me into the person I am today, for encouraging me and for helping me to keep everything in perspective, and thank you for all your work on this campaign. Not everyone is fortunate enough to have such a strong support network made up of family. I know how lucky I am to have people I love very much always a quick phone call away.

To my love, Nat: you support me, comfort me and challenge me, and nine times out of 10 you know which of those I need at any given time. Neither of us knew what you were signing up for more than seven years ago, but you have as always remained calm and just rolled with it. You have enough patience for us both, which is lucky, since I have almost none, and I am yet to discover something you are not capable of doing. I love doing this with you by my side.

To our loving, thoughtful, clever, confident and very funny Ms T: thank you for happily coming along to meetings, often providing everyone in attendance with a sticker or two, and for lifting my spirits when I needed it by running to me for a cuddle when I got home ready to crash. You are pure joy and my heart bursts with love for you. I will always work to make our state better for you, your generation and those who come after.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I also recognise the presence in the chamber of the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC, Attorney-General for South Australia.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate resumed.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:32): Today, I reply to the opening of parliament address of Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, Governor of South Australia. I record my appreciation of her service to the people of South Australia and to this parliament.

Already our Governor has travelled extensively in South Australia and been warmly received by its people. We are indebted to her for the intellect and energy she brings to her position as Governor and which we all enjoy the benefit thereof.

During Her Excellency's address to parliament yesterday she welcomed 14 new members to the parliament, and I add my welcome. Her Excellency also congratulated those of us who were returned as members by their constituencies, and in particular I noted the following:

You each have your own loyalties, your own priorities, and your own areas of personal interest. But the necessarily adversarial nature of Parliament should not overshadow the far greater qualities that unite you all, most significantly your desire to make a meaningful difference in the lives of South Australians as evidenced by your embrace of Parliamentary service.

May you carry out these solemn responsibilities with wisdom, with respect, with courage, and above all with integrity.

As is well known to members who return, and will be learned by those who are new, parliament has means by which to ensure that we all undertake our responsibilities with integrity. As members of parliament, including ministers, the parliament can deal with any failings in this regard. There are a number of options open to parliament, including giving precedence to the establishment of a privileges committee.

Last year, by a motion passed on 12 October, the parliament determined that it would establish a select committee of inquiry essentially to consider and report to the parliament on my alleged conduct. The select committee, inter alia, referred matters to the state Ombudsman to investigate. The Ombudsman provided a report to the parliament, which was tabled yesterday on

3 May. Both reports are public and the contents speak for themselves, though I think it is fair to say the findings could not be more different.

I welcome the Ombudsman's report and thank him and his office for the comprehensive, thorough and independent investigation over the past six months. His findings were clear: no conflict of interest, no breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct and no maladministration. I am particularly pleased that the hardworking public servants have been cleared as public officers.

The public officers who presented to last year's select committee included the head of the Attorney-General's Department, the department of planning and local government and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and senior public servants from the Crown Solicitor's Office, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Department for Environment and Water and ministerial offices. Not to be left out, there were two state planning commissioners.

As is now a matter of record, there was an enormous number of documents called for and produced by government departments and ministerial offices both to the select committee and to the Ombudsman. I also advise that the Ombudsman at all material times allowed me to be legally represented. This included my solicitor's correspondence on my behalf and the presence of senior counsel to present submissions and accompany me in the providing of evidence on oath to him.

The Ombudsman himself has made statements about the reference to him by the select committee on this matter and has given quite a scolding in respect to the failings of the drafting manner of terms of reference to him. Essentially, he has outlined the shortcomings of the way in which the matter was referred to him and indicated that, if parliament or a select committee thereof has any concerns about the conduct of a member, then it would be prudent for it to consult with him on the drafting of such terms of reference to ensure that it is consistent with and within his jurisdiction and responsibility.

Further, it should not make findings on these matters first and then ask him to undertake an investigation subsequently, as it clearly has the potential of politicising his office. Understandably, he is concerned about the reputation of his office, including the public's confidence in his independence. I suggest it is also important that the advice given and the invitation extended by the Ombudsman be heeded to ensure this parliament's reputation is not tarnished.

No-one in this chamber will be surprised to hear that I consider the select committee of last year to have been nothing more than a witch-hunt and that it had all the features of a kangaroo court. However, I make the following comments that I trust will be of assistance in ensuring future select committees or inquiries actually enhance and protect the interests of parliament and its reputation and will be useful for the parliament to consider.

Firstly, if the parliament is to establish a select committee to investigate and report on such matters, then surely it should allow the select committee to determine a time frame to facilitate this. I note the select committee last year was established by motion of the parliament on 12 October 2021 and required to report by 11 November 2021. Quite frankly, it is farcical to expect that any inquiry body, particularly given the extent of witnesses and documents to be considered, have 37 days for completing this task, in particular giving procedural fairness to all concerned.

This is no excuse for them failing to give me procedural fairness, but then it is my view that this inquiry was and remains motivated by the political objectives of at least three of the members, including the Chair. Just one example to support this was when counsel assisting submitted, and the majority of the select committee found, the existence of a contract between KIPT and the independent forestry owners. This formed the basis of their finding that I had an actual conflict of interest.

The Ombudsman uncovered in his investigation that there was no contract at all. It did not exist. Now I suggest that even the most junior lawyer would understand the importance of having evidence of a contract before making such an assertion. There was none. I do not for one minute consider it is any excuse that this was as a result of having an unreasonable restriction on time. It is just plain incompetence at best and, at worst, mischievous.

Secondly, I refer to the select committee's use of legal support, including the appointment of Senior Counsel as counsel assisting. Although this has been unusual for a select committee in the

past—they usually have one research officer and no lawyers—I agree that there may be considerable value to the parliament in making provision for this taxpayer expense. Indeed, a legal team and counsel assisting have been and continue to be valuable in inquiries such as royal commissions and inquiries by the Coroner.

What is startling, I suggest, was the approach taken in this select committee in the denial of legal representation for any witnesses who elected to have the same. Historically, and in my experience in the parliament, select committees have not had their own legal teams appointed, so consideration of how this witness representation may operate has not really been addressed. I know the select committee in the other place, chaired by the Hon. Frank Pangallo MLC, denied legal representation to the Commissioner of Police in an inquiry last year.

The question of legal representation, I suggest, does need to be fully explored and I would urge the parliament to do so. Failing to do so will again put the parliament at risk of criticism. We all have an obligation to ensure that the reputation of the parliament is not diminished and, most importantly, that it retains the confidence of the people of South Australia for whom it exists to serve.

Dr Gray, counsel assisting the committee, stressed the importance of procedural fairness in the conduct of the inquiry. I agree with her in that regard. I suggest, however, that there were considerable failings in this regard by this committee and, notably, where omitted from Dr Gray's closing submissions. I refer in particular to my application to the committee for counsel—namely, Ms Frances Nelson QC—to appear to present an application early in the hearings, namely, after the first three witnesses. It was refused, that is, an application for her to appear.

However, the Chair of the committee advised that my counsel could put a written submission in support of that application. That written submission was made on 5 November 2021. Members might be puzzled as to the nature of this submission and the application it made. That is not surprising because it does not feature in the submission of Ms Gray or the final report of the select committee. The application directed to the attention of the Chair was in fact an application for recusal.

It outlined the basis upon which the member for West Torrens, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, should disqualify himself from the committee. It suggested that the member had, at the very least, a reasonable apprehension of bias, if not actual bias, having made public statements repeatedly after only three witnesses had appeared before the committee. I propose to refer to that submission. It is addressed to Ms Andrea Michaels MP, Chair, Select Committee regarding the Kangaroo Island port application:

Dear Ms Michaels

Re: Application for recusal

I am advised that the Select Committee inquiring into the Attorney-General has declined her request to make a submission in person to the Select Committee. On behalf of the Hon the Attorney-General, I make following submissions.

1. I regard the integrity of the Select Committee and the consequences that may flow from any report to the Parliament of such importance that I am providing written submissions.
2. In my respectful submission, the Hon Tom Koutsantonis MP should recuse himself from sitting further on the Select Committee because there is a reasonable apprehension of bias.
3. The Select Committee is charged with inquiring into the conduct of the Hon the Attorney-General in her role as Minister for Planning and Local Government.
4. The process involves hearing evidence, and, after hearing all the evidence, forming a view on all the evidence and providing a report to the Parliament. The process of inquiry by any tribunal must not be infected by the apprehension of bias because, if so infected, its ultimate report would be of little, if any, value.
5. The apprehension of bias principle is that a decider of fact must disqualify himself if a fair-minded lay observer may reasonably apprehend that such a person might not bring an impartial mind to the resolution of the question he is required to decide. That principle is so important to perceptions of independence and impartiality that 'there should be no appearance of departure from it, lest the integrity of the inquiry be undermined' (*Charisteads v Charisteads & Ors* [2021] [HCA 29] at [11] - [18]).

6. The formulation of the basic test for apprehended bias is the same for both curial and non-curial decision-making.
7. In her opening statement on 2 November 2021, Dr Gray said the role of a parliamentary committee is to make factual inquiries, and emphasised that a Select Committee does not have the power to make any findings as to whether there has been a breach. If a breach is alleged, it must be referred back to the relevant House.
8. Dr Gray went on to say that her role was to assist in ensuring the inquiry is conducted in accordance with the requirements of procedural fairness. I note that she also said the Committee should consider any application made by the Hon the Attorney-General or counsel on behalf of the Attorney-General concerning the requirements of procedural fairness. Again, I am disappointed that her application has been declined.
9. In my respectful submission, there is, at the very least, a reasonable apprehension of bias, if not actual bias, on the part of the Hon Tom Koutsantonis MP such that he must immediately recuse himself.
10. On 3 November 2021, when only 3 of the 10 witnesses had given evidence, he issued a public statement, which was repeated in both the printed and electronic media. Relevantly:
 - a. Deputy Premier Vickie Chapman has no choice but to resign, after giving utterly unsatisfactory answers to serious questions about perceived or real conflicts of interest and allegations of misleading Parliament...
 - b. Vickie Chapman failed to provide a satisfactory response as to why Minister Michelle Lensink had been designated as a potential acting minister in the event [of her recusing] herself.
 - c. After today's unsatisfactory answers, Vickie Chapman has no option but to resign her commission immediately.
 - d. If she won't resign, Steven Marshall must sack her.
 - e. Vickie Chapman had more than three hours today to provide satisfactory answers to serious questions about perceived or actual conflict of interests.
 - f. Her answers were unsatisfactory.
11. Further, in the course of receiving the Hon the Attorney-General's evidence on 3 November, he said:
 - a. I have to say, Attorney, in my 24 years in this place I have never seen a clearer example of a conflict of interest.
 - b. I'm sorry, Attorney, those two statements don't add up. Either you have lied to us or you have lied to the parliament. Both statements can't be accurate.
12. In response to his comment by the Hon the Attorney-General that he had made up his mind, he said:
 - a. I think everyone has, given we have given what we have just heard today.
 - b. Attorney, isn't this just blatant corruption?...
 - c. I think any fair-minded person looking at this would just think you didn't want anything near your land changed and therefore you did not approve this port...
 - d. We've got documents prepared here for you to sign for your own department saying you had a conflict. Attorney, at what point does this whole facade just collapse around you? And you have just decided before you became planning minister there was no way you were going to allow this proposal...to be approved...
 - e. You should not be the decision-maker, yet you ignored that advice and you did not declare it. You didn't tell anyone. Even the proponents told us in evidence today that they didn't know that your property was adjacent to land they contracted.

Again, 'contracted'—I have added that piece. The email continues:

Attorney, it's clear as day.

13. Further, on 3 November 2021, the Hon Member published on social media: 'Evidence from @VickieChapmanMP is that she can't recall whether she sought Crown Solicitor's advice as to whether she had a conflict. Just staggering.'
14. On 3 November 2021, the Hon Member said:

- a. 'That land adjacent means she has a real or perceived conflict and she should have recused herself' (Channel 7 Adelaide).
 - b. 'Completely unsatisfactory. The Attorney has no other option but to resign' (ABC Adelaide).
 - c. 'Isn't this just blatant corruption?' and 'The Attorney has no other option but to resign, and, if she won't resign, the Premier surely has to dismiss her' (Channel 9 Adelaide).
15. I am aware that legal authorities do not require that an allegation of actual bias be raised. Given what has fallen from the Hon Member, no fair-minded lay observer would conclude that he was able to decide the factual matrix in this matter impartially or without prejudice.
 16. If the ultimate report of the Select Committee is to have any credibility, the Hon Tom Koutsantonis MP must recuse himself forthwith.

FRANCES NELSON QC

5 November 2021

I remain concerned, and I suggest so should this parliament, that this matter appears not to have been dealt with by the committee. It may be that certain members, and indeed, even the member for West Torrens, had considered this submission and rejected it. Surely, if there had been some consideration, it would have been important to record how the matter was dealt with and by whom and, most importantly, report it to the parliament via the final report. Perhaps some members of the committee did not want this matter to be reported on, as it might blemish the ultimate findings.

For completeness, I remind members that two of the members of the committee provided a dissenting statement, and I thank them for that. But how can a parliament be confined to relying on advice of select committees if there is such a blatant exclusion of even consideration of such matters by the committee? Ignoring matters and/or keeping them a secret does nothing to assist the parliament and can only attract criticism and the reputational damage that I have outlined.

I have made public comment about the probative value of the inquiry and any attendant report, with the participation of the member for West Torrens, as being negligible. Most importantly, however, I urge the parliament to ensure that in future select committees the hearings, if they are public, are also transparent. It is a matter for the parliament, but it may be beneficial for the parliament to seek advice on these matters, including from the state Ombudsman, as he is invited, including as to how improvements can be made.

I am mindful that as members of parliament we also have responsibilities under our code of conduct, in addition to our constituents ultimately determining our presence in this chamber. These are matters that are important to consider and are critical for confidence in this parliament. I urge parliament to do so.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (16:50): I rise to make an impromptu and unprepared Address in Reply speech, as is my wont. It is always a pleasure to be here, but I have to say that over the last week it has been more of a pleasure than it has been over the last four years. That is as a result of the very hard work of our leader the Premier, the member for Croydon, and of course of the whole Labor team, a united and strong team which from day one was determined that we needed to get back into government, needed to save the state from those opposite. As it turned out, we did.

I mentioned the member for Croydon as a particular driving force for this, of course. From day one he has driven his team at a relentless pace and with relentless energy, and that team has stayed strong and united behind him. That is what got the result we saw at the election on 18 March.

I want to start by congratulating all the new members in this place. Some of them have spoken today, and very passionately. There were a lot of tears, and it was an emotionally draining day for a lot of us on this side of the house. It has been my pleasure to work with some of these new members in various ways, whether it has been on campaigns or even before the campaigns.

It was my absolute pleasure to spend a couple of days down in North Brighton, in the member for Gibson's electorate, an area I am not particularly familiar with. At that time it was unclear to me how the people I was speaking to intended to vote—they were not giving anything away—but it is fair to say that they were amongst the nicest people I have ever spoken to. I remember saying to the

member for Gibson afterwards, 'Everyone here is just so nice. I don't know whether it's you or the picture on the card I'm giving out, but everyone was so nice and pleasant.' I would like to thank the people of North Brighton for getting behind the member for Gibson and making the right decision in the end.

Of course, I also spent a fair bit of time with the members for Adelaide, Newland and King, particularly, whether it was doorknocking or making phone calls on their behalf, because I believed in them as candidates. I think one of the great successes of the Labor victory was in deliberately preselecting candidates in every seat that we thought could win. There were no candidates fielded who we did not believe in. That paid dividends and we won previously unheard of seats such as Waite. The now member for Waite worked relentlessly and built on her already existing networks in the community, and that also paid dividends.

I remember spending quite a bit of time out in Waite at the Upper Sturt CFS, a great collection of people working under the firm direction of Captain 'Moose'. That was an absolute pleasure, and it was also an absolute pleasure to have been able to make some commitments on behalf of and with the member for Waite in order to make their lives safer as they go about making our lives safer.

I want to congratulate all the new ministers. As I said, it was a strong and united team over the last four years that went into this election, and it remains a strong and united team that has been put in place to enact the policies we took to the last election. As members have previously stated, these policies were nuts and bolts policies about properly funding schools, properly funding TAFE, but there were also pretty far-reaching reforms in terms of early childhood education and, of course, the Hydrogen Jobs Plan. It was an absolute pleasure to be part of that team and it still is an absolute pleasure to be part of that team as we put those plans into action.

I want to congratulate the new shadow ministers. I will not say anything unparliamentary. I want to congratulate all the new shadow ministers, including the new leader, of course, the member for Black. Certainly, our experience as shadow ministers is that it is a pretty thankless job. There is relentless pressure to monitor and respond to what the government is doing, what the media are saying the government is doing and what the media are saying we are doing. It is a relentless and often thankless job, getting up early in the morning to read the papers, to listen to talkback radio and to receive text messages back and forth all over the place. It is a relentless job and I do wish them well.

I think democracy is well served by a well-functioning opposition. Certainly, during the last four years, our democracy was served by a well-functioning opposition, and I do hope that that is reflected over the next four years because it is important, and that is reflected in our support for the appointment of an independent Speaker in the Westminster model. It is something that I support very much. I think Westminster, as the beginning of this beautiful and sometimes flawed experiment in parliamentary democracy, sets the model for the rest of us and we could hardly do better than adopting an independent Speaker. I congratulate you, sir, on that appointment.

As I said, it is a tough gig being a shadow minister. You are responding all the time and you are working all the time. To digress, I want to thank the member for Hartley. The member for Hartley, who was my opposite for the last two years of our time in opposition as the police minister, did have some good qualities as a minister and one of those was his propensity to consult—his propensity to reach out to me when there were matters of importance that we needed to agree on and that we needed to find common ground on—and his common decency. He called me on the Sunday morning after the election, as I understand he called several others, congratulating me on my win and I congratulated him of course. In his seat, we had a good candidate who fought the good fight and ultimately was not successful, but I do want to thank the member for Hartley.

I want to thank some people close to me. I have been here for 12 years and I have been served every step of the way by my officer manager, Chantelle Karlsen. She has been an absolute rock. Whatever happens to her, whatever happens in her life, she is always there for me. She is always there at the end of the phone if I need her, and she especially has been over the election period we have just been through.

In fact, she was much more so in 2018, when I had a candidate for SA-Best running against me. The Liberals, as always, ran dead in my seat. The SA-Best candidate, not through any work of

their own, did take the fight up to us and ended up coming second in the seat of Elizabeth, so that was a particularly hard-fought campaign in a particularly difficult environment for the Labor Party after 16 years in government. Chantelle Karlsen, with the rest of the team, was there every step of the way for me. I do understand that some newer members of the house have reached out to her, in terms of setting up the office and a bit of advice along the way, and I hope that she has given them the help that she always gives me.

I also want to pay tribute to my other permanent staffer, or up until recently only other permanent staffer, Chad Buchanan. What can I say about Chad?

Members interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Tittering from the back! Chad is an incredible person. He always makes something out of nothing, and I mean that in the best possible way. As an organisation, we have a limited number of resources at our disposal and, of course, in an election campaign, particularly an election campaign run under the leadership of our party at the moment, we concentrated on seats that we wanted to win, that we hoped to win, such as Waite and Unley. We can talk more about Unley if you like, member for Unley. Of course we directed resources to those seats where they were absolutely needed.

Somehow, when election day came around we managed to find the resources we needed to staff our booths, put up our corflutes—all those things—as well as assist where we could in some of our neighbouring seats. There was a large pool of volunteers, obviously, but they were moving around all the time. I want to acknowledge Chad's work in pulling those people together at the last minute, particularly for Elizabeth, where, as I said, the Liberal Party did not put up much of a fight. I was hoping they would, but in this instance they did not.

While I am on the election in Elizabeth, I want to mention One Nation. I note there is a new One Nation member in the upper house. I have not met her yet. I genuinely do not know anything about her—I did not hear her acceptance speech—but I do welcome her to this house. I understand that she has made some considered comments so far in the media. I want to acknowledge that One Nation as a party did reasonably well in Elizabeth. They came third, with just a little over 10 per cent. I have not checked all the other figures, but I suspect that is among the highest in the state, and that does not surprise me.

I will be careful about what I say, but One Nation and parties like One Nation represent quite a broad range of people, I believe. There are people none of us will have anything to do with. There are people who for ideological reasons are full of hatred towards other races, towards people who believe that our democracy simply should not exist, and they will gravitate towards a party of the right where they see they may have a home.

I think there is a much larger group of people, who the first group of people exploits, who genuinely feel they have been left behind by the major parties. Whether or not that is true, they genuinely feel that, and they largely exist in working-class communities like mine. I urge people to perhaps have their political differences with a party like One Nation but not have a knee-jerk reaction to those people who have chosen to vote for a party like One Nation.

Obviously, I would prefer them to vote for the Labor Party. From the bottom of my heart, I believe that the Labor Party exists to serve the interests of working people. We of course try very, very hard to listen and engage with all our communities, but we have to acknowledge that there are people who, for whatever reason, feel that they are not properly engaged with and have been left behind by the major parties in recent years. They will gravitate towards these parties not because they are intrinsically racist or intrinsically full of hatred towards certain groups in our community but simply because they feel, perhaps unfairly, that they are not well represented.

I want to mention the member for Unley—not that I have anything against the member for Unley; he has been a delight to deal with so far. Others may not realise that, as the Opposition Whip, he has been an absolute delight to work with. I want to talk a little bit about his opposite in the state election, Ryan Harrison, who sadly is not here amongst our people today. He worked extremely hard in the seat of Unley, as did all our candidates. He took it right up to the wire I think. I do not know what the end results were; the member for Unley may furnish me with those.

An honourable member: One.

Mr ODENWALDER: One?

An honourable member: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do just want to acknowledge publicly the work of Ryan Harrison and his team. They did an incredible job in Unley and worked very hard. It is a shame that he could not be here today because that was a seat much like Waite, which was very unlikely we would win and in the end we did not. So I just want to pay tribute to Ryan.

I have been absolutely delighted to be made the Government Whip. The last few days have been incredibly busy and incredibly stressful, but I am so happy that I am part of a team that are disciplined and know the rules before they start, and so it makes that job easier in some respects. Of course we have had a lot of juggling to do this week. We have had a lot on the agenda, and it has been an absolute pleasure working with everybody, and I hope that we can continue to be disciplined as the years go on. I know we will and I hope I continue as the Government Whip for a long time.

I want to acknowledge my two new staff, Rebecca and William. Like me, they have never worked in a whip's office, so be patient with them, everybody. They are learning the ropes as well and they are working incredibly hard. They have been here late every night so far this week preparing motions, juggling things around, sorting out pairs with the opposition, sorting out the general functioning of parliament, and I do want to acknowledge their hard work.

I hope that most of you behind me here have had a chance to meet both of them. They are there whenever you need them, as is of course the member for West Torrens, the Leader of Government Business's parliamentary staffer Corey Harriss, who is also an absolute machine of the parliamentary process. He knows whatever is going on at any given time and has always been there to help.

Given that this was an impromptu speech, I have not prepared too many things, but I want to end on this note. Unlike some people in recent speeches, I did actually remember that I should thank my wife. I want to thank Ann; my two young boys, Felix and Miles; and also to a certain extent my elder son, James, who actually does not really care whether or not I am around very much. I want to thank them for their love and their support not only during the election period and not only during the last three days—which have been particularly difficult to juggle, as I am sure they have been for others—but over the last four years as a shadow minister.

As I said before, it is a tough gig being the shadow minister. It is the early mornings that get you down, and it is not just the workload you experience but the fairly random and unexpected bursts of work you are expected to do and you want to do that do put an immense pressure on your family, as anyone who has been a shadow minister or, I am sure, a minister will know.

So I do want to thank Ann. She has been an absolute rock, juggling her own work life and working from home, as well as juggling a particularly energetic 14-month-old kelpie. It has all added to the mix to make our family life particularly stressful over the last four years and also over the last few days. I will not read aloud to the house the text message I got when I informed her that we might be sitting late tonight, but thankfully we are not, I hope.

Of course, there are other members I want to acknowledge. The member for Taylor is here and I want to welcome him to this place. Amongst the new members, I welcome the member for Taylor to this place. He is a very experienced federal politician and, like Olivia, I had the immense joy of working in the member for Taylor's office when he was the member for—

The Hon. N.D. Champion: Wakefield.

Mr ODENWALDER: —Wakefield. It was a fascinating experience and in many ways a learning experience.

Mr Pederick: Go deeper, go deeper.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, I won't, I promise. Before I hand the floor to the member for Gibson, I want to thank all the other northern MPs. Over time we formed a fairly solid northern bloc. At the moment, we are of course right behind the prospective member for Spence in the member for Taylor's

vacated seat, Matt Burnell, who is a very, very good candidate. I have known Matt for a long time. In fact, his sister and my wife went to school together in Mildura, then I came across him later on in the union movement. It shows what a small world it really is. He is a very good man. He has the interests of working people at heart, and of course he has the support—as we all do mutually—of all the other northern MPs.

It is so good to have some new northern MPs to add to that support, including the member for Florey and the member for Playford. I remembered to thank the member for Playford, although on election night the member for Playford spoke for about 75 minutes and thanked everybody he had ever met, except for me and the member for Taylor. Admittedly, I did not do anything to help him, but we were among friends.

An honourable member: It would have been nice.

Mr ODENWALDER: That is right: it is the polite thing to do. Of course, I thank the member for Ramsay, the member for Light and the former member for Taylor. I should pay tribute to him. The former member for Taylor Jon Gee was an exceptional servant of the labour movement over many, many years. He was a good friend to many people in this place and he is a loss to this place. I am sure the new member for Taylor will adequately make up for that loss, but Jon Gee will be missed. His solid presence in this place will be missed. I do not think I have left anyone out of the north.

Mrs Pearce: I got one before.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, it is great to welcome the member for King and the member for Newland to this place as well. I might wrap it up here, sir, if you are alright with that.

The SPEAKER: I was hoping that you might address the house on—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It is a terrific whip speech. I note that a former whip is interjecting and I welcome those interjections. Perhaps the member speaking does as well. I do note that the member did of course make a significant contribution to the South Australian police force.

Mr ODENWALDER: I have not actually resigned yet.

The SPEAKER: Of course not.

Mr ODENWALDER: I just indicated that I would resign soon.

The SPEAKER: I see.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sorry, I interrupted you and I apologise.

The SPEAKER: You most certainly have the call, member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: You were saying something nice about me, I thought.

The SPEAKER: I was. I was looking forward to your contribution in relation to the South Australian police force.

Mr ODENWALDER: Well, that will have to wait, sir. I will leave that to others for now. Thank you for your indulgence.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I recognise the presence in the gallery of friends of the parliament on this very important occasion. I remind the house that this is the member for Gibson's first speech and that she should be accorded the normal courtesies and respect afforded to new members on this very, very significant occasion.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Debate resumed.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (17:14): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we gather, the Kurna people. I recognise their continued connection to the land and waters and acknowledge that they never ceded sovereignty. I respect all Kurna elders and ancestors and any First Nations people here today.

I offer my congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, on your election to that office. I would also like to congratulate our Premier, who led a united campaign team and not a minute was wasted. Our community was moved by your vision for the future and of our state to deliver a fairer, better society and more opportunity for those who need it most, but it is more than that: it is a vision of the future for our young people, and policies which will improve the lives of future generations to make sure we live in a society where we don't leave people behind.

It is a vision that resonated strongly in Gibson, where we achieved a 12.5 per cent swing, the biggest in the state for a new MP. I am honoured to be a member of your team and to help you strive for these ideals and achieve these ambitions.

Today, I stand here as the representative of the people of Gibson. It is a role I am incredibly honoured to be given the opportunity and take incredibly seriously. I acknowledge the contribution made by the previous member, Corey Wingard, and the work he did for the last eight years. I look forward to working with and for all members of the Gibson community no matter who they voted for, and to everyone who voted for me and entrusted me with this privilege, thank you. To serve in this house is an honour afforded to few. I know that the hard work has only just started and that true satisfaction will come when we realise our ambitions.

The electorate of Gibson is incredibly diverse and beautiful. We have a stunning coastline, wetlands, walking trails, we have great schools, strong sporting and community groups and great coffee. Our small businesses offer local employment and contribute to a dynamic economy. They have had a hard time over the last few years with financial and emotional stress, but there is a huge amount of economic diversity.

Many in our community are unable to enjoy the privileges available to some. For those who rely on social housing, for those who struggle to access the services many of us rely on in our everyday lives, who struggle to pay the bills as the cost of living soars, for those with a disability and their carers who need to access better support services, it is your experiences I am keen to understand better and to advocate for. I will work to ensure that we acknowledge and celebrate all that is good in our community whilst also striving to ensure that we leave no-one behind, that we deal with the issues that matter and will make a difference.

I was born at the Glenelg Community Hospital, growing up in Hove and went to school at Paringa Park Primary and Brighton Primary before heading to Westminster School. In fact, I am a member of the Labor Party because I believe that education is a powerful tool for opportunity and that the postcode of where you live or were born should not determine opportunities afforded to you.

I joined the Labor Party because it believes in the same values. I believe in strong health and education systems, a fair go and decent paying jobs. It is the party of the great union movement, a party that embraces people from all walks of life regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, religion or culture and a party that has a resolute commitment to justice and equality for all.

These are the same issues electors in Gibson voted for: to support our healthcare workers for well-funded and accessible education, skills and secure jobs. I am so proud to hold these values, and I will fight to see them protected and advanced.

As I have said, I am part of a movement that has been working for these values for a long time. Part of this movement was my great-great-grandfather, William Henry Andrews, who was born into a family of labourers in Belfast in 1858. In 1889, he arrived in Adelaide with his young family working at *The Register* newspaper. He joined the South Australian Typographical Society and was a delegate to the Trades and Labor Council.

He was also an active member of the United Labor Party. At their sixth annual conference in 1909, he moved the following motions: for dwelling houses for the working classes and state ownership of all flour mills, and he seconded a motion for a statutory eight-hour working day for South

Australia—legacy. I am here today acknowledging those like my great-great-grandfather and many others who have strived for a fairer, more equitable tomorrow and continuing on their commitment.

My parents, Tony and Meredith, are here, and of course they shaped so much of who I am today. My quiet dad, with his sharp intellect, was a maths lecturer at Sturt Teachers College. He was a union delegate and a key negotiator during the merger with Flinders University and led a picket line at the start of University Drive to fight against management seeking to erode the pay and conditions of the workers. To stand with my dad on that picket line, and also to observe the immense pressure he felt simply to stand up for the rights of his colleagues, was truly formative.

My mum worked in the library at Mawson High and then in admin at Brighton High. I recall standing on Hove station, waiting for the train into the city with mum and the many conversations she would often have with the residents of Minda waiting at the station too. It was here I realised that you could make conversation with someone who might seem different from you. Even if it felt a little awkward, you could be inclusive and have a delightful interaction. You can choose respect. Now, as the member for Gibson, I can say that even when you are 50 it is nice to make your parents proud.

I have an older brother, Simon, who as a seven year old I used to refer to as the GMITW: the greatest man in the world. We spent hours at the park as kids, kicking a soccer ball or throwing a baseball, and my love of sport began with him. Thanks for being a shoulder to lean on whenever I have called out for help.

As I said earlier, I went to school at Paringa Park primary and Brighton primary before heading to Westminster School. Westminster offered me many opportunities, and I took them. I know this is a privilege, and I will continue to use the experiences and education that have been afforded to me to give back to and best represent my community. Following my schooling, I went to Flinders University to complete my honours degree in drama. From uni, I worked in youth theatre and at Cirkidz.

I continue to support the arts at every opportunity, subscribing to the State Theatre and as a member of the Art Gallery and diehard WOMAD fan. I love reading, film and dance, and I believe it is through the arts that we can truly make sense of our world. Our stories, and making sense of who we are, are crucial for a broader understanding, providing insight, empathy and often simply a break from our world. Too often, I believe that the arts are viewed as a niche interest—despite the fact most of us engage with them daily—too easily cut from budgets as not being central to our needs. But if we do not get an opportunity to reflect and imagine, we will be the poorer as a society.

Arts and culture are integral to the lives of all Australians and an asset to our nation. The arts are inclusive and help to create and maintain social cohesion, even as they explore some of the more complex aspects of the human condition. By examining the challenges our society and communities face from different perspectives, the arts contribute to social change. Individually and collectively, artists can lead change for the common good. Unfortunately, as a young person working in the arts, there was—and there still is—little job security, so I began a traineeship created by the ACTU to get young people active in the union movement. From here, a career lasting 20 years was born.

I am a proud unionist, to stand with workers and build power. I know there are many who scoff to see a unionist find themselves as a member of parliament as if it were simply a given, feeding a tired and ill-informed stereotype. Yet it is the qualities and skills I have developed as a union official that stand me in such good stead to listen. To advocate, to build genuine community connection. To help empower people to stand up and advocate for themselves and the betterment of others is truly inspiring. As a unionist, I have represented childcare, disability and aged-care workers for many years. I understand the important role they play in our society and the need to properly value their work. They care for our most vulnerable. It is important work and it is hard work.

In my most recent position as the State Director for Professionals Australia, I had the pleasure of working alongside great campaigners in Tamarah, Kimberley, Dale and Paul, yet it is the members and delegates who inspired me the most: scientists and engineers and pharmacists who, like all workers, need a voice and deserve respect. If engineers, scientists and pharmacists are not listened to, there can be grave consequences for our community. One campaign I am very proud to have been a part of was our work to stop 196 job cuts and, only a couple of years later, preventing

the privatisation of SA Pathology. Of course, I did not fight alone, and I wish to acknowledge the passion and commitment of Kimberley and delegates Ryan and Casey.

Being union is about decency, respect and standing side by side with those who need a hand up. Because for so many, working life is tough. It is not a fringe movement; it is the essence of what makes our society good, and I am here to continue that work and support others in their struggle. It is the same work that I will continue as a member of parliament to ensure that no matter what area you live in, no matter your age, no matter your gender identity or how much money you do or do not have, I will be there to listen and stand with you to fight for respect and for what is fair.

I am a keen soccer player, playing for Westminster Old Scholars soccer club. For many, like me, grassroots sport is an important way of coming together and connecting with community. I am a fan of the Matildas, so much so that my husband, Tom, and I travelled to France for the Women's World Cup. Sport provides healthy activity, teamwork and community as families find connection. It can also be a platform to raise awareness, including awareness of human rights issues, and few are quite as effective as former Socceroo captain Craig Foster and how he has used his position and voice to advocate and campaign for refugees seeking safety.

Like my Labor colleagues, I am committed to ensuring we take climate action to protect our environment for future generations. I believe we are a state where it is evident that investment in renewable energy technologies leads the way in this transformation and shows the economic opportunity we can create for our state with political support and economic investment. Climate damage and habitat destruction are two of the biggest challenges we face, and I am eager to be a part of a government that acknowledges we face a climate emergency. I have been a long-term member of the Australian Conservation Foundation and look forward to working with and supporting the important work that organisations such as this do in our community.

I am a feminist. I am a feminist because so many women's experiences, identities, knowledge and strengths are not acknowledged and respected and we do not do enough as a society to empower all women to realise their full rights. For five years, I worked on the management committee of the Working Women's Centre, a service providing free legal advice and representation to vulnerable workers about their rights at work.

I am a feminist because so many girls and women I know have been sexually harassed. It would be hard to find a woman who has not had to cross a road to make sure they are not being followed, who has not been inappropriately touched, who has not walked down the street holding their keys as an emergency weapon, who has not had someone touch their shoulder and been scared—and so much worse, including those facing domestic family violence.

I am a feminist because women are still yet to receive equal pay. I look forward to working with our Deputy Premier, Susan Close, to address cultural issues in the state parliament, ensuring we lead the way to make our workplace and community safer for women. To close the pay gap, and to ensure that women and girls are not discriminated against, harassed or have less opportunity because of their gender.

Gender and feminism can be a complex and difficult subject for many, but being inclusive, being respectful, not targeting or stereotyping people because of something like their gender, sexuality or marital status are things we can all do, and things I am committed to doing. I am confident we can do this because—and this is something I am very excited to talk about—I am one of seven new female Labor members of parliament. To each and every one of you, congratulations. You worked so hard and deserve this. You are incredible. Thank you for your support to get to this place. I cannot wait to do this work with you and make real and lasting change.

It is Labor that has actively sought this change with our commitment to quotas for women in parliament, and it is these policies that really do make a difference. I look forward to what will now be an inevitable change in culture and ideas. To everyone who knocked on doors, made phone calls, who shared our positive plans with their neighbours and who listened to their community: this belongs to you as much as it does to me. I thank you. We were successful because we spoke personally with thousands of electors, we listened to them and we treated them with respect. I will continue this work as a member of parliament.

I would especially like to acknowledge the Australian Services Union, led by Abbie Spencer; the CEPU, led by John Adley; the United Workers Union, led by Demi Pnevmatikos; the AMWU, led by Peter Bauer; all their members and delegates; and Senator Karen Grogan. I would like to thank the party office and all the MPs who supported me in my campaign. Particular thanks must go to the Hon. Katrine Hildyard and the Hon. Nat Cook, who doorknocked with me and for so many other candidates on a weekly basis because they believed in me and because they are deeply committed to our Labor cause.

To the true believers on the campaign: you put your heart and soul into seeing us be successful in Gibson because you believe in what this Labor government stands for, and you know what it will deliver. I thank each of you. Thank you to my campaign team led by Cam, with his intelligence, pragmatism and sense of fun; Matt, my volunteer coordinator; Kimberley; Lucy; Hilary and Christopher.

I have a wonderful family, one which knows that women and mothers, with support, can achieve great things. My husband, Tom, has encouraged me, supported me and volunteered for me throughout the campaign. Not once has he ever made me feel bad for coming home later than expected, for campaigning all weekends and then, when I finally get home, still having work to do. Your unwavering support gives me strength. I love you.

My daughter, Lucy, has always backed me and volunteered at every street-corner meeting which, as a 21 year old, is quite a commitment when they are held on Saturday and Sunday mornings. Every time I asked for your help your response was, 'Of course,' but most importantly you believed in me, and when I came home and shared my worries with you, you always put things in perspective. To my son, Sam, thanks for stepping up around the house and walking Freya when the rest of us were out campaigning. Your quiet support has been noticed. Thank you, Tom, Lucy and Sam. To have you beside me makes everything possible.

The reality as a member of parliament is that not everyone has voted for you or your party, but I stand here in this place and make this promise to my community: I am here to work for each and every one of you and, even if we cannot agree, I will listen. We each have opportunities in our lives to make a real difference, and here in this place I will not waste a single moment nor take for granted the opportunity I have been given: the honour of being your voice and your member for Gibson.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I also acknowledge the presence in the chamber, on this occasion and on an earlier occasion, of Senator Karen Grogan. Thank you for joining us, Senator.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Bills

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (COVID-19) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:38): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, and I welcome you to your current elevated position. I rise to make some further remarks in regard to the South Australian Public Health (COVID-19) Amendment Bill 2022. I was just venturing into my remarks earlier today about some of the issues with border communities. They are many and varied.

There are many farmers who own land on either side of the border, and there were many intricacies in managing those farms with lockdowns and all the COVID management. I want to acknowledge Commissioner Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier, Chief Public Health Officer, for the

massive amount of work they have done over the last two years with all their teams in helping to manage COVID across the state.

It got down to some very fundamental issues that were brought to me as a local member with a border community. There was a family farm with a father and a couple of sons working on it. It was a big property of several thousand acres just out the back of Pinnaroo, and some of their land went over the Victorian border.

With the rate of lockdowns, they were concerned that, when it got to harvest time, they would not be able to reap their crops on the Victorian side. I said, 'I think you will be okay. You're an essential service. Where do you get through to your Victorian land?' They said, 'You can see it about two kilometres in the distance.' They showed me a line of trees and I asked them if they had a gate there. They said yes, and I said, 'Right, when those crops are ready, whatever happens, you need to reap it as an essential service. I will make it my responsibility to make sure that you're okay and don't run into any compliance issues,' and they were happy with that.

As I indicated earlier, there were many, many issues, especially with education and health services. Di Thornton lives across the border on the Victorian side and runs a private health clinic in Pinnaroo. She could not even come to work when lockdowns came in, so we had to do a lot of work with the local community to make sure that people could come across the border. I met with the principal of Pinnaroo Primary School. He is now at Mypolonga in my electorate. I had people communicating with me, including teachers who lived on the wrong side of the border, about the issues they saw in not just them getting to work but the schoolchildren as well.

I will never forget talking to the principal when a teacher I knew walked past the door. She was being very polite in how she was framing her argument to me. I could tell she was pent up and I said, 'Just let it go. I have worked in shearing sheds. I have used all the words.' Well, did I open her up, but she was still polite enough. I said, 'Now you feel a lot better that you have told me exactly how you feel.' That was the stress for border communities, but all those things were done to keep people safe. I looked at a number that was released the other day right across the country: we kept 46,000 people alive due to these restrictions.

It is tough, as no-one wants to be restricted. The Spanish flu was reflected on earlier today. Five hundred million people caught the Spanish flu over 100 years ago and 10 per cent of them died: 50 million people died from the Spanish flu. The interesting thing is that in those days they used washing your hands and social distancing. Who would have thought that in this day and age, two years ago when the COVID incident started, you would have to tell people to do something simple like wash your hands? It seemed quite odd to me.

It has been tough, and I really want to commend the health sector and the policing sector. People were subbed out to the border control points and they were getting email updates every half an hour, so if there was some confusion that is just the way it was because sometimes the rules changed pretty quickly and information flow had to happen, and they did a great job under pressure.

There were some of the most tragic stories on the border. A friend of mine had a daughter going to a school in Victoria and literally could not touch her for many months. I cannot remember how long, but it might have been close to 10 or 12 months. The deal was that she went to Naracoorte on a back road and the police were there. The daughter, who was doing year 12, sat on one side of the border and the mother sat on the other and they had to stay at least a metre apart. The police officer, who was reduced to tears in the end, said, 'If you touch her, I am going to have to arrest you.' That was how tough it was because people had to keep the rules. Obviously it got better with the exemption process and getting people through, but this gets to the nub of the question in a moment.

To say that the police were doing a great job was exemplified by a farmer friend of mine at Pinnaroo who was driving his self-propelled boom spray on a back road between his properties on the border. He pulled up to take a phone call, to do the right thing because he was on the road, and next thing a police car zoomed up. He said, 'What are you doing?' They said, 'You're right in front of one of the cameras we've got in the trees.' There were cameras set up for people who dodged the main road. These were right across the border, so the police took it extremely seriously, as they should have, and I applaud them for it. I think it did take a bit of education. I think it was city-based police officers saying, 'Well, what are you driving?' They got through that and that is fine.

It is the first time in 100 years that a worldwide pandemic has had to be managed. I certainly get it that, at any scale, people get upset about restrictions. The biggest frustration, as was indicated in the house earlier today, is the anti-vaxxers. I am a great supporter of freedom of choice. People said to me, especially before the election, 'What's your view on vaccination?' I said, 'I support freedom of choice, but whatever choice you make there are issues or complications that can be around it.' But I also said to these people, 'We need to have higher vaccination rates.' That was the issue all the way along before we could open up the borders, as we did on 23 November. It was just a real pity that Omicron loomed in the next few days.

But do you know what? One of those communities on the border, I never heard from them because they had been sick of having buds put up their noses every week, as they had to, so they could keep crossing the border to go to work. I also acknowledge the interstate truck drivers who did such a fantastic job not just carrying this state but carrying this country. Those blokes and ladies—there are a lot of ladies driving trucks now—had to get tested every seven days. It was such good work having the Tailem Bend testing station set up at the new On The Run at the motorsport park first but then at what was a Caltex but is now an Ampol on this end of Tailem Bend. That has worked brilliantly as a testing station and is where I got my PCR-positive test the other week. It was a couple of weeks ago, so do not panic.

It has been a huge job. I want to reflect on some of the misinformation that got out there. Ivermectin is a wonderful sheep drench that came out in the mid-eighties. It was life changing for sheep farmers; I think it was a clear drench, from memory. I was working in Western Australia on farms for a little while at that time before I came home to put a crop in around 1985 or '86. They had all these big launches and it was a game changer for making sure that sheep got treated for worms and I think it was itch mite as well—I would have to look at the label.

The interesting thing is how many experts googled—Google experts—figured that ivermectin was going to fix them. I was stunned by very educated people saying to me, 'This is the go.' I explained, 'Well, look, this is a sheep drench. If that's where you want to go, that's up to you, but I wouldn't be going there.'

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Did you have some? What does it taste like?

Mr PEDERICK: I haven't seen ivermectin for a long time. I had another person I had done a bit of work with; they were in the agricultural services industry. We know each other pretty well. He rang me up one morning and said, 'So, Peds, when do I need to sell my business?' I said, 'What are you talking about?' He said, 'When are you going to link ABNs to whether or not you are vaccinated?' I said, 'Are you serious? This is the first time I have ever heard that.' I appreciate it if you want to make the choice not to get vaccinated, but I said, 'There has not been any discussion about that.' It just blew me away, that level of thought about getting vaccinated, but that is alright and people can have that choice.

As time went on, we saw in both the education and health sectors—and my understanding is it was only several hundred in each sector out of tens of thousands of people in each sector—when the mandatory vaccination process came in, this created headaches. Of course it created headaches. People were making a choice—an interesting choice, I think, but that is fine. I am double-vaxxed and boosted.

I had someone ring me from the local health sector who said, 'I'm going to lose my job.' I said, 'Well, that's a choice you need to make.' It was interesting that five days later he was back at work, so he must have got vaccinated. I said that people are going to have to make a real decision if they want to keep making their house payments or living, for instance. I take my hat off to the ones who stuck to their guns, but it came at a huge cost. People were diversifying their income sources and that kind of thing. Vaccination was the key to making sure that we could start opening up the state.

We saw what happened in Western Australia, where they set up the fortress. Fair enough, they call everything outside Western Australia 'over east', but Omicron crept in and next thing was they were having hundreds of cases every day. They had not even opened the gate and it was there. It has been an interesting time.

We used to shut the state down for one case and now we are getting, I think, 4,000 or 5,000 cases a day. The superspreader events have been interesting. People can name weddings. In Robe, there was a wedding just before New Year's Eve and then there was New Year's Eve, and Robe always puts on a good show especially for much younger people than me, more in my son's age group, 18 to 21, and sure enough, many people got COVID.

My younger son thought he had it three times, and he was fully vaccinated, but by the time he got it he was just happy to get it to get it out the way. He was okay. He just went to bed and slept for 12 hours and got on with life.

In regard to where we go with the future management under this bill—and I know there will be a lot of questions asked in committee—we have to work as a parliament, because a lot of this stuff was done in a bipartisan way when we were in government, and I think we need to continue that to a certain degree.

The first people we need to think about is the community of this state and make sure we do the right thing, that we keep people alive, that we do not overload the hospital system, that we do not, God forbid, run out of ventilators or run out of intensive care unit beds because we have to look after the people of this state.

That is exactly what we did in the Marshall Liberal government. It probably cost us some paint at the last election, but we did it trying to do the right thing for the state. As was proven with the commentary the other day about keeping 46,000 people across the country alive, that is where the rubber hits the road. I will listen with interest to the rest of the debate.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (17:53): I want to thank all the people contributing to the debate: the Treasurer, the Minister for Human Services, the shadow minister, the member for Frome, and thank you for making a contribution outside the normal process, given the emergency nature of making sure we put these measures in place, as well as the member for Unley and the member for Hammond.

This is a very important piece of legislation for making sure when the declaration of the major emergency ends that baseline COVID-19 restrictions will still be in place. I thank the opposition for their indication of support, at least in this chamber, and I hope that they will support it in the other chamber. I do note that there was support from the previous opposition in regard to COVID-19 legislation and policy generally, which I think served South Australia well in terms of having a bipartisan approach to COVID-19 and I hope that that approach continues from the new opposition.

The measures that are in place here essentially are the limited number of measures that will be in place currently. We are not seeking to provide any additional ones with the exception of there being flexibility in regard to COVID-positive and close contacts. In relation to all those other sectors, they will be the restrictions that are in place under the current emergency management directions, particularly aged care, health care, hospitals and disability care. Those are the areas in which the advice is clear in terms of the need for additional protections to protect vulnerable people in sectors where we know that masks and vaccination requirements are important.

I do make the point—and I am sure that this is something that colleagues opposite would agree with—that we have had very limited vaccination requirements in South Australia compared with most other states over the past year or so. If you went to a state such as Western Australia or Queensland, and I think at various times Victoria, you would have seen very significant vaccination requirements in place in those states. In fact, under the laws vaccination passports needed to be shown to enter hospitality venues and the like. We have not seen that here except where it has been on a voluntary basis that has been put in place.

In regard to consultation that was raised, having recently been in opposition I have been on the receiving end of consultation over the past four years. I have to say we have certainly done our best given the rushed nature to make sure that we get this to the parliament, to make sure that we give parliament time to consider it over the next two sitting weeks before the end of this declaration period, to make sure that we got a briefing to the opposition as soon as possible.

Within hours—I think, a couple of hours—of cabinet considering the matter, I provided a copy of the bill to the shadow minister. Within a couple of hours after that we had a briefing for the

opposition from Chief Public Health Officer Professor Spurrier and myself, and Deputy Chief Public Health Officer Dr Lease, answering questions, providing information—and that was even before we had briefed our own caucus—so there was a strong desire to make sure that the opposition had appropriate notice.

My office received a request from the former Minister for Health, the Hon. Stephen Wade, for a copy of the explanatory memorandum and the second reading speech. We were immediately able to provide the explanatory memorandum and, as soon as it was finally signed off on, the second reading speech was provided as well. I have to say that of all the bills that I dealt with in opposition I do not think that the Hon. Stephen Wade ever, from my recollection, provided me with the second reading speech in advance. We are trying to go above and beyond to make sure that the opposition have information and, if there is information between the houses that they would like to seek, we will certainly make that available as well.

I think the shadow minister talked about having a 29th extension of the Declaration of a Major Emergency essentially to give parliament more time; well, that may well have to be a possibility if parliament cannot consider this. I hope that parliament would consider this and these baseline measures would receive broad support, so we would not need to have a 29th extension of it, given that they and a significant heightened level of restrictions in fact were in place under the previous government only a few months ago.

In relation to whether it would come back in three months or six months, we have picked six months because that will get us through the winter period. The pressure on the health system tends to be not just winter but also an element of spring as well. I guess the other factor is if we go for a shorter period then we may well have to introduce legislation to extend it very quickly after we get the legislation passed, so I would preferably hope that we would be in a position to actually review where we are at closer to the end of that six months.

It may well be that it is not necessary to extend it, whereas with a shorter level of extension it is more likely that we would need to come back to the parliament more quickly to seek an extension. However, I did want to make sure that this was appropriately sunsetted so that parliament has reassurance that, if there is going to be a continuation of this, then parliament will be involved in that process.

I think there was a question in relation to the penalties. The penalties are entirely consistent with what is in place at the moment under the Emergency Management Act. Essentially, parliamentary counsel have moved those penalties across to this legislation to make sure that they are consistent with what has been in place in relation to COVID rules for the past two years or so. In fact, some of the penalties for other breaches of the Public Health Act in terms of serious risks to public health are a lot greater than what is in place under what we are proposing specifically in relation to COVID-19, just for the next six months. With those few words, I look forward to the committee stage and further discussion and deliberation on the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms PRATT: My first question is: does the State Coordinator support this bill and is there any part of the bill that the State Coordinator does not support?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yes, I had a discussion with the State Coordinator only yesterday in which he confirmed his support. I do not believe there is any part he does not support. We have certainly been working between Health and SAPOL on the development of this.

Ms PRATT: Does the Chief Public Health Officer support this bill and is there any part of the bill that she does not support?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yes, I believe that the Chief Public Health Officer does support this bill. I am not aware of any part that she does not support.

Ms PRATT: Finally for clause 1, short title, does the South Australian police force support this bill and is there any part of the bill which they do not support?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think that is probably the same answer as question one, in that the head of the South Australian police force is also the State Coordinator, so I presume it is the same answer.

Mr PISONI: Are you able to provide a list of employers and community organisations that you have consulted on the bill, particularly on the clause that refers to the enforcement of directions and the penalties and those who are liable for those penalties?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: This has been consulted internally within government. It has not had an external period of consultation, given the time frames to bring this to the parliament in relation to the status of the declaration of a major emergency. On the issue that you raise specifically in terms of the penalty provisions, as I mentioned in my summing up, it is exactly the same as what is in place in relation to the Emergency Management Act. That is the nature of what was passed by the parliament back in 2004.

I understand it was a lengthy consultation process that happened in relation to those penalty provisions then, albeit there was an amendment made to that within the COVID period in relation to the penalty provisions regarding expiation notices as well as, I believe an imprisonment period. Whatever consultation process was undertaken by the government of the day in relation to those measures when you were in the cabinet room is the same process that has been undertaken here. We are seeking just to keep that entirely consistent with what has been in place for the COVID pandemic over the last couple of years.

Mr PISONI: Did you specifically consult the hospitality sector or the live music industry?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: No. As I said, this has been an internal process in government. However, the government has had broad consultation on a number of matters with the hospitality and live music sectors. I think it is fair to say that they are very supportive of the changes that have been made to the COVID-19 restrictions in the past six weeks, which are certainly supporting their businesses.

What we are seeking to do here is to carry forth the baseline of restrictions that are in place at the moment which, compared with what has been in place for hospitality and live music over the past two years, is very limited. In fact, if we were in the future to require density requirements or other capacity limits, as has been in place over the past two years in relation to the management of the pandemic, then this legislation does not give the ability to do that outside of setting another emergency declaration in place, either under the Emergency Management Act or under the South Australian Public Health Act, as has been put in place previously.

Mr PISONI: So what you are saying is you have not consulted specifically on the penalties and who is liable for those penalties with business or industry, in particular the hospitality industry, the tourism industry or the live music industry, for example. Can you confirm that?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I can confirm that these are exactly the same penalty provisions that are already in place, that were put in place through amendments to the provisions made under the Marshall Liberal government, and I presume that there was some consultation. Maybe you could enlighten us as to what that consultation was at the time, but this is exactly the same as what is currently in place in relation to those matters.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms PRATT: In relation to new section 90B, can the minister advise who is going to have input to and take responsibility for the recommendations that are put to the Governor?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Firstly, I should note that it is great that you are straight into being able to manage a committee stage, whereas I think when I was elected it was probably years before I was involved in a committee stage, so well done to the member for Frome for that.

Mr Cowdrey: No reflection on your ability.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That is right. Exactly. In relation to the directions, what the government has made clear since it has been elected is that we will be using the Emergency Management Council of cabinet as the vehicle for managing issues in relation to the pandemic. In the past, there have been two different mechanisms that were used: one was the Transition Committee and the other was a COVID-Ready Committee. Both were informal committees, if you like, within the government.

We have sought to bring that back within the cabinet structure and to have the Chief Public Health Officer, the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing and the police commissioner as part of that process in providing advice to that committee, which I think has been serving us well over the past almost two months—six or seven weeks or so—that we have been involved in that process.

That process of EMC will be the vehicle we use to receive the advice, to make the deliberations, to make the advice which ultimately cabinet advises the Governor in terms of the setting of the directions. To be entirely clear again, these are only in relation to people who test positive for COVID-19 or who are close contacts of those people who have COVID-19.

Ms PRATT: I thank the minister for that answer. He has perhaps pre-empted the next question, but I will ask him more fully then: can the minister please explain the intended process for the development of directions, in particular what role cabinet and the committees he has referenced, and other bodies, may have in that process? Could you expand on that, please?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yes, thank you. The Governor obviously acts on the advice of Executive Council and the cabinet, and so it would be the process, as I just outlined, through the Emergency Management Council of cabinet, where we would receive that advice and then ultimately a brief through Executive Council in relation to those.

I think it is worth noting that in relation to the other areas of particular high-risk settings, where there is a desire to essentially bring across those directions, there is a need for some flexibility in relation to COVID-19 positive and close contacts because there are likely to be some changes over time in relation to those matters, whereas we are anticipating less change in relation to the high-risk settings. Where there would be change, it would simply be a matter of removing elements of what the requirements are in those settings, whereas in relation to COVID positive or close contacts there may be some replacement.

An example of that is what has recently happened in relation to close contact cases, in that we have gone from seven days' mandatory quarantine for those people, and we have transitioned that to now being five positive rapid antigen tests, mask wearing and restrictions around high-risk settings. That is not an element in which you could easily just cross out one element. You need to replace it with other elements, hence the need for some flexibility in relation to those two very particular types.

Ms PRATT: Would the Chief Public Health Officer still have the power to issue directions in relation to COVID-19 under part 11 of the Public Health Act?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The short answer is yes, but essentially this is what we spent a lot of time looking at. The reason why that has not been used is that in a practical sense it is likely to be problematic. Essentially, the Chief Public Health Officer would need to issue individual directions to people, and each of those individual directions would be subject to people being able to appeal those individual directions, which clearly is very different from the way we have been managing COVID-19. Particularly now that we have been managing thousands of cases a day, it would be entirely impractical for that to occur. Hence, there needs to be some standardisation of what the rules are in relation to people who contract COVID-19, which the existing section would not provide for. However, technically it would still be possible but unlikely.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Since it is her first time, I will let the member for Frome have one more.

Ms PRATT: On indulgence, Mr Acting Chair, I know it is not a supplementary, but it links into the previous question: what weight does the advice of the Chief Public Health Officer have on the decisions of the emergency management committee?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: A very strong weight, obviously. I think everybody in South Australia really appreciates and commends the advice of the Chief Public Health Officer in the work that she has done where she has been advising the State Coordinator. That has, as I have said, followed a number of different processes over the past two years: initially directly, then the Transition Committee was involved, then there have been directions committees formed at various times, then there has been the COVID-19 committee, but at each stage, legally, it has been the State Coordinator making those decisions, with advice, obviously, from the Chief Public Health Officer. Very clearly, the Chief Public Health Officer's advice is strongly weighed in terms of cabinet's deliberations of all matters and the Emergency Management Council's deliberation of all matters. We entirely value the work she has done.

Mr TEAGUE: Minister, would the section 90B directions be the subject of the objects and principles of the act?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): I remind members that questions should be directed through the Chair.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yes is the answer.

Mr TEAGUE: Chair, would the section 14 principles apply to the new part 11A; if not, why not?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As you will see in new section 90E, under paragraph (a) there is a modification in relation to the principles of sections 14(6), (7) and (9). To correct my earlier answer, those principles do not apply to part 11A, in relation to those principles. This has been the subject of legal advice in relation to looking at the directions that are in place because we know now what sort of things we are looking at. The legal advice relates to whether there is a risk of a challenge, essentially, as to whether those principles would likely rise to a challenge under those.

I have to say, I think the Chief Public Health Officer's view was she considers all the principles of the act in her decision-making and would weigh that up. But we certainly have had views expressed in advice we have received that making a change to those specific principles would help to make the parliament's intent clear, to make it clear particularly in regard to the individual liberty elements of the principles, and that we could continue with the directions that are in place as those baseline restrictions and it would not put the government and the health response up to a potential legal challenge.

Mr TEAGUE: What appeal rights do individuals have in relation to isolation or quarantine under those section 90B directions?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Essentially the same that would be in place under the emergency management directions, which would be judicial review to the Supreme Court.

Mr PISONI: Are you able to provide the definition of a body corporate and whether it includes strata corporations formed to manage the shared facilities within a block of flats or an apartment building, for example, and also whether it would include any legal structure for amateur sporting clubs, hobby clubs or other clubs in that definition of a body corporate?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Thank you to the member for Unley. Essentially, this is going to be consistent with what has been in place under the Emergency Management Act, which has been in place for the last two years the member for Unley has been sitting around the cabinet table. In relation to the body corporate, though, in the context of the baseline provisions that we are dealing with, it is likely to be relatively limited in terms of who potentially likely would be involved, because we are either looking at high-risk settings such as in aged care, disability, etc. or we are looking at individuals in terms of COVID-19 positive or close contact.

The advice I have received is body corporate is meant to be broad in terms of different types of organisations that could fit under that. That is consistent with what has been in place under the Emergency Management Act. However, within the context of what has been provided here, it is likely

to be quite specific in that those high-risk settings are where it is likely to be corporations rather than individuals who would be involved.

Mr PISONI: The question was whether stratas that are corporations that are set up for the management of residential properties are included or captured within the body corporate and whether those amateur sporting clubs are captured in the body corporate and, if so, whether the presiding officer, for example, which usually is a person who is a resident rather than a tenant or an owner with tenants of that strata organisation, would take on responsibilities of managing decisions at the annual strata meetings that are made. Would they be captured in this act?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Once again, the minister had been around the cabinet table for the past two years when similar provisions had been in place under the Emergency Management Act. Firstly, it is an incredible credit to SAPOL for the very sensible way in which restrictions have been enforced in that we have not had a heavy-handed approach, which I think the member for Unley is trying to lead us down the garden path of with sporting club presidents and things like that.

However, once again, you have to look at the context of the act. It is broad in terms of different corporations. A strata corporation, as I understand, could be a body corporate. However, you talk about a sporting club. I am not sure that there are many amateur football clubs that are running aged-care facilities where these requirements would be in place, or netball clubs that are running disability accommodation centres or tennis clubs that are running hospitals, so it is quite limited in terms of the applicability because it only applies to where we have directions in place.

Those are now a lot more limited than the past two years in which the member was part of the cabinet, where there were not restrictions in terms of hospitality capacity, those sorts of requirements, which will not be a feature under this legislation unless there was to be a future emergency down the track.

Mr PISONI: I find it extraordinary that the minister is not able to define a body corporate in his own bill. The other question I have relates to how an emergency officer:

...may require a person who the officer reasonably suspects has committed, is committing or is about to commit, an offence against this Part to state the person's full name and usual place of residence and to produce evidence of the person's identity.

A person must immediately comply under the subsection. There is a maximum penalty of \$5,000. What happens if they refuse? How do they receive that fine if that information is not obtained, or is there a method in which the person is encouraged to give that information? Can you explain what the process would be in gaining that information if it was refused?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Once again, this provision is entirely consistent with what has been in place and operational for the past two years under the Emergency Management Act, for which the member for Unley was sitting around the cabinet table, so I am sure he would know what the practice was of the operation of that over the past two years. What we are seeking to do is to bring these matters into the South Australian Public Health Act, in which they can be baseline COVID-19 protections that we can have in place for the next six months.

I am happy to get some further information between the houses. I will express to SAPOL the member for Unley's interest in whether or not they have used this provision and, if so, how they have used the provision. However, it is entirely consistent with what has been in place for the past two years. I, for one, think that SAPOL have done an exceptional job in making sure that they, as well as other authorised officers, such as health officers etc., have used those powers sparingly, have used those powers in an educative way rather than what we might have seen—and what I think some other states have seen—in terms of more heavy-handed approaches.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to section 90D, who does the minister need to consult with in issuing a gazettal notice in regard to the expiry of directions? For instance, does the minister need to consult with the Chief Public Health Officer, and is this a matter that goes back to cabinet prior to a gazettal and the removal of restrictions?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: This is also entirely consistent with what we saw under the COVID-19 emergency measures bill, where this was an ability that I think the Attorney-General had,

to turn off particular elements. I think that worked quite successfully and there were a number of elements of that legislation that 'turned off' as they were not required over time.

What we sought to do here is to enable a similar provision where elements of the directions can be 'turned off' for lack of a better phrase—I am sure there is a technical legal way of saying it—over time to make sure that we do not have in place things that we no longer need in the management of the pandemic. I am sure that the former Attorney-General, the member for Bragg, in her consideration of them likely consulted cabinet. I certainly will be consulting through Emergency Management Council and certainly, absolutely, with the Chief Public Health Officer before making any decisions under that.

Mr COWDREY: Can the minister explain why he has chosen a six-month time frame for the expiry of directions under the legislation, and would the government be open to considering a shorter time frame?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We have consulted with the Chief Public Health Officer, and she and I were both of the view that we needed to put a limit on this to make sure that parliament were involved. I think she nominated the six months, if I recall, which I certainly was happy with.

If we went much shorter, I think the issue is we would basically need to start the process of extending it pretty quickly after it came into operation, particularly because I suspect that parliament would want a longer period of consultation, given the start of parliament this first time. So you would almost be at the process of starting to extend the bill just as you introduce the bill.

I think six months gives us more of an opportunity to have a proper, good look at how it has been operating, to see whether or not we do need particular sections and to see where we are up to in the management of the pandemic, which may well lead to whether we need to continue it at all and, if so, whether or not it is in a substantially different form. I think if it was just three months, we would be pretty much starting the work on bringing something back straight away and it would be in exactly the same form.

Mr COWDREY: Just to clarify: it was on advice from the Chief Public Health Officer, the six-month time frame. As just one more matter of clarification in regard to the first answer, was there consultation with the Chief Public Health Officer? You mentioned in passing that she may be consulted, but is there a requirement for consultation with the Chief Public Health Officer prior to the removal of—

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is not specifically explicit in the legislation because what I asked the department and parliamentary counsel to do was do exactly the same as the previous government had done in the previous COVID-19 emergency bill, and so this is, with some variations I am sure, a similar process that was in place there. However, I am absolutely willing to give a commitment in terms of the need for consultation and would absolutely be doing that.

Mr COWDREY: Sorry, that was clarification.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Alright, member for Colton, one more if it is quick.

Mr COWDREY: I have always been very generous, Mr Brown.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): That is not what I remember.

Mr COWDREY: Does the section 90D expiry provision apply to all directions under 90B, including those directions which are deemed to be directions under 90B by virtue of schedule 1, clause 2? Sorry, that was a very wordy explanation.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: You had me, but my advisers tell me the answer is yes, so I will believe it.

Clause passed.

Schedule.

Ms PRATT: Does the government anticipate that a public health incident or public health emergency will or may be declared in the foreseeable future?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Professor Spurrier always talks about the crystal ball in COVID-19 management. No-one knows the answer to that. I think we have to be prepared for all eventualities. It is plain for everybody to see that we are going to see continual variants of COVID-19, and variants by and large will be more transmissible because, to take over from the other variants, they will have a genetic advantage compared with the previous variant. The question is, therefore, whether they are more severe or not, and that is the unknown factor. The other unknown factor is whether vaccinations hold up.

We have some excellent vaccines that have held up exceptionally well. The evidence is quite clear that if you are vaccinated you are much less likely to be in hospital, you are much less likely to pass away. Even with Omicron, which was more resistant to the vaccines than other strains, we have seen that a third dose provides a significant improvement upon people's ability to combat Omicron. No-one can say in terms of what is likely to happen in the future. There is the possibility that either an emergency under the Public Health Act or an emergency under the Emergency Management Act may well be required in the future.

Ms PRATT: Do the State Coordinator and SAPOL support proposed clause 3 of the schedule?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Yes.

Ms PRATT: What changes in SAPOL staffing to the COVID-19 response are expected if this bill is passed?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I will have to refer that question to the Minister for Police, but I think it is safe to say that COVID-19 has had a very significant impact upon SA Police staffing, particularly when we were in the situation where significant border controls were required and also the situation where significant quarantine arrangements were involved. I guess the third element was when significant levels of inspections and checking on people and businesses was required as well. Largely, all of those three elements are not being used by SAPOL at the moment. To some extent, there is some enforcement action is still happening, but at a lower level than what previously was in place. I think we have just Tom's Court left as our quarantine facility at the moment.

Where SAPOL have been doing lots of work, in the terms of their policy work, Dr Lease and the assistant commissioner probably have daily if not hourly contacts on a whole range of matters. Their COVID-19 team has been set up to be able to manage a lot of the support to the State Coordinator.

SAPOL continue to have an important emergency management function and, from my understanding, the assistant commissioner, who has been running the COVID-19 response, is in the longer term going to be the emergency management head as well. It is not as though there is not going to be an important role that SAPOL plays in terms of emergency management, of which pandemics are part of that, but certainly I think it is safe to say that the changes of where we were three, six, nine or 12 months ago compared with now have been a significant release in terms of the pressure on SAPOL that have allowed many frontline officers to return to ordinary policing as well as less pressure in terms of protective security officers and other elements of the SAPOL workforce.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (18:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Committees

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of the committee.

STANDING COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of standing committees.

At 18:42 the house adjourned until Thursday 5 May 2022 at 11:00.