

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 1 June 2022

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

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Members

BRAGG BY-ELECTION

The SPEAKER (10:31): I inform members that, following the resignation from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Vickie Ann Chapman, I have conferred with the Electoral Commissioner as to a suitable date for a by-election in the electoral district of Bragg. I will today issue the writs to effect a by-election in the electoral district of Bragg on Saturday 2 July 2022. I make this statement having regard to sections 47 and 130A of the Electoral Act 1985 South Australia.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUSTICE MEASURES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (10:32): Introduced a bill for an act to amend the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act 1940, the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017, the Civil Liability Act 1936, the Courts Administration Act 1993, the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015, the Criminal Procedure Act 1921, the Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993, the Fences Act 1975, the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993, the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015, the Legal Practitioners Act 1981, the Mental Health Act 2009, the Real Property Act 1886, the Residential Tenancies Act 1995, the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995, the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991, the Witness Protection Act 1996, and the Youth Court Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

At the outset, I seek leave pursuant to standing order 80A(3).

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: I am pleased to—

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, just to clarify, are you seeking to extend the time for your remarks?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes. Standing order 80A(3): an additional 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER: The advice from the Clerk is that it may have been better to approach that in a slightly different way but, in any event, to inform the house, for how long do you now seek to make your remarks? I understand it is 15 minutes.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, and I have sought and obtained leave for an additional 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER: Yes. Unless there is any objection, I propose to call the member for Heysen.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's the last time you do that without speaking to us beforehand. That's the last time. All you had to do was ask, but you are so uncourteous that you behave like this. This is the last time you will get this opportunity.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Absolutely, go ahead.

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Your last opportunity. All you had to do was ask.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's right; courteous is not your strong suit, is it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: the member for West Torrens continues to—

The SPEAKER: He does, and he is being called to order.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You're a smart Alec.

Mr PISONI: —breach standing orders.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens! I will hear the member for Unley in relation to a point of order.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That was all you had to do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is warned. Member for Heysen, you have the call.

Mr TEAGUE: I am pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Justice Measures) Bill 2022. I will endeavour in the time available to me to address the range of measures, covering as it does 18 separate pieces of legislation—and uncontroversially—but taking the opportunity to bring to the house the range of Attorney's portfolio and other justice measures that were previously the subject of that portfolio bill last year.

The house has been taxed in recent minutes in relation to the extent and scope of courtesies exchanged. I might just put on the record that I acknowledge and appreciate what has already been a very courteous and, to the greatest extent reasonably possible, reasonable exchange between the Attorney-General and his staff and me and my staff. There is no surprise in relation to the scope of measures that the Attorney-General has elected to introduce that are the subject of the portfolio bill. I will not reflect on that; that will be dealt with separately. The fact is that it contains a subset of what was a portfolio and justice measures bill introduced in the last parliament.

Insofar as courtesies are concerned, I extend my thanks and appreciation to the Attorney-General and his office and to my own staff for having taken time over recent weeks to engage in understanding the range of priorities that the government has decided to bring to the parliament in these early weeks. There being no substantive reason not to do so, I take this opportunity to bring to the house the balance of those measures, so there is courtesy. Far from engaging in some exercise by way of sleight of hand or lack of notice or courtesy, I have sought time—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —in order to address—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

Mr TEAGUE: —the subject matter of—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

Mr TEAGUE: —the bill in the house at the outset of my remarks.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I will return it to you in spades for four years.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen has the call.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Get used to it. You will enjoy it.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is on one warning.

Mr TEAGUE: Once again, I extend my thanks to the Attorney for the approach that he has taken in these early weeks.

The bill, addressing as it does a number of acts—18 in all—makes miscellaneous amendments to those acts that are committed to the Attorney-General and justice-related amendments to acts committed to other ministers. It addresses a number of discrete and technical issues and, as I said at the outset, those are not matters for which there is any indication of substantive difference. I certainly invite the government's adherence to those changes—18 different acts in all.

To begin, part 2 of the bill amends the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act 1940 in relation to the jurisdiction of the South Australian Employment Tribunal and the South Australian Employment Court. The amendments in clauses 3, 4 and 5 enable protection orders to be made by the court and the tribunal in the course of exercising their personal injury jurisdiction.

They remove the present requirement in section 8A that, for the District Court or the South Australian Employment Tribunal or South Australian Employment Court after amendment to make a protection order, the infirmity or reduced capacity prompting the protection order must arise from the injury that is the subject of the personal injury proceedings. This will allow, for example, a protection order to be made in respect of a second plaintiff spouse in a dust diseases matter, where the spouse's incapacity arises from age or other illness rather than the dust disease.

Part 3 of the bill amends the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. Section 86 of that act allows the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection to give a direction to prevent a person communicating with a child who is in the custody or under the guardianship of the chief executive. Historically, I am told, there have been difficulties proving that communication occurred, even where a child is in the company of the person the subject of a direction.

The amendment in clause 6 provides the chief executive with an additional ground for issuing a direction so that a person can now be directed not to be in the company of or otherwise associated with a guardianship child. New section 86(4a) ensures that a child who is in the company of a person the subject of a direction, who communicates or attempts to communicate with such a person or who is harboured or concealed in contravention of a direction given to a person, does not commit an offence. New section 86(6) provides that a child to whom a direction relates cannot be compelled to give evidence in proceedings relating to an offence charged under this section.

Part 4 of the bill amends the Civil Liability Act 1936 to remove a redundant reference in section 64(3)(b) to section 105 of the Law of Property Act 1936, which has been repealed. That can be found at page 5 of the bill. The effect of the section is otherwise unchanged.

Part 5 of the bill amends the definition of 'judicial office' in section 27A of the Courts Administration Act 1993. This relates to an amendment to the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015 in clause 35 of this bill, setting out the hierarchy of judges and other judicial officers. It is necessary to amend this definition to ensure that it is consistent with the clause 35 amendment. Part 6 of the bill, comprising clauses 9 to 22, contains a series of amendments to the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders Act) 2015. I will refer to part 6 just now in some further detail and I will refer to that act as the high-risk offenders act in these remarks.

Clause 9 adds commonwealth offences to the definition of 'serious sexual offence' in section 4(1) of the high-risk offenders act. It also deletes the definition of 'youth' and adds a subsection (3) to the effect that a reference in the act to a person convicted of an offence includes a person who was, at the time they were convicted of the offence, under the age of 18 years. Read in

conjunction with section 6, as substituted by clauses 10 and 11 of this bill, the net effect is that while an application for a supervision order cannot be made in respect of a person under 18 years, offences committed by a person under 18 can be taken into account when considering whether they should be the subject of a supervision order as an adult.

Clause 10 of the bill substitutes section 5 of the high-risk offenders act, which defines the meaning of 'high risk offender'. The amendments remove certain ambiguities and clarify those offenders covered by the definition and the type of offending. For example, it is made clear that the definition only covers serious violent offenders while they are currently serving a sentence of imprisonment for a serious offence of violence.

Clause 12 of the bill amends section 7 of the high-risk offenders act to clarify that an application for an extended supervision order may only be made in the 12 months preceding the expiry of the term of imprisonment. It also clarifies that when deciding whether to make an order under section 7, the court must not take into consideration any intention of the respondent to leave the state, whether permanently or temporarily.

Clause 13 of the bill, still addressing those high-risk offenders act amendments, will amend section 9 of the act to clarify that the obligations of a person subject to a supervision order are suspended while they are in custody. Clause 14 of the bill amends section 10 of the high-risk offenders act. That section spells out the conditions that automatically apply to extended supervision orders.

The amendment adds a condition that the person subject to the order is prohibited from leaving the state without the permission of the Supreme Court or the Parole Board. Those bodies are only able to give permission if the person provides information about their proposed travel, including the information prescribed by regulation. Section 10 is also amended to clarify that the Supreme Court may impose any condition able to be imposed by the Parole Board under section 11.

Clause 15 of the bill inserts an additional subparagraph (ia) in section 11 to clarify the Parole Board's powers to place conditions limiting the movements outside the home of high-risk offenders under extended supervision orders. In practice, this may be a curfew or close supervision at home.

Clause 16 amends section 13 of the high-risk offenders act to allow the Supreme Court to transfer an application for variation or revocation of a supervision order to the Parole Board and to make rules in respect of such a transfer. Once applications are transferred, they can proceed as if they had been made to the Parole Board.

Clause 17 of the bill amends section 14 of the high-risk offenders act to allow the Parole Board a level of discretion to make consequential or ancillary orders when varying a supervision order.

Clause 18 of the bill inserts new section 14A in the high-risk offenders act to allow the Parole Board to vary or revoke the conditions on a supervision order, including conditions imposed by the Supreme Court, where there has been a material change in circumstances and it is in the interests of justice to do so. When considering an application to vary a supervision order, the Parole Board must give all parties an opportunity to be heard and to make submissions on the matter.

Clause 19 amends section 17 of the high-risk offenders act to allow the Parole Board to direct that a person be detained in custody pending circumstances necessary for the purposes of ensuring their compliance with a condition of a supervision order. These circumstances may include matters such as appropriate accommodation or treatment programs—and a very practical measure, I might add. I take the opportunity at this point to thank the Parole Board for the extraordinary and very practical work they do in the justice system.

Clause 20 amends section 18 of the high-risk offenders act to address operational difficulties with the powers of the Supreme Court where an offender breaches either an extended or interim supervision order. The amendments will allow the Supreme Court to order that a person be detained in custody via a continuing detention order until the expiration of the breached or further supervision order, or for such lesser period as may be specified by the court.

In addition, new subsections (4a) and (4b) would allow the Supreme Court to vary or revoke conditions on a continuing detention order or to order an offender to be detained in custody pending

circumstances necessary for ensuring compliance with the order, similar to the Parole Board amendment to section 18—in clause 20 of the bill—that I have addressed just now.

Clause 21 of the bill inserts a new part 3A in the high-risk offenders act addressing interagency cooperation. It will contain, then, provisions for interagency cooperation that are there set out in the new part 3A. These provisions mandate formal information sharing processes with other jurisdictions. They are modelled on part 4A of the Crimes (High Risk Offenders) Act 2006 in New South Wales.

I have addressed in some greater detail those provisions in relation to the high-risk offenders act. There is just one more, finally, in terms of those high-risk offender amendments. Clause 22 of the bill amends section 22 of the high-risk offenders act. That amendment will allow for appeals from a refusal by the Supreme Court to make an extended supervision order or a continuing detention order. Again, this is a practical mechanism in the context of what is still an evolving regime in relation to both categories of order.

Part 7 of the bill contains an amendment to section 103 of the Criminal Procedure Act 1921, clarifying that the power to lay any information in a superior court under this section may only be exercised in the authority and name of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP).

Part 8 of the bill amends the Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993 to provide for the appointment of judicial registrars to the Environment, Resources and Development Court. I will not stay to address those part 8 amendments; they are there for members at pages 12 and 13.

Part 9 of the bill amends the Fences Act 1975 to update a reference in section 24 to refer to the Magistrates Court Act 1991 instead of the Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926. This is an example of one of those technical amendments contained within what is wideranging.

Part 10 of the bill amends section 61 of the Guardianship and Administration Act to remove what is now an obsolete reference to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Section 61 currently provides that the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal is not to consent to a termination of pregnancy unless the carrying out of the termination would not constitute an offence under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. As the Termination of Pregnancy Act 2021 has rendered it no longer illegal to terminate a pregnancy, the reference to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act is now redundant.

Section 61 has been recast so that the other two provisos to termination remain but the Criminal Law Consolidation Act reference has been removed. They are set out at page 14 of the bill and the provisos are there as section 61(3)(a) and (b) but just removing the now redundant reference to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act—in other words, leaving those provisos intact.

Part 11 of the bill amends the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015. Clause 34 inserts references to judicial registrars in the hierarchy of judges and other judicial officers. Clause 35 clarifies that the holders of judicial office can be removed from office regardless of whether the act appointing them provides for such removal. In addition, clause 36 inserts a new section 34A—that is there with the heading 'Commissioner may determine not to give notice in a particular case'—in that act. That will have the effect of allowing the Judicial Conduct Commissioner discretion not to give a written notice required under the act in relation to a complaint or the dismissal of a complaint. That must be read in the context of other provisions in the act including section 13(2), which makes it clear that the rules of procedural fairness apply. I just stress that.

Part 12 of the bill amends the Legal Practitioners Act 1981. Clause 37 extends the application of section 14AB(1)(c) to suspected unsatisfactory conduct or professional misconduct of Australian-registered foreign lawyers.

Clause 38 inserts new subsection (4) in section 23 of the act. That is to clarify that the prohibition on legal practitioners sharing profits with non-lawyers does not prevent a legal practitioner from entering into an agreement to share profits with an Australian-registered foreign lawyer.

Clause 39 amends section 23D of the principal act, the Legal Practitioners Act, to require an Australian-registered foreign lawyer establishing an office in South Australia to give notice to the Supreme Court to that effect in the same way that interstate-registered practitioners must do.

Part 13 of the bill, which deals with the Mental Health Act 2009, amends section 84(1) to remove the inference that mandatory initial reviews of short-term treatment orders under section 79 of that act carry an automatic entitlement to legal representation in every case. In practice, the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal conducts initial reviews under section 79 on the basis of written reports and treatment plans. This means legal representation is not necessary for initial reviews.

Part 14 of the bill makes minor amendments to the Real Property Act 1886 to update what are now simply obsolete references, and that is plain on the face of those changes at clauses 41 and 42 on page 16 of the bill, and I will not stay to address those at any greater length.

Part 15 of the bill amends the Residential Tenancies Act 1995 to require a person paying a bond to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to provide the information required by the commissioner in order to help address the issue of unclaimed bonds. Part 16 of the bill amends the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995 to enable the Small Business Commissioner to charge a fee for mediation and commercial lease disputes.

Part 17 of the bill amends the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991 to update obsolete references in section 46. Those are set out in clause 45 of the bill and, again, plain for members to consider that obsolete references are entirely within section 46(2) and (3) of that act, and those are the subject of clause 45.

Part 18 of the bill amends the Witness Protection Act 1996. Clause 46 updates obsolete references. Clause 47 amends section 24 of the principal act in light of the fact that there is no longer a Crown counsel. The director is now defined as including a person acting in the position of the director, the deputy director or a suitable person to whom the director has, by instrument in writing, delegated his powers under this section with the approval of the Commissioner of Police.

Finally, part 19 of the bill makes a minor amendment to the Youth Court Act. That is at clause 48. That is to remove the requirement for principal members of the Youth Court judiciary, including special justices, to be appointed for a set term.

That concludes the matters that are the subject of the justice measures bill. It is a bill covering many different areas, dealing with a range of important issues to ensure the justice system works effectively and efficiently for our community. I thank members for the leave granted to an extension of time within which to conclude my remarks. I hope that was self-evident, the need for it, and I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A Koutsantonis.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, adjourned debate to be taken into consideration—

Mr TEAGUE: I presume you are going to ask me, Mr Speaker, to what date should debate be adjourned.

The SPEAKER: Well, in fact, I have not asked yet, but I will ask that question now.

Mr TEAGUE: I would be grateful for your assistance in relation to the date, but the next Wednesday of sitting.

The SPEAKER: That is 15 June.

Mr TEAGUE: To 15 June.

The SPEAKER: It has been moved. Is it seconded? I see the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have an amendment, sir. I move to amend that date, as follows:

That debate be adjourned, amending the date from 15 July, to Wednesday 30 November.

The SPEAKER: The amendment has been moved. Is it seconded? Member for Heysen?

Mr TEAGUE: Sir, if I may speak to the motion?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will speak first because it is my amendment. Sit down.

Mr TEAGUE: I am on my feet. I have the call I think.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No-one has the call yet.

Mr TEAGUE: Well, I am on my feet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So am I.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, it might be said that you had had the opportunity and then the amendment was moved. I will turn to the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I think the pretty appalling abuse of standing orders by the member for Heysen by seeking leave to extend his remarks before he began them put the house in a position where how could we possibly have known he needed to extend his remarks. It is an abuse of process, and I think, quite frankly, an appalling abuse of process. That type of smart alecness by the member for Heysen will bring him undone.

The courteous thing to do in those matters is to approach the government and say, 'Listen, there are a number of bills that I would like to move to discuss. It is going to take longer than 15 minutes. I am going to seek at the end of my 15 minutes an extension for further time to discuss my remarks. Would the government be amenable to that?' Instead, he thought he would be clever. Well, let's see how clever he is now.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, I think the opportunity was there to address your motion, but it may be that you wish to close. In any event, it may just be convenient, given the business before the house, that we move to put the amendment. I understand that it is seconded. I will put the—

Mr TEAGUE: Mr Speaker, I am seeking the call and I would like the opportunity to address briefly the contribution of the member for West Torrens. First, a technical matter—

The SPEAKER: I think it is a reply. I think it is your reply, member for Heysen. You have the call.

Mr TEAGUE: A technical matter on the substance of the amendment: the motion is to adjourn to the next Wednesday of sitting. The member for West Torrens refers, I think, unless I misheard him, to 15 July. The motion is to adjourn to 15 June, and I certainly commend that motion to the house.

Perhaps by way of closing, I was at pains at the outset of my remarks, perhaps unnecessarily so, to highlight the extent of constructive and productive engagement with the Attorney and his staff in relation to the range of justice measures that are the subject of the portfolio bill and the justice measures bill.

Having given notice yesterday of a bill that is going to range over 18 separate pieces of legislation, I would have thought it would come as no surprise—and by the time that I rose to speak on the second reading debate, those acts that are amended by the justice measures bill, by the various processes of this house, had been read in what is a relatively tedious process to read the long title to a bill in these circumstances, but they had been read a full three times. So it should have come as no surprise to the house that in speaking to the second reading—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —the mover of a bill that is going to amend 18 different acts might just indicate to the house that, 'No surprises, folks, I am going to be seeking, if I may, leave, in an orderly way pursuant to the standing orders,' and 80A provides that may be done.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

Mr TEAGUE: I recall ruling on it myself on several occasions and—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —the distinction that the member for West Torrens now wishes to draw around what constitutes courtesy is courtesy raising it at the outset so that everybody is on notice of what is coming—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —is courtesy raising it at the final 30 seconds of a 15-minute contribution, or is courtesy as the member for West Torrens in a somewhat novel way has now brought to the house, that courtesy in these circumstances involves somehow going around knocking on the member for West Torrens' door and saying—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —'By the way—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

Mr TEAGUE: I would like—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

Mr TEAGUE: —for the member for West Torrens to have special notice of what might be required in order to deal with business before the house on this morning.' So, for a whole variety of reasons, it is a matter for the house to give leave or not. It is not *War and Peace*. It is no particular dramatic situation. The house can give leave or not. The house can withdraw leave if it wishes.

I have simply come along here and said, 'I'm going to move a bill that's going to have the effect of amending 18 different acts—it's something I've worked through with the Attorney over recent weeks—in a way that gives the house an opportunity to be heard. I will seek an extra 15 minutes.' I did not anticipate that that would rile up the member for West Torrens, so if there are particular concerns—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —for the member for West Torrens about the way that debate is conducted in this place, then the member for West Torrens might care to send me a little sheet of memoranda about how he would like things to be done—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

Mr TEAGUE: —from day to day so that he remains content. I might highlight in this regard that from the outset, when it came to the extension of sessional orders, on the first day in this place when the member for West Torrens had taken on the responsibilities of Manager of Government Business, I have gone around—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —on a matter of business, on a matter of government business—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: I have gone around and said, 'Have you forgotten something here?' I was met with, 'No, we haven't. That was what we deliberately wanted to do. We don't want to have a 30-day limit on our questions on notice.' That was a government process matter about which, alright, we can have an engagement. In this case, I have engaged over a period of weeks with the Attorney-General—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, there is a point of order which I will hear under 134. I do observe, though, that I am eager to advance the business of the house, and I am not sure necessarily that we are now in a space that is doing that. I would ask the member for Heysen to draw his remarks to a close and that may resolve the point of order that has been raised.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I will draw my remarks to a close. I have absolutely no idea what the point of order might have constituted. It does not seem to have been elucidated at all. If the member for West Torrens is getting on his feet—

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, I did not ask for submissions in relation to that; instead, I asked that you draw your remarks to a close. The business before the house is tolerably clear and I am eager to move the house forward.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: I have spoken in this place in recent days about common courtesies. Far from being sophisticated or in some way seeking to—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —obtain an advantage, I think my record stands fairly clearly that where notice is appropriately given—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen is drawing his remarks to a close.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: Without any reason.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Plenty of reasons.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: Without any reason.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Plenty of reasons.

Mr TEAGUE: None that you elucidated at 11.30pm on the relevant night.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, are you drawing your remarks to a close?

Mr TEAGUE: I am, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members, the standing orders prevent quarrels between members.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Heysen, member for West Torrens, if interjections continue, 137A will come clearly into view.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 24
Noes 12
Majority..... 12

AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Champion, N.D.	Clancy, N.P.
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Fulbrook, J.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.	Hughes, E.J.
Hutchesson, C.L.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.B.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Pearce, R.K.	Picton, C.J.	Savvas, O.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Cowdrey, M.J.	Gardner, J.A.W. (teller)
Hurn, A.	McBride, P.N.	Patterson, S.J.R.
Pisoni, D.G.	Pratt, P.	Tarzia, V.A.
Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Brown, M.E.	Marshall, S.S.	Piccolo, A.
Pederick, A.S.	Stinson, J.M.	Speirs, D.J.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL (TELEPHONE VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:20): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Electoral (Telephone Voting) Amendment Bill 2022. The bill proposes amendments to the Electoral Act 1985 in relation to telephone voting, and it does so with respect to what are a range of categories of designated voter as may be expanded and more particularised by regulation as might be required.

At the outset, and because he has been the subject of some consideration already this morning, I want to indicate to the house that this amendment bill brings back the subject matter of the 2021 electoral bill, insofar as it addresses these matters, but complemented by the contents of what were draft regulations presented to the house that married up with the bill, had it passed this place in 2021, but that were introduced to the body of the act by the then shadow attorney-general in the other place in February.

I note the good work of the now Attorney-General insofar as this bill now stands alone. It was part of a miscellaneous electoral bill, it was then the subject of an electronic documents electoral bill and now it stands alone. While it still provides for regulation, it, as the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC spoke

to in the other place in February, brings into the body of the act certain categories of designated voter and also more particularly provides for telephone-assisted voting and the guarantees around what a telephone-assisted voter is entitled to in order to assure certainty with regard to both the entitlement and the mechanics of it.

Honourable members here in the last parliament will be familiar with the subject matter and, had they looked at the February bill in the other place, they would be familiar with the fact that it brings in those aspects that were otherwise dealt with as draft regulations when it was here. It is that bit more whole unto itself and it is dealing only with this subject matter.

As was the case in February and remains the case now, it is good to have these provisions on the statute book in plenty of time—in fact, many months, I expect. A significant period of time will be required for the Electoral Commissioner and the Electoral Commission of SA to apply these measures. There is no suggestion that it is practical to apply them, for example, to the by-election to which you referred to earlier, Mr Speaker, but it is an opportunity to introduce these measures to the statute book in an orderly way.

On that point, it is well to observe that the Electoral Commissioner produces a report after each election, and much of what was in the miscellaneous bill and the electronic documents bill came out of recommendations that were made in that report. This is not one of them. This is a measure that was raised by the commissioner as a measure that would provide further assistance to those vision-impaired and otherwise disabled electors, beyond the election report itself, for general purpose, including overseas electors and those who might suffer with more particular disabilities.

It is important to point that out because it was not conceived of as a COVID measure as such. What we have in this bill is the possibility to designate one of those categories of special elector entitled to the telephone vote as a COVID-19 elector, so it is in the bill, but it was not conceived of and nor should it be thought of as a process that is COVID related or otherwise a particular response to emergency.

It is just one of its potential applications and that is provided for in the bill, given the present circumstances that we are now in and having exited emergency management, in a way that stands alone. We know that there may be circumstances where electors find themselves isolated and unable to vote in COVID circumstances, so there it is in the bill. The machinery of it is that what we see is the insertion of a new division in part 9.

We have division 5A, which deals with the entitlement, although there in principle without the machinery, for vision-impaired voters to access electronic assistance to vote. So division 5A is still there. Division 5B now provides a further round of process for vision-impaired electors with some bolted on, practical processes to ensure that they do have access to telephone voting, as well as a whole range of other designated categories of elector. So 5B is new, 5A is still there and, rather than amend 5A, in accordance with the provisions of this bill you have them now sitting side by side.

We have heard a lot about COVID circumstances in particular, but I want to highlight that sight-impaired electors, in particular, are voters who will benefit from these more particular provisions. They are just one example of those who will benefit. Overseas voters, as we know, have been disenfranchised by increasingly slow postal systems in recent years and so that will be a benefit.

We know that telephone voting has been available in other jurisdictions, including the recent federal election, for vision-impaired electors and we know that the commonwealth parliament's committee inquiry report, 'Report of the inquiry on the future conduct of elections operating during times of emergency situations', in June 2021 has informed and provides useful guidance to us in coming now to the house with this bill.

I want to place on record my appreciation and that of all members of the house for the Electoral Commissioner and the staff for the work that they have done on the recent more or less back-to-back state and federal elections, and I want to thank parliamentary counsel for the extraordinarily efficient work consolidating this bill in a way that keeps it coming along in a coherent way from the time it was first introduced. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

*Motions***NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR**

Private Members Business, Other Motions, Notices of Motion, No. 1: Mr Tarzia to move:

That this house—

- (a) commends the Marshall Liberal government and Morrison Coalition government for committing funding to complete the north-south corridor; and
- (b) calls on the Malinauskas Labor government to commit to maintaining the currently agreed schedule for completion of this vital project by 2030.

Mr PISONI: I draw your attention to the state of the house, sir.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:32): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

SA PATHOLOGY

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (11:33): I move:

That this house—

- (a) thanks the hardworking pathologists, scientists, technicians and nurses for their amazing work looking after South Australia during the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (b) condemns the former Liberal government for planning to privatise SA Pathology; and
- (c) recognises the Malinauskas Labor government's ongoing commitment to keeping SA Pathology in public hands.

Throughout the pandemic, South Australians relied on a quick turnaround on testing and analytics of COVID-19 PCR tests. The role of pathologists, medical scientists, technical officers and nurses has been critical in ensuring that appropriate actions and measures were able to be implemented when necessary.

SA Pathology was never a good fit for privatisation, as we have learned from the COVID-19 crisis. You simply must have surge capacity and SA Pathology to respond to crises like this one. Stopping the privatisation of SA Pathology is a victory for every medical scientist, technical officer, nurse and doctor who joined their union and fought the good fight to protect a critical public health service. Professionals Australia ran the STOP the Health Cell-Off campaign for two years, arguing that privatisation would strip SA Pathology of crucial capacity.

Having a local public service is critical, because it means you are not reliant on interstate testing. Whether it is COVID-19, the flu or an outbreak in the state's water supply, medical scientists at SA Pathology are at the frontline of containing the crisis and saving lives. Workers at SA Pathology can now focus on their job and continue to provide a world-class testing service that enables us to diagnose and treat patients quickly and efficiently.

When the outbreak of coronavirus first occurred, it was difficult to get testing kits because of the high demand globally. The virology division in SA Pathology was able to design and get a validated method up and running within two weeks, while other kits sold out worldwide and were unavailable. This in-house testing by the virology division at SA Pathology was available one week before the British national health system (the NHS) with its large pool of laboratory experts was able to have its in-house testing up and running.

The alternative to developing our own testing regime would have been to physically send people's respiratory samples interstate for testing, which significantly delays results and places the patient and the community at risk in the interim. The skill and knowledge base to do this in-house cannot be undervalued and this is precisely the capability that was being undermined in staff cuts at SA Pathology.

It is not just about being resourced to scrape by. You need surge capacity, and it is not just for coronavirus. The timely provision of pathology services has a direct impact on patient care. Delays to diagnosis lead to delays in treatment and South Australians stay sicker for longer. Delays can result in an outpatient deteriorating to the degree they need to visit an emergency department, and for existing inpatients it can lead to longer bed stays.

As a public healthcare provider, 100 per cent of SA Pathology's tests are bulk billed, whereas that would cease with a privatised service. If the Liberal government had proceeded with cuts and privatisation, the prices would have gone up and the public would be at risk. We have seen what happened when we privatised electricity. The same would have happened at SA Pathology. Every time they needed a blood test or any other pathology service, South Australians would have been out of pocket. We would have seen quality reduced, delays to diagnosis and delays to treatment and South Australians staying sicker for longer.

The work of SA Pathology includes the food and environment laboratory, which identifies the toxins and their source and provides evidence for prosecution of companies that breach our state's—

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

A quorum having been formed:

S.E. ANDREWS: In the event of a suspected white powder incident, SA Pathology's PC3 lab can test the powder to determine if it is anthrax. When South Australians are injured or ill and need life-saving blood transfusions, SA Pathology ensures patients receive the blood and platelets they need. We need the South Australian government to continue investing in our medical science skills and for doctors and nurses, workforce and capability, as it is a key economic driver to support good health outcomes.

The COVID-19 statistics provided SA Health officials with real-time information that helped keep South Australians safe during the most uncertain times of the pandemic. These workers have been tireless in their efforts to respond to the emerging challenges of COVID-19. They provided South Australians with accurate results and a strong level of assurance in the most uncertain of times. We thank those who have worked long hours in the morning, late at night, throughout weekends, including multiple double shifts.

Throughout the Marshall Liberal government's term, South Australians have seen attack after attack on our public assets and the planned implementation of a large-scale privatisation agenda. SA Pathology was one of those assets facing the prospect of privatisation in 2019 as part of the Marshall government's proposed array of cuts. The now Malinauskas government recognised the importance of these assets and fought alongside Professions Australia against the proposed cuts and privatisation.

We are very fortunate that SA Pathology was saved. Without it, who knows how we would have fared responding to COVID-19. I can assure the house and South Australians that the Malinauskas government will continue to fight against privatisation and have committed to keeping SA Pathology in public hands.

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (11:41): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraphs (b) and (c)

The motion would now read, 'That this house thank the hardworking pathologists, scientists, technicians and nurses for their amazing work looking after South Australia during the COVID-19 pandemic.'

SA Pathology and indeed all our frontline workers have been key to South Australia's success in battling the COVID-19 global pandemic. Their service and dedication have been paramount to our state's standing as one of the safest places in the world, and our testing regime really was the cornerstone of our success. In particular, I would like to acknowledge SA Pathology clinical lead Dr Tom Dodd, who led and implemented a world-leading, innovative regime which included many firsts.

People may forget this, but we were the first jurisdiction in the Southern Hemisphere to establish a drive-through testing clinic for COVID, second only in the world by a mere matter of days. In many instances we had testing rates that were amongst the highest in the world and that is something that we can all be very proud of. To put it simply, SA Pathology saved lives and so, too, did all our pathologists, our scientists, our technicians and nurses. On behalf of the opposition I would like to sincerely thank each and every one of them for their diligent work in looking after South Australians during the COVID-19 pandemic.

It is a shame that the member for Gibson's motion politicises what is a truly important matter. The former Liberal government had no plans to privatise SA Pathology. Indeed, the motion as it stands is based on factual inaccuracies, so much so that the opposition simply could not support it without our amendments, and I suspect that the member knew that.

The SPEAKER: The amendment has been moved and seconded, but I am reminded, too, that other members may wish to make a contribution and, of course, those contributions may contemplate further amendments. However, in an earlier exchange with the member for Schubert there was not a member seeking the call, in which case it may be that we move immediately to that business. There being no other member seeking the call, if the member speaks, she closes debate.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (11:45): I oppose the amendment, and the motion should stand.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION WEEK

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (11:45): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises National Reconciliation Week between 27 May and 3 June 2022;
- (b) acknowledges that National Reconciliation Week is a time for all South Australians to learn about our shared histories, cultures and achievements, and to explore how each of us can contribute to achieving reconciliation;
- (c) congratulates the Malinauskas Labor government on its Aboriginal affairs policies, including a commitment to state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart and \$1 million for the design and delivery of new statues and monuments to commemorate South Australian Aboriginal leaders; and
- (d) recognises that, as part of National Reconciliation Week, Eddie Mabo Day will be celebrated on 3 June 2022 and commemorates his successful efforts to overturn the legal fiction of terra nullius or 'land belonging to no-one'.

Naa Mani. Ngai Nari Catherine Warooyoo Hutchesson. Marni Naa pudni Parliament House. Kurna Miyurna Ngadlu. Kurna Yarta Tampinithi. Ngaitayla.

We gather here today on the land of the Kurna people, land that was never ceded, land on which Kurna people have native title and on which we hope to walk side by side to reconciliation.

This week is National Reconciliation Week and is bookended by two key dates, starting on 27 May as the anniversary of the 1967 referendum, when Australians voted overwhelmingly to change the constitution to allow the commonwealth to make laws for Aboriginal people to help address inequalities and include them in the census. Culminating on Friday 3 June, this year it is the 30th anniversary of the High Court decision in the Mabo case, recognising native title and overturning the legal fiction of terra nullius. This year's theme is 'Be brave. Make change.'

On the weekend, I attended the Blackwood Reconciliation Walk, hosted by the Blackwood Reconciliation Group. The walk is celebrating its 25th anniversary. It begins in the heart of Blackwood and wanders down Shepherds Hill Road to Colebrook Reconciliation Park. I would like to congratulate the group on the success of the day. It was also great to be joined by the member for Hurtle Vale and our newly elected federal member, Louise Miller-Frost.

On Saturday, I was brave and chose to acknowledge in the Kurna language Kurna elders and other Aboriginal people from other lands. It was a nervous attempt, and I would like to thank local Kurna elder Uncle Tamaru for his teachings and guidance. I am getting better, but these are only a few but very important, words. I look forward to expanding my vocabulary and making change.

I know some of my colleagues are also taking the time to learn. It is a great start but there is much to do.

Reconciliation SA does excellent work to advance the cause of reconciliation in our state, led by co-chairs Professor Peter Buckskin and Mrs Helen Connolly, and CEO Shona Reid. I am glad to be a member of this government, one that outlined an extensive Aboriginal affairs agenda for the future, ahead of the state election—reform that will be led by the first Aboriginal man to be elected as Attorney-General, Kyam Maher.

At the heart of this is our commitment to state-based implementation of the call from the Uluru Statement from the Heart: Voice, Treaty and Truth. This includes Voice: a legally enshrined Aboriginal voice to the South Australian parliament. The model for this will be worked on in close consultation with Aboriginal communities to ensure it can truly be a voice for them and their aspirations.

Treaty: agreements between the State of South Australia and Aboriginal people. This will pick up on the work of the Weatherill Labor government, which signed the Buthera Agreement with the Narungga people in Australia's first agreement in the treaty process. While the process was cancelled by the Marshall Liberal government, we have committed to restarting the work of the treaty.

Truth: reconciliation cannot be achieved without recognising the wrongs of the past and the present. Labor governments around the country are working hard to deliver on the Uluru Statement. Victoria has established the First Peoples' Assembly of Victoria, which is currently setting up a framework for treaty and has established the Yoorrook Justice Commission for truth telling, which has begun hearing from elders.

The Northern Territory is developing its treaty process, with a final report on consultation and recommendations for a framework to be handed down by the Treaty Commissioner later this year. The Albanese federal government has committed to delivering the Uluru Statement from the Heart, including a referendum on changing the constitution to enshrine a First Nations voice within its first term.

This process will not be easy. It is long, difficult work, but the Malinauskas government is committed to achieving meaningful and genuine reconciliation with Aboriginal people. The Malinauskas government also has a range of other commitments to achieve reconciliation and support Aboriginal South Australians. We will legislate to protect and strengthen Nunga courts. These Aboriginal sentencing courts, the first of their kind in Australia, now operate in almost every Australian jurisdiction and are found to deliver strong outcomes to reduce reoffending by Aboriginal offenders.

We have committed to providing \$1 million to the design and delivery of statues and monuments of South Australian Aboriginal leaders, in close consultation with Aboriginal people. We have committed to recruiting 15 additional Indigenous rangers to the National Parks and Wildlife Service to draw upon 2,000 generations of Aboriginal knowledge for caring for and protecting country. I was glad to join the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on the weekend to reannounce this as part of budget week.

There is a lot of work to be done to close the gap, to achieve reconciliation and to deliver better outcomes with and for Aboriginal South Australians. The Malinauskas Labor government is committed to doing the hard work. We look forward to working with Aboriginal communities right around the state and delivering our agenda.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:51): I am grateful for the opportunity to rise to speak on this motion—coming to the house, happily, when it does in the course of National Reconciliation Week—that, as paragraph (a) of the motion notes in terms that appear were moved by the minister in the other place, the Hon. Kyam Maher, the house recognises National Reconciliation Week between Friday 27 May and Friday 3 June. So we are in the course of it.

At the outset, I indicate that I will move to amend the motion, insofar as I would move to remove paragraph (c) and replace it as follows:

- (c) Recognises progress towards reconciliation during the Marshall Liberal Government including the occasion of Dr Roger Thomas's address to parliament on 3 December 2020.

In so doing, I will come back in a moment to what was that very significant occasion on 3 December 2020 when Dr Roger Thomas had the occasion to address this house. It was the first such occasion, as far as I am aware, and a very significant occasion it was indeed. I had real pleasure in attending the Reconciliation SA breakfast on Friday morning to meet and greet Dr Thomas.

I said to him, 'Hey, it's wonderful to see you,' and we remembered together what a happy day it was on 3 December 2021 when Dr Thomas, adjacent the Speaker's chair, stood on the floor of this parliament and addressed the house in relation to work that had been done at that time towards a better reconciliation. We know that this is work that we continue to do together. It is involving both symbols and matters of substance, and National Reconciliation Week is replete with both.

I have mentioned the Reconciliation SA annual breakfast, which was held on Friday morning. I think it is important to point out to members of this house that there were 1,400 or so in attendance at that breakfast. It was MC'd by a ring-in, by a fellow from New South Wales. He could not help but remark on a number of occasions that this was by far and away the biggest such occasion nationally in the course of Reconciliation Week. In coming together in that expression, it was a stunning moment for someone from outside this state, and it was remarked upon on several occasions on Friday morning.

Reconciliation SA is celebrating 20 years this year and so, as well as the celebration of 20 years, which was another happy occasion a week or so earlier for everyone so happily to come together for that breakfast that is held each year, 1,400 or so in attendance is a great show of solidarity in relation to work that has been done both by Reconciliation SA and by everyone throughout the state over the course of those 20 years.

These were not all matters addressed by Dr Thomas in the course of his remarks, but the Marshall Liberal government's achievements—it goes to the amendment but more broadly—within the scope of this area included an investment of \$9.1 million into infrastructure upgrades in 15 regional and remote Aboriginal committees, including road repairs, improvements to waste management and community infrastructure upgrades.

At Lot Fourteen, it established The Circle—First Nations Entrepreneur Hub to support Aboriginal innovation, entrepreneurship and employment. It funded with the federal government the establishment of a First Nations arts and culture centre now being built at Lot Fourteen for opening in 2025. It provided annual funding totalling \$4.03 million in 2020-21 in grants and other support for Aboriginal arts and crafts.

It appointed a Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People to assist Aboriginal families and communities to keep children safe in culturally appropriate ways and develop policies and practices that promote the safety and wellbeing of Aboriginal children over-represented in the child protection system. It implemented South Australia's first standalone Aboriginal housing strategy, backed by \$83 million of state and commonwealth funding. It is not just words but actions and a record of achievement in circumstances where a great deal is still to be done but there is also much to celebrate.

So, with that amendment, commending as I do the balance of the member for Waite's motion, I would simply highlight three more things of significance that have occurred in this year's National Reconciliation Week, the first of which relates to the week in particular.

After the Reconciliation SA breakfast that was attended by 1,400 people, I had the great honour to go across the road to Government House to sit alongside the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, as well as the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the former Premier the Hon. Steven Marshall, who led this significant work over these years, among many other distinguished guests of Her Excellency the Governor Frances Adamson AC, on the occasion of the first flying at Government House of the four flags: the Australian flag, the state flag, the Aboriginal flag and the Torres Strait Islander flag. All four flags, since Friday morning, have been flying proudly at the entrance to Government House. We talk about both symbols and substance, and there it is writ large.

I indicate that I am doubly proud because Andrew Frazer, the legendary national Volunteer of the Year, was the one to build that stonework for the flag platform. Andrew Frazer, from Bridgewater, was present and I was so glad to see him there. It is a proud moment as well to reflect

on the fact, and I acknowledge that the Minister for Education is present in the chamber, that the flying of the flags that is taking place now coincided with the occasion of the address of Dr Thomas. One thing I was proud to do in the course of my time as Speaker was to add the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags to fly in this chamber.

I will finish with the words of Dr Lynn Arnold AO at the cathedral last Sunday. In relation to reconciliation more broadly, he said, quoting author Ursula Le Guin:

'You can go home...so long as you understand that home is a place you have never been.'

So it is that we need to understand that a reconciling home-coming would bring us to a different place from that from where we had departed.

Let this work continue.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:02): I rise to make a very brief contribution to this debate and simply to recognise that I will be opposing the amendment put by the member for Heysen. Therefore, the motion I will be supporting includes the original paragraph (c) which congratulates the Malinauskas Labor government on its Aboriginal affairs policies and, further, that I will be moving an amendment, which introduces a paragraph (e). Therefore, I move:

That a paragraph (e) be added to the original motion, as follows:

(e) recognises the contribution of Dr Roger Thomas in his address to the parliament on 3 December 2020.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (12:04): I rise to speak in support of the member for Waite's motion and I also acknowledge my opposition to the member for Heysen's amendment and support the new amendment moved by the member for Elizabeth.

I want to focus my comments on the impact of Indigenous culture on our South Australian arts and culture sector. Reconciliation is at the heart of South Australia's support for the arts and culture sector. Self-determination and Aboriginal-led organisations have been supported to bring Aboriginal arts and culture to the forefront of our state arts ecology.

Arts South Australia has for a long time employed an Aboriginal arts officer to foster extensive networks and engage Aboriginal people and their communities in strategic arts and culture initiatives and provide project funding opportunities, not only to ensure equitable access but to embrace the rich history expressed through Aboriginal arts and culture in this state.

Aboriginal artists have worked alongside non-Aboriginal artists sharing stories, knowledge and skills to give ancient and powerful truths a new voice through artistic expression, through public artworks that stand as long-term reminders of a past, acknowledging the present and, importantly, giving hope to the future. Major events have showcased Aboriginal culture through song and dance. Being in the audience of such events is always a true privilege, it is powerful and moving and is a stark reminder of the journey of Aboriginal people and the impact of colonisation.

Earlier this year, the government released the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Arts Strategy for South Australia and, through that work, the pathway for true reconciliation will continue to evolve under this government. In this National Reconciliation Week, we are called upon to be brave and to make change, and our government is proud to be doing this by continuing the implementation of this groundbreaking strategy. The development of the strategy was Aboriginal-led and in consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts and cultural participants and a wide range of other stakeholders.

Arts South Australia has delivered a number of initiatives and supported partnerships during the strategy's development phase. Some of these include:

- funding for the Adelaide Fringe to distribute \$100,000 in grants and programs to Aboriginal artists, following on from successful programs in previous years;
- a partnership with the City of Adelaide to fund Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander professional development grants to provide opportunities for ATSI artists and creatives in the public art realm, with a total fund of \$100,000; and

- pilot projects and case studies with over \$200,000 funding granted during the development of the strategy resulting in several successful projects that exemplify new ways of working and best practice, in addition to embodying the aspirations of the strategy and actions within the implementation plan.

The comprehensive implementation plan sits alongside the strategy to ensure that the government can be timely and responsive to the changing needs of the ATSI arts and culture sector.

Arts South Australia is looking forward to welcoming an Aboriginal person into a dedicated Aboriginal senior project manager role to continue work on the implementation of the strategy. The employment of a dedicated Aboriginal-identified role to lead and enable the implementation of the strategy, drive policy and strategic direction and provide artists and sector support is a key commitment of the implementation plan. Other aspects of the implementation plan include:

- maintaining support for emerging Aboriginal artist groups to enable their long-term transition to funded organisations;
- establishing a panel to support and guide Arts South Australia on Aboriginal arts and culture;
- engaging strategy ambassadors to promote the strategy and the South Australian Aboriginal arts and culture sector;
- establishing a South Australian Aboriginal arts network to enable peer-to-peer networking and the strengthening of relationships;
- developing the digital skills of Aboriginal artists, groups and organisations to support their practice and growth; and
- building leadership pathways, cultural career pathways and board and executive level professional development opportunities.

The South Australian Malinauskas Labor government provides a dedicated program of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander grants through its Arts and Culture Grants Program. These and other funding programs are open to all South Australian artists—a diversity of projects and outcomes are supported—many of which promote and reflect reconciliation at its heart, where artists come together as equals, where cultural heritage is respected, acknowledged and embraced, and where project outcomes touch the lives of many. There is shared understanding and a building of trust and respect across expanded networks and relationships that will guide future partnerships and inspire hope.

One such example is the ActNow Theatre, which recently received a \$10,000 grant to create a First Nations board internship which will include attendance at board meetings, mentorship meetings, a governance diploma through the Institute of Community Directors in South Australia and paid study tours. The aim of this position is to work towards more young First Nations people being in a position to take up governance and leadership roles in the arts industry, which is critical.

ActNow has also received \$25,000 to build on its successful First Nations Pathway Program. This program will offer 10 to 15 young Aboriginal artists a week-long intensive introduction to the performing arts and film industries. We also have the APY Art Centre Collective Aboriginal Corporation, which has received \$30,000 to allow leading APY artists to create large-scale collaborative artworks for an international showcase. Nineteen artists will be employed in the creation of six paintings, telling the story of the deep talent and diversity emerging from the contemporary APY art movement.

Engagement through arts and culture provides support in achieving the Malinauskas Labor government's reconciliation commitment. I commend the original motion, with the member for Elizabeth's amendments, to the house.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (12:11): Thank you everyone for your contributions. We support the current amendment and move that motion. I close the debate.

The SPEAKER: I observe, too, that there are a number of amendments proposed. I turn first to the member for Elizabeth observing, too, that the member for Heysen has indicated amendments.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do not speak again, do I?

The SPEAKER: We have the amendment and it is seconded, and I will put the question. Before I do that, I will observe that the member for Elizabeth, as I understand it, is seeking to introduce a new paragraph (e). For guidance to members, and for the benefit of the house, I observe that the member for Heysen is seeking to remove paragraph 3, which I take to be paragraph (c), and replace it with a new paragraph 3, which I take to be paragraph (c). I put the question in relation to the amendment moved by the member for Elizabeth.

Amendment carried.

The SPEAKER: Turning to the member for Heysen, it may be that he does not wish to press his amendment?

Mr Teague: Well, it's wrapped up.

The SPEAKER: Very well. The question before the Chair is that the motion as amended be agreed to.

Mr Odenwalder: That's just my amendment?

The SPEAKER: Yes, that's right member for Elizabeth, and the member for Heysen I see concurs and is not pressing his amendment.

Motion as amended carried.

YOUTH WEEK

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (12:13): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises Youth Week, which runs from 13 to 22 May 2022;
- (b) acknowledges the 266,000 young people between the ages of 12 and 24 years who live in South Australia;
- (c) acknowledges the contribution that these young people make to our state's social, cultural and economic life; and
- (d) congratulates the Malinauskas Labor government on its commitment to build five new technical colleges which will help more young people finish school with skills for their future.

I would like to speak to the motion regarding SA Youth Week, which was celebrated between 13 and 22 May 2022.

SA Youth Week is an opportunity for us to celebrate the lives, accomplishments and talents of young people. Young South Australians between the ages of 12 and 24, almost 266,000 of them, bring significant perspectives, talents and skills to this state. Across 10 days, SA Youth Week celebrated young people by hosting dozens of events across the state.

The Department of Human Services provided grants to 15 councils and organisations across metropolitan and regional parts of SA to host these events. These grants allowed young people from across SA—from the Adelaide Hills, the Limestone Coast, Eyre Peninsula, Victor Harbor, the Riverland, Gawler and the Mid North—to get together, to catch up with new and old friends and to have fun and learn new skills. From radio open mics and virtual reality parties, through to forums and educational events, it was a fantastic, inclusive week where young people's voices were heard by government, by the public and by each other.

One excellent event that many of my colleagues attended was with the Commissioner for Children and Young People's new statewide SRC at the Festival Theatre. This saw around 160 students from years 10, 11 and 12 from all corners of the state come together to talk about the issues facing them and their communities. Personally, I was particularly pleased to attend and sit alongside students from Modbury High School and Torrens Valley Christian School from my electorate, as well as the wonderful students from Endeavour College from the electorate of Florey.

We know as well that more and more young people are becoming politically engaged. We are seeing more young people look towards us as their local representatives to make decisions on

their behalf that secure a better future for them and the following generations. Personally, I have seen a huge number of young women reach out and thank me and my colleagues for showing them a way forward in politics.

Amongst the young people in our state are future leaders, policymakers, healthcare professionals, tradies, artists, educators and, hopefully, MPs. This generation of young people will hopefully be one day sitting where we are in the Parliament of South Australia and creating policies for their communities. Hopefully, we leave strong democratic foundations for them.

Between January and March this year, over 14,000 young people enrolled to vote in South Australia for the first time. In total, almost 120,000 people aged 18 to 24 went to the polls in March and, as we know, lots of them helped elect this Malinauskas Labor government. Young people of South Australia have entrusted us across the chamber as their members of parliament to create policies that will leave behind a better future than we inherited.

The Department of Human Services is committed to working with young people to develop policies that best serve them. I wish to thank the Minister for Human Services and member for Hurtle Vale, Nat Cook, for her commitment to establishing a Youth Advisory Council in South Australia. This Youth Advisory Council will provide a direct avenue of communication between the young people of South Australia and the state government, and I hope that having so many young people in state parliament will also be an avenue for that communication.

Future youth-related policies that come through this parliament will have been significantly informed by the knowledge and views of young people in SA. It is vital that the policies that impact young people have been created with their voice. The views and perspectives of young people are important for our government. For me, personally, it is incredibly humbling to have the privilege to represent people in their 20s in this house, something that I take very seriously. I must also make mention of the member for Narungga, who apparently does not get mentioned enough as also being part of the lower house 20s club, so I thank him for his voice in this place as well.

Young people were disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 in South Australia, making up the largest age group in insecure work, with 44 per cent of jobs lost in South Australia in the first year of the pandemic held by young people. This left one in three either unemployed or underemployed, yet only 12 per cent were eligible for JobKeeper. Our hospitality, construction and arts sectors—some of the biggest employers of young people in SA—were almost entirely brought to a standstill in early 2020.

Whether directly or indirectly, through job loss, social isolation and financial insecurity, COVID-19 led to significant levels of mental health issues amongst young people in South Australia. That is why the Malinauskas Labor government is committing \$50 million to employ 100 new mental health and learning support specialists to support school students across South Australia. I would particularly like to thank the Minister for Education for his work on that as well.

The Malinauskas Labor government is passionate about providing young people with the best opportunities to thrive. We are committed to helping young people achieve their goals right here in South Australia, to train here, to work here and, eventually, to raise their families here. Every young person can expect to be provided with ample education and employment opportunities under a Malinauskas Labor government, which is the exact reason why our government has committed to build five new technical colleges in South Australia, with \$175 million set to be invested into three new metropolitan-based colleges and two in regional South Australia.

The locations have been announced as Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Tonsley, Findon and The Heights school, which will benefit so many students in my area in the north-eastern suburbs. The first of these technical colleges is due to open in 2024. By 2026, all five will be open and operating with students undertaking courses in building, construction, community services, hospitality, engineering and information technology.

To the youth of South Australia, we as a government extend our gratitude. Thank you for your resilience over the last few years and for the exciting future that you are all helping to shape. The Department of Human Services will shortly begin developing the state's new three-year Youth Action Plan. I really encourage young people to watch out for the various opportunities to have input into this plan and to have your say on how you want to see our government supporting you.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:20): I thank the member for Newland for bringing a motion about Youth Week to the attention of the chamber. Obviously the opposition endorses much of the sentiment that was just expressed and enthusiastically supports (a), (b) and (c) in the motion. I will have some comments about (d), and I foreshadow that I will indicate an amendment that I will get to in due course to add an (e). I hope that will have the wholehearted support of the Labor benches, as I think it adds greatly to the motion and helps ensure that the people of South Australia, and the young people of South Australia in particular, can have full expression of their needs met. I will get to that in a couple of minutes.

Firstly, I want to talk about the things on which there is absolutely no contention, and Youth Week is an important week. As Minister for Education, I appreciated the engagement the Department for Education was able to have with a wide range of youth organisations around South Australia, from the large NGOs, the youth affairs councils to the smaller locally based ones; indeed, many councils, I also acknowledge, have engagement in Youth Week by running Youth Week events.

Youth Week is not the only week in the calendar identifying and noting the particular importance of young people in our state's quality. The motion ahead of us acknowledges that 266,000 young people between the ages of 12 and 24 years live in South Australia. I have not checked the stats, but I will take the member for Newland's word for it. I am sure that it certainly sounds about right. Those 266,000 young people, as the member for Newland says, do make a contribution to our state's social, cultural and economic life.

Again, as Minister for Education, it was an extraordinary privilege, on a daily basis really, to be invited into schools, childcare centres, preschools and kindies and engage with young people, including those aged under 12, but indeed all those young people of school age and up to 24, as the motion identifies, who do contribute in that way whether it is through their economic contribution and doing important jobs that help our society run.

We have also some outstanding young entrepreneurs in South Australia. I think of companies like Paolo Sebastian, who at school effectively saw that business start to flourish well before the age of 25 and not long afterwards was dressing Hollywood superstars at the Oscars and so forth.

Young people in South Australia are brilliant. There are so many extraordinary young people who are leading the way, and I acknowledge them. I acknowledge the extraordinary contribution that so many other young people make in their engagement economically with the community, doing jobs that people need done and engaging socially, building their experience that in many cases will lead them to other jobs in the years ahead.

The Marshall Liberal government worked really hard to help them along the way in developing improved pathways opportunities so that when children are in primary school, which is now tier 6, and they go into year 7 they are in high school as a result of the work done by the Marshall Liberal government. In high school, their engagement with the vocational education training and pathways now begins in year 7 as a result of the reforms of the Marshall Liberal government.

It gives them opportunities to engage in work practices from a young age, to engage in a project we called the World of Work Challenge, and I hope that the new minister will keep that going. I think it will serve him well in the four years ahead if he does and if he maintains those VET reforms.

That engagement between the Department for Education and employers and industry to give more opportunities to young people to explore what their passions might be in a real-world sense I think is tremendously opportune and should not be constrained to just schools that say they have a note of vocational education training pathways. It should indeed be something that all schools across South Australia are offering, and that was our plan.

Noting that the Malinauskas Labor government does have a particular commitment of \$175 million for five new technical colleges, I do not want to be churlish and remove what is ultimately a self-congratulatory clause to an otherwise very strong motion. I thought we would leave that in there because I look forward to seeing the detail of what the Malinauskas Labor government will offer, but I move to amend the motion by adding for balance:

- (e) congratulates the Marshall Liberal government on delivering five new public schools and developing more than 100 major school upgrades as part of a record \$1.5 billion commitment to public education during its term in office.

It was not a motion that I was looking to bring on today purely in its own right but, having had the government introduce through (d) of the motion a pat on the back for the work they claim they will do, I think it is only reasonable to acknowledge that, alongside that \$175 million commitment by the Malinauskas Labor government to what they propose to do over the next, I assume, four years, we should also acknowledge that an enormous amount of work has been done and that support for our public education system in South Australia, as an extraordinary enabler of opportunity for South Australia's young people to find their passion, explore that passion and connect it to a job and a career in the years ahead, is a bipartisan mission.

It is an ambition shared by everyone in the chamber, and I hope that the government will therefore see fit to support the proposed amendment, which will highlight something the community calls for and longs for: it wants us to work together. Rather than seek to remove the Malinauskas Labor government's pat on their back, I simply seek to add an acknowledgment that I trust the Malinauskas Labor government will acknowledge that there was a substantial legacy of work provided to them when they came to government.

Indeed, of those five new public schools, four of them were open at the beginning of this year and another one will open at the beginning of next year. I take the opportunity again, as I have a couple of times previously, to hold out the olive branch of friendship to the Minister for Education and thank him for reaching out to me and inviting me to turn the sod with him at the Rostrevor school, Morialta Secondary College. It was something that he did not have to do, but it was a good thing to do. I think that the community appreciated that the government did that. I got a lot of good feedback saying, 'This new Minister for Education, good on him,' and good on him and good on the government for continuing the work on that school at Rostrevor.

The Treasurer, the Premier and other ministers have been at pains to say that the Malinauskas Labor government is different from the Weatherill and Rann governments; indeed, the Weatherill government was proposing to sell that patch of land for housing. Minister Boyer and this government are going to continue the work started by the Marshall Liberal government and complete a school there, which will serve the children and young people in the eastern and north-eastern suburbs very well for decades to come.

There are five new public schools and 100 major upgrades, with a total commitment in the order of \$1.5 billion. There are minor works to every single public education site in South Australia announced during the COVID budgets. This is significant work to upgrade our public education facilities to increase capacity, to build capacity and to help those important children and young people find pathways to successful jobs and successful careers.

I encourage members to support the amendment because I think that by supporting the amendment the house can demonstrate harmony, which is something I know young people in our community look to us as community leaders to do. To oppose the amendment, I fear, would reflect badly. To support the amendment will cost the government nothing. It is just a pure acknowledgment that the Labor Party has come into government with a large body of work in public education done.

I want to also take the opportunity to acknowledge some of the very important work done around the year by other youth organisations. Children's Week is another week that we will see later in the year. I think the Children's Week Association has already opened nominations for awards, and I am sure the minister will enthusiastically engage with that organisation in the period to come as well. I note that the Department for Education, in conjunction with Government House, now offers a substantial program of civics and citizenship awards. I understand the minister presented those awards at Government House several weeks ago.

I take this opportunity to apologise to the organisers of that event and to the recipients that I was unable to join them on that occasion due to an unforeseen diary problem with some people who came to see me a bit early. I did not want to turn them away, so I had to miss watching those awards be presented. I certainly did not mean any slight to the minister, the Governor or the recipients of those awards. I am sure they got on fine without me. I understand the minister was in attendance and was very well received.

With that moment of harmony and encouragement to the government, I look forward to the remainder of the debate. I put it to members that if they oppose the amendment for (e), then how can they hold their heads up and think that (d) is a worthwhile part of the motion? But we will support it in any case because we are supporting harmony and bipartisanship.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (12:30): I rise to support the member for Newland's motion regarding Youth Week, which I will not repeat, but basically this is a motion supporting the great work of the sector that supports and works with young people to improve our society. It might be surprising to the member for Morialta to know that I will not be supporting his amendment. In the spirit of a lesson in history, I do not recall such generosity of acknowledgement of the expenditure of the previous Labor government prior to the 2018 election. In the spirit of equality and even-handedness, I think we will just call that part of it quits.

I would like to first of all commend the member for Newland for this motion. I would like to wish the member for Newland a happy birthday for 22 May, graduating from what is known as the definition of youth in many countries but, in many other countries and in my world, 'youth' still covers the age of 26. I say congratulations to her and a huge happy birthday.

I really want to speak to this fantastic motion to acknowledge some of the wonderful work and events that happened during Youth Week. Specifically, I want to talk about the National Schools Constitutional Convention that was held during the week before Youth Week. It is an incredibly powerful forum where young people from all across Australia get together, pre-COVID times in person, and debate many constitutional issues. This year, some of the debate I heard was about the bill of rights, so it is quite intense. It really is building very strong value sets and capability in our young leaders in their schools.

I was pleased to attend at least part of their session here in the Old Chamber with a dozen young people from across South Australia, including Duom Akuei from Trinity College Senior and Callum Barrott-Walsh from Cardijn College. Callum is one of my constituents, and he is someone to watch in terms of future leadership, let me tell you. There were Amber Brock-Fabel from University Senior College and Leela Cotton Kenny from Mitcham Girls High School. I am a proud Mitcham Girls graduate, I think the only one who has come into parliament. May many more follow.

There were Lucia De Ross-Field from Adelaide High, Kate Dospisil from Adelaide High, Joseph Holmes from Glenunga International, Emily Pilmore from Kingston Community School, Elena Scullen-Howe from Glenunga International High, Alessandro Tedesco from University Senior College, Tom Webster Arbizu from Marden Senior College and Masoumah Zaki from Roma Mitchell Secondary School. They are doing a great job, representing young people in their communities. This is how we need to do policy for young people. At the heart of the work we do is listening to our constituents, and these young people were outstanding. Congratulations to all of you on participating in that.

Also, I was very pleased to open Youth Week with the YACSA team that was at say.kitchen on a very cool Friday evening. There was a bit of rain as well, so we were lucky to have that event inside. The YACSA team partnered with the Department of Human Services to host that launch in say.kitchen, which is a terrific place if you are ever looking for a great social-impact type venue to hold an event.

The event saw a wonderful Welcome to Country done by Isaac. We had Adelaide-based Nukunu singer-songwriter Tilly Tjala Thomas, who is fantastic. I got the chance to talk to quite a few people in the room from different organisations, who are very keen again to engage and contribute towards improvements in our community, people from Kura Yerlo, the Enabled Youth Disability Network, Young Carers and the South Australian Youth Forum.

There were young people from all across Adelaide and some from regional South Australia, the YMCA. I was really pleased to open that Youth Week and kick off what was a great conversation at a whole range of events, which I am sure many members attended in their own communities. I cannot wait to participate in the planning and bring some of that vision to life for next year.

The Commissioner for Children and Young People hosted a statewide SRC, which I know many members also attended. That was held in the Festival Centre. I was at a table with young

people from Port Lincoln, Kimba, Ceduna and Whyalla, and some of the insights that they were able to provide me on behalf of young people in their community were so helpful. I have since spoken to the Minister for Education on a number of matters, and I know that there is resolution coming to some barriers for success for young people in some of those regional areas.

I am really pleased to participate in being a conduit to get those messages across, and I look forward to visiting those young people we have set up a process to communicate with. I know other members talk to young people from across South Australia. It was a great event, so congratulations to Helen Connolly and her team on bringing that together. It was very good.

The fourth event that I attended that really was extraordinary was in my region, the Onkaparinga Youth Recognition Awards. Again, I am sure there were like awards in a whole range of other council areas. I attended that with Simon McMahon, the acting mayor. Also there was Amanda Rishworth, who is now the federal Minister for Social Services. Congratulations to our local federal MP. She is going to be extraordinary in that role. I cannot imagine anyone better. She was there on the night. The member for Kaurana, the health minister, was there and also the member for Reynell, the minister for multiple different portfolios.

There were 90-odd nominations for different recognition awards and the winners were Reef Fahey for contribution to community, who did 400 kilometres of waterskiing to create awareness for Down syndrome and Ski for Life. There was Amiria Mahuika for learning success. She has a passion for singing, writing and music, which has seen her doing tertiary studies towards a career path as a singer-songwriter.

Isaiah Muller, despite losing both eyes to cancer early in life is absolutely excelling at humanities, science and chess. He is very witty as well, I would have to say, having met Isaiah. I am sure the Speaker would appreciate those combinations and his success. Elsie Procter, winner of the Business and Social Enterprise award, loves baking. She is 11, I believe, and has a business venture utilising contactless delivery with some extraordinary brownies. I cannot get the gooey middle and she has got it nailed at the age of, I think, 11.

I have heard about Youth Worker of the Year, Leah Stacey, and come into contact with her across the years with my history of working with youth in the not-for-profit sector. Leah supports young mums to re-engage with education and help create a brighter future for them and their children.

With my last little bit, I would just like to say that the Youth Action Plan is underway. We will be, as a department, releasing a new Youth Action Plan and it will be one that means something. It will not just be a tick list of success or list of things that were already underway under the previous government as was the last Youth Action Plan—and I challenge members to tell me otherwise. This new one will be saying something, it will mean something, it will be informed by young people and it will help to contribute towards resilience, strength and a successful future. I commend the motion. I will not be supporting the amendment.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (12:41): I rise just to speak very briefly in support of the member for Newland's motion and to reflect on the short time that I had at the statewide SRC at the Festival Centre. This has already been referred to by the member for Newland and the member for Hurtle Vale as well but it was a really impressive event.

Unfortunately, I was pressed for time, as you often are in these jobs, and was racing from one event to get there and then leave quite promptly to get to another one, so I only had about 45 minutes. In hindsight, I would have liked much more. I am also often pretty nervous about events where politicians sit down with young people and do the old it is good to be with the youth and pretend that you are really up to date and up to speed and in touch with all the things that people younger than myself are, which I do not think we ever truly are even when we have kids of our own.

I am always starting from a point of being very cautious in how I engage with young people like that and take care not to patronise them, not to pretend that I understand perfectly the issues that they are dealing with but also be really keen to listen. If my years in different roles in government have taught me anything, they have taught me that so much is always lost between the views of anyone in the community, I guess, but more than any group I think young people, as that is communicated and translated and passed through the line until it gets up to cabinet ministers and

the Premier. The honesty, frankness and detail of that message is often watered down and lost, and what decision-makers end up with at the cabinet table is nothing like what is actually being expressed by young people in terms of what they actually want their elected representative to do for them.

I guess what I am saying is that although I am always careful when entering something like that not to be patronising, I do think they are incredibly valuable exercises and I want to commend the Commissioner for Children and Young People for putting it together and giving us the opportunity to be there. Before I finish, I just want to mention that there were some really valuable things that I took away from the 45 minutes I had with the 10 or so young people at my table.

We went around in a circle, and I explained to them, 'I am a bit short on time, but I would like you just to be completely frank with me about what you would be doing if you were in my job to better assist you in your pathway through school.' That was all I said. I gave no preamble about what the Malinauskas Labor government was doing. I held off on the politics and left the floor open to them and there was an incredible theme that arose which was consistent as we went around.

That theme was about a desire from these young people to have possibly not part of the curriculum but at least something offered in high schools to assist them with a number of basic life skills—that was how they put it to me—the kind of life skills that they feel they need and are sometimes missing now in 2022. They were things like how to fill out your own tax return and how to better understand contracts, particularly mobile phone contracts.

Of course now, from a very young age, kids have their own mobile phone. I remember when I got my first mobile phone in 2002. I was at university. The member for Newland scoffs, because she may not have been alive when I got my first Panasonic mobile flip phone, which had a colour screen so I could play Snake in colour; it was very impressive. That was the first time I had had to enter any kind of contract, and I was just shy of 21 years old. I had never had to enter any kind of legally binding contract before, so I had never had to turn my mind to that issue. Of course, that is not the case now.

Other life skills mentioned include understanding the basics of a contract and what your obligations are, understanding how things like credit work, how you might pay off a loan, how you understand the pitfalls of things like Afterpay, which is now a really popular and commonplace method for people to buy something and pay for it later with. These people at the table explained that often they do not know before going into agreements like that, or even lease agreements on cars, that there might be a balloon payment or something like that at the end, where a larger sum of money is then owed, and they quite simply did not understand and were possibly taken advantage of by an overzealous salesperson.

They were the themes from the 10 young people I got to engage with, which were really consistent around making sure that the offerings in terms of equipping our young people with the life skills they need in this day and age are up to date and not still stuck in the past. I will finish by saying that I really appreciated their feedback and that I was pleased to say we had turned our minds to some of these things in terms of the commitment that this government made before the state election to update our financial literacy curriculum that is taught in schools and to make sure that there is no place for any financial institutions to teach financial literacy in our schools anymore.

Some members of this place will be familiar with the findings of the banking royal commission, which had some pretty strident remarks, which have been echoed by the 'barefoot investor', Scott Pape, about what has been found to be predatory behaviour on behalf of some banks and the Dollarmites accounts, which I had as a kid.

I am still scarred by the experience when, at the end of grade 6 in 1993, mum and I went into the Portland branch of the Commonwealth Bank, as I was finishing primary school—that is where it finished in Victoria then—to withdraw what I think was \$26, which, if I recall, was almost enough for me to buy a V33 cricket bat, which was the poor man's version of what Viv Richards and the Waugh brothers were using at the time. They came back out and said to mum that there was nothing left in the account because it had all been eaten up by fees. That was the first time I ever saw my mum really take someone to task like that. She was upset.

That stuck with me, and I read closely the findings of the royal commission, which spoke about the way financial institutions were using financial literacy programs in schools to make lifelong clients of people and to teach them. They had characters called Addy and Spen, who would teach you about saving money and spending money, and then Cred appeared as well, who was about teaching them the benefits of having credit.

I explained to them that we are moving to a curriculum in South Australia that we have committed to as the Malinauskas Labor government where financial institutions will not be able to do that work anymore. We will work, I hope, to be able to engage Scott Pape personally, if he is interested, to work on having an updated financial literacy program so that we deal with some of the things these young people mentioned around how to understand a mobile phone contract, how to understand how you might do a tax return yourself, how to understand the pitfalls of things like Afterpay.

I just wanted to add that to this debate today and commend the member for Newland for this motion and also commend the Commissioner for Children and Young People for convening the SRC and letting us all be a part of it. I hope it continues for many years to come, and I will make sure next time I set aside more time so I can sit down and hear these fantastic ideas from some of our young leaders.

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (12:49): I would like to thank the Minister for Human Services and the Minister for Education for their supportive comments. As to the speech by the member for Morialta, in the spirit of harmony I would like to thank him for his support on paragraph (d). However, we will be opposing the amendment to add the additional (e).

As the members opposite are aware, many of those commitments to new public schools were indeed funded by the Weatherill government and not funded by the Marshall government. I will acknowledge, however, that the amendment does use the term 'delivering'—a term I am very familiar with, as similar wording was often used regarding Labor's commitment and Labor's funding at Modbury Hospital, in my electorate. The term 'delivering' was used by the members opposite. I acknowledge that they have used the term 'delivering', but the fact remains that many of those school upgrades were funded by the previous Weatherill government. As a result, we will not be supporting the amendment today.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

INTERNATIONAL FIREFIGHTERS' DAY

Ms HUTCHESON (Waite) (12:51): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that 4 May 2022 was International Firefighters' Day;
- (b) remembers the firefighters who have lost their lives while serving our community;
- (c) expresses condolences to the family and friends of Louise Hincks who tragically died in January this year while fighting a fire at Coles in the state's South-East; and
- (d) shows its support and appreciation for firefighters who put themselves at risk and work hard every day to protect our community.

International Firefighters' Day is an incredibly important and significant day in our calendars. Firefighters, whether paid or unpaid, do not think twice about putting their lives on the line. In South Australia, we are fortunate to have the Metropolitan Fire Service (MFS), the Country Fire Service (CFS) and landowners who are farm firefighters as well. The MFS are a professional service. They are available night and day and work hard at structure fires, car accidents and hazardous events, and assist residents. They often work hand in hand with the CFS, especially when there are significant events. Firefighting or being a firefighter is a dangerous job. Hazards and risks come from anywhere at any time, and on International Firefighters' Day we remember those firefighters who have lost their lives while serving their communities.

In January this year, a fire broke out in our state's South-East at Coles. It was a hot and windy day and it was clear that it was going to be a significant event. Hundreds of firefighters answered the call from all over the state, including Victoria. As they always did, they got their page,

they jumped on a truck and they headed down to Coles. On 21 January, I recall hearing that a firefighter had sadly lost their life and that one had been seriously injured. As a firefighter, it hits hard when you hear something like that, but you do not automatically think it is going to be someone that you know quite well. As more information became available during the day it became clear that I did know the fallen firefighter, and as we gathered at our CFS station it was clear we also knew the injured firefighter, and quite well—very well.

I met Louise Hincks when our children were very little. Louise Hincks was an incredible lady. She worked hard for the CFS, not only as a volunteer firefighter but also for SAFECOM, and she supported other firefighters who had been injured or who had been through traumatic events and needed her support, both mentally and socially. She worked hard. She has two young children—well, they are teenagers now, but when our kids used to play together they played well and we would always sit around and chat, with my friend Liesa, and we would talk about our futures and what we saw for our kids.

Unfortunately, on 21 January Louise Hincks answered the call—as she would quite often—to head down to Coles. She was the Strike Team Leader, she worked hard, she ran her crew the Happy Valley brigade, and like any other fire that she had attended she always thought that she would be going home. Louise joined the CFS as a teenager. Both of her teenage daughters now are also CFS volunteer firefighters at the Happy Valley brigade. Her husband, Lindsay Hincks, also works in emergency services. Louise has always been well respected. Unfortunately, on that day, on 21 January, the worst happened: a tree fell and Louise lost her life. She never came home.

It is incredibly difficult to listen to the stories and the friendships she made and how much she impacted everybody in her career as a CFS firefighter, but it was very heartening to hear and watch the CFS family gather around her family and gather around each other. We welcomed her home on the South Eastern Freeway across all the bridges at all the exits. It was incredibly touching. From there also the events that happened afterwards—her memorial service and then another service at the CFS historical Museum at Naracoorte—all acknowledged her commitment not only to the CFS but to her community because in general CFS volunteers do not think about themselves: they just think about who they are protecting.

We give our condolences to Louise's family and friends and her brigade family. The Happy Valley CFS brigade are currently preparing a memorial of their own for Louise, which will be a peaceful place to reflect—for her daughters to go but also for her family and friends to go and remember.

Firefighters are often injured in their call of duty. It happens quite often, but death is not as often; in fact, it hardly happens. They are very well trained, they know what they are doing, they work hard to make sure they do their drills, they know what to do, but sometimes bad things happen, and in this case that is what happened down at Coles.

Firefighters are also injured psychologically when they attend fires. We need to throw our arms around those who were at that fire but who were also at other fires where they have been injured. The CFS Foundation works hard to support firefighters and their families, and we acknowledge the work they do and the hard times with which they have to deal with the firefighters that they look after.

I ask that this house shows its support and appreciation for all firefighters today and every day because every day a firefighter will get up in the middle of the night or in the middle of the day, leave work if they have to and go and support their community. We need to always remember that they are there when we need them but that they are also a person just like us, and so I ask that we all support this motion.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:57): With the very short amount of time I have, I wish to support this motion saluting all firefighters. I also am a volunteer with the CFS, and I want to salute all the firefighters, whether they be in the MFS, the CFS or the farmers who come out with their farm fire units, who do take incredible risks. I saw it during the Yumali-Netherton fire, where several people got burnt, including my brother, who had a burn on his hand. Another bloke copped some fairly severe burns, but due to the valuable work at the burns unit and his wearing that tight suit for about 18 months he is coming very good and still able to run his property.

In the very short time I have, I certainly want to show my support for Louise Hincks and the valuable work she did with SAFECOM and as a leader in the CFS. My absolute condolences go to her family. It is not something that we expect to see—someone out fighting fires and losing their life—so I honour her sacrifice.

I note that the CFS Foundation has been raising funds for a memorial garden for Louise Hincks at the Happy Valley CFS. They have managed to secure a grant of \$5,000 from the City of Onkaparinga to cover the costs of the project. There have also been donations of cherry blossom trees, a large memorial rock (which would be worth quite a bit) and some vouchers from Bunnings, but they still require over \$17,000 to fund the earthworks for this much-needed memorial so that Louise can be remembered for time to come.

I would like to see Minister Szakacs and the Labor government step in and put that funding together. I think it is a small amount of money to make sure that we honour the memory of Louise Hincks at the Happy Valley CFS and also remember that sometimes people do not come home. Our firefighters from all across the state do such a marvellous job. Again, I think it would be a fitting tribute for Minister Szakacs and the Labor government to find those funds to make sure the memorial can be put in place so the Happy Valley CFS, her daughters, her husband and everyone else can pay their respects. With that, I support the motion.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (13:00): I move to close the debate.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Ministerial Statement

POST-CORONIAL REVIEWER APPOINTMENT

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: On 21 April 2022, South Australia's Deputy Coroner handed down his findings into the tragic deaths of young Amber Rose Rigney and Korey Lee Mitchell, which occurred in May 2016. The deaths of these two children and the death of their mother were senseless and tragic, and my thoughts remain with their extended family, friends and community.

Upon the release of the Deputy Coroner's report, the government accepted all four recommendations, noting they reiterate the critical importance of building on current reform work to support an effective whole-of-government response to vulnerable children and their families. The first of the Deputy Coroner's recommendations was:

I recommend that the Premier of South Australia, the Minister for Child Protection and the Chief Executive of Child Protection cause a review of all coronial and other recommendations relating to child protection in the State of South Australia with a view to the implementation of the same.

I am pleased to advise that we have appointed Ms Kate Alexander as the external reviewer to undertake the review. Ms Alexander has a strong reputation across the sector and is someone who I am advised deeply understands the complexity of child protection systems, service delivery and evidence-based practice.

Ms Alexander is the Executive Director, Office of the Senior Practitioner for the New South Wales Department of Family and Community Services. She is responsible for the office's work in the review of child deaths, the design and implementation of the New South Wales Practice Framework, leading evidence-based practice and facilitating learning of frontline staff. Ms Alexander has vast experience as an expert witness in New South Wales coronial proceedings and royal commission hearings.

Ms Alexander has a Master of Social Work (Family Therapy) and has worked in the fields of child protection and sexual assault services for over 25 years. She is currently undertaking a PhD at

the University of Melbourne, focused on decision-making in child protection, particularly where domestic violence is involved.

In 2018, Ms Alexander was awarded the New South Wales Public Service Medal for outstanding services to family and community. In 2010, she was awarded a Churchill Fellowship and travelled to the United Kingdom, Norway and the United States researching child protection systems with a focus on the skill set of the frontline workforce. This research led to the development of the New South Wales Practice First framework and the New South Wales Practice Standards.

Ms Alexander's appointment has been confirmed and the review will commence. It is expected to be completed by October 2022. We anticipate that recommendations from previous inquests, including those into the tragic deaths of Chloe Valentine and Ebony Napier, as well as recommendations from the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission, led by Commissioner Nyland, and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse will be in scope. The Deputy Coroner also stated:

I recommend that a complete review be conducted in relation to all of the statutory obligations contained within the Child and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 so as to ensure that practices within the Department align with those statutory recommendations.

This activity will also be undertaken by Ms Alexander within her review. The Deputy Coroner recommended:

On completion of recommendations 1 and 2, all obligations under the Act are fully resourced to enable those duties and obligations to be carried out.

This work will be undertaken following Ms Alexander's review. Recommendation 4 relates to the involvement of police in child protection matters involving allegations of illicit drug use placing a child at risk. This matter is being examined by the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection in collaboration with SAPOL to ensure that the respective roles of both protective agencies are understood by frontline staff.

The review to be undertaken by Ms Alexander is another important step in our continuing work to improve the state's child protection sector and its systems, policies and practices. I look forward to updating the house on the outcomes of the review in due course and continuing work to enable South Australian children and young people to mentally, emotionally and physically thrive and be safe, loved and cared for.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:06): I bring up the interim report of the committee on the House of Assembly petition No. 84 of 2021, entitled SA Ambulance Service Resourcing.

Report received.

Mr FULBROOK: I bring up the fifth report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr FULBROOK: I bring up the sixth report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

Mr FULBROOK: I bring up the seventh report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

Mr FULBROOK: I bring up the eighth report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time***COST OF LIVING CONCESSION**

Mr SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why his Cost of Living Concession expansion for the coming year is only limited to people who meet strict eligibility criteria for the concession? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr SPEIRS: Hikes in the cost of petrol, electricity and food have seen many South Australian households struggling to make ends meet. By way of comparison, every household in Victoria is set to receive a \$250 cash payment to help with the rising cost of living from 1 July simply by signing up to an energy comparison website to become eligible.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:14): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his important question because cost of living is top of mind, I think, not just for every South Australian at the moment but probably for every Australian. In fact, I heard on the radio only this morning reports of the rates of inflation throughout most modern economies. I think the US now is just under 9 per cent, continental Europe is hovering around about 8 per cent and I think the United Kingdom was around about a 10 per cent hike in the rate of inflation. This is an omnipresent issue.

Clearly, inflation, in our view, is the working person's curse, but those people who feel the brunt particularly acutely are those who don't have the flexibility or ability to adjust their incomes. Working people on enterprise agreements that are typically three to five years in length, their incomes are very much fixed but, similarly, pensioners and other people on incomes—often from the government—are fixed as well, which means they don't have the ability to immediately account for cost-of-living pressures unless they curtail spending.

The ability of people on low and fixed incomes is very small. They don't have large discretionary incomes, which means they feel the pain first and foremost, which is why, long before the most recent inflation figures came out, on this side of the house we could see the challenge coming and we decided to do something about it. In the lead-up to the most recent state election, which was only a few weeks ago, we had very lengthy deliberations—and I can assure you that they were very lengthy—about what our policy mix would be to address this challenge, including not just a short-term focus but also a long-term focus.

For the purposes of the Leader of the Opposition's question, he speaks to a policy that very much is trying to provide relief in the immediate term. One of the policy levers that state government has available to them, of course, is to address the cost-of-living concession which is provided for on a fixed eligibility basis and which was supported by those opposite throughout the entirety of their period of government.

We are applying the same eligibility criteria, but what we are doing is doubling the size of the cost-of-living payment. If we increase that by the rate of inflation, it might amount to an increase of the order of \$5 to \$10, but instead we have decided to double it—so a 100 per cent increase. I can say with absolute confidence that that policy was opposed by the Liberal Party. They opposed our Cost of Living Concession increase. They seek to criticise it.

In fact, I can specifically recall their leaders within the movement, and that includes of course representatives of the Budget Cabinet Committee, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, supporting efforts of accusing us of throwing cash around. We don't believe it is throwing cash around. What we think is that it is very deliberate and targeted support to those in our community who need it most—those who need it most.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the now opposition, the then government, has maintained their opposition to this policy. Let the record state that the opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is opposed to our policy, but I can assure the shadow minister for education, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition, amongst everybody in this house, that when the Treasurer and I, along with the member for Adelaide, were announcing this policy amongst a group of predominantly pensioners on the weekend they were very grateful for it, and we look forward to delivering it in this year's budget only tomorrow.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Is the minister aware of her government's plans to axe programs that encourage the uptake of renewable energy in South Australia in tomorrow's budget? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr SPEIRS: Just one day after this house declared a climate emergency in South Australia, the Minister for Energy and Mining told InDaily that the Home Battery Scheme and the Switch for Solar programs, which encourage renewable energy uptake and, importantly, ease cost of living for some of the most vulnerable South Australians, will be axed, and I quote him, 'I'm glad we're killing it.'

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:19): Quite frankly, the most appalling policy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —of the former government was to take pensioners and take their concessions off them in exchange for solar panels and batteries. We have pensioners who rely on their concessions. They need these concessions because it goes towards their cost-of-living issues. In order to try to appease Treasury, members opposite came up with a policy to try to convince pensioners to give up their concessions that they get each and every year and month—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to take them off them, off low-income earners, off vulnerable people, off people who are on these concessions, in exchange for solar panels and batteries.

Mr Patterson: They would be \$500 better off.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, isn't that interesting?

The Hon. N.F. Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Human Services is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The former government offered this: they offered roughly 8,000 home owners in selected suburbs this scheme. Do you know what the uptake was of that 8,000-person package? Four per cent. Do you know why? Because the punters saw them coming. They saw them coming and they knew what they were up to. They knew the Liberals and they knew what the Liberals were up to: they were after their concessions to try to save money for the budget. If I were the Leader of the Opposition, this is the one policy I would be ashamed of the most. The most vulnerable people in our community—trying to take money out of their pockets.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Four per cent. They saw them coming. Let's talk about the Home Battery Scheme, another very ambitious program by the previous government. They had this ingenious scheme where they wanted to have 40,000 batteries roll out over four years, but they had

a cunning plan. What they were going to do was continually decrease the subsidy and somehow, inversely, it would increase the uptake of home batteries.

It's a genius scheme, and I'm sure in some alternative universe somewhere this would have worked. I'm sure there is somewhere in the world where, by decreasing the subsidy continually, you increase the uptake of batteries. Think of it: they start out offering a \$6,000 subsidy on the battery, then it gets down to \$2,000. Battery prices are increasing, and members opposite would have us believe that the uptake would increase. This scheme was dead.

The question then becomes: do we keep on putting good money after bad, or do we actually do what will lower wholesale energy prices and therefore lower retail prices and make sure that we incentivise and work towards having more large grid-scale renewables built? Over the term of the last government, only two wind farms were built—two. There was a freeze: 'Do not come to South Australia and build a wind farm.' We are the home of wind farms—two over the last four years.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morphett!

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Of course, now we are heading towards a green hydrogen revolution, and members are still complaining about that. Members opposite were trying to disadvantage people who could afford to be disadvantaged the least, and now they are complaining about us stopping the rort.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary to the Minister for Human Services: in the lead-up to the March 2022 state election, did the Minister for Human Services ever indicate her support for the Switch for Solar program and, in fact, advocate for the broadening of it beyond the trial suburbs initially indicated by the then government?

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:23): I will just remind members opposite—

The Hon. P.B. Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You stole my thunder.

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You stole my line. Whatever the Leader of the Opposition has said, he knows that the cabinet speaks with one voice.

An honourable member: Solidarity.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Solidarity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Members opposite are well aware of the principle of solidarity. I know the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morphett!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is a student of the solidarity—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. Minister, please be seated. I will hear the point of order under the standing order 134.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, I draw your attention to standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: There is some force, although I do observe that a degree of compare and contrast or context, as I remarked in yesterday's question time, is appropriate. It is early in the answer, I see that four minutes remain and I draw the minister's attention to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is important that cabinet solidarity always be maintained. For example, I remember recently there was a discussion on 891 radio where a very well-respected journalist asked the Leader Of The Opposition, 'Did you think that the former Deputy Premier had a conflict of interest?'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And his response was yes. There is a point of order, okay.

The SPEAKER: I imagine, member for Morialta that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morphett! Your colleague the member for Morialta is raising a point of order. Member for Hartley will resist the urge, he well knows the standing orders. Member for West Torrens! Minister for Human Services! Member for Newland! Member for Morialta!

Mr GARDNER: Sir, he defies your instruction and I submit that it comes close to obstruction of the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That is a substantive submission that I'm not sure can be made out on the facts but, in any case, I hold the minister's attention to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am a servant of this house. I am one of the principal reasons that we uphold the points of orders and the standing orders and the management of government business.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The thing about cabinet solidarity is—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —when there is a decision made, all cabinet ministers stick to it, so I thought it very interesting that Mr Bevan asked the Leader of the Opposition about his views on Ms Chapman's conflict of interest and, when he replied yes, I just wonder whether it was because, whether on background, he had said previously—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that she is conflicted. She is conflicted!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. Order, Minister for Human Services! Member for Hartley! Member for Morphett! Member for West Torrens! The member for Morialta has the call.

Mr GARDNER: The question was in relation to the Minister for Human Services' views on advocacies on the scheme in question, the Switch for Solar scheme. The minister's response is

nowhere near it, standing order 98 and your prior rulings require that he comes back to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: There is some force in the submission that is made. I have earlier asked the minister to chart a line closer to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will make it stop. I'll make it stop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We speak with one voice on this side of the parliament. There is no secret backgrounding going on behind the scenes. There are no winks and nudges about anything like that. We speak with one voice, and with one voice we say we will not be taking concessions off pensioners and the vulnerable. We will not be taking those concessions off people, quite frankly, because the truth is that the punters saw this scheme for what it was—and they didn't like it.

I am glad that as a cabinet and as a party we are killing this scheme because this scheme that the Leader of the Opposition defends would have taken concessions off the most vulnerable people and that is just wrong. That is just wrong. If the former government wanted to hand out solar panels and batteries to people who are on concessions, then do so freely but don't do it in exchange for their concessions. That's immoral.

SA WATER

Mr SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer provide a guarantee that the government will not add to the cost-of-living pressure by forcing up domestic and business water rates through the next SA Water regulatory determination? With your leave, sir, and of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr SPEIRS: Average household water bills rose by 232 per cent under the last period of Labor government. The Marshall government provided a saving of up to \$245 a year on the average bill while I was the Minister for Environment and Water. The next SA Water regulatory determination will apply from July 2024. Water consumers are seeking a commitment from this government that it will not add to the cost-of-living pressures by deliberately inflating the asset base of SA Water through this regulatory process as Labor did last time they were in government.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:29): It's wonderful to get a question nearly halfway through the sitting week—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —when I hand down a budget. It has suddenly occurred to those opposite to ask the Treasurer a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I wonder what else is going on this week that might be of interest in the Treasury portfolio? Nonetheless, we have a question. The former Minister for Water has tried to outline to the house his bona fides when it comes to the management of the water portfolio. He is right: there is a new regulatory determination period coming up for SA Water, a period which starts in 2024 and which will guide the setting of water prices going forward.

Can I also say that he is absolutely right to draw the house's attention to the cost-of-living pressures which South Australians, like all Australians, are facing—in particular, petrol prices, which of course are severely impacting household budgets. It might be time for us to reflect on what that impact of petrol prices means for the overall cost of living on households. It means that there is less money for groceries.

The way in which governments have tried to provide relief, putting aside what we're going to do from tomorrow's budget with the Cost of Living Concession, the former federal Coalition government said that they would ease fuel excise for a temporary period—six months to September—and to pay for most of that they were going to withdraw the diesel rebate for the heavy vehicle industry.

Mr Telfer: That's not the way the system works. That's not the way it works.

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: So it will be temporarily cheaper for you to drive to the supermarket and it will be more expensive to buy goods at the supermarket as a result of that genius policy.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: So that's what we get from those opposite when it comes to cost of living. When it comes to the price of water—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, here we go—here we go indeed because there are some government controls over setting the price of water. For example, the Minister for Water can issue a direction to SA Water about what costs should be included in that next determination period.

For example, the previous Minister for Water issued a direction to SA Water for them to incur more than \$60 million of additional expenditure, which everybody across South Australia is going to pay for in order to fix up what we on this side recognised as a problem—that is, an egregious situation, where residents of the north-eastern suburbs don't have access to adequate sewerage services. We supported that. We supported him issuing that direction because he issued that direction to actually support the Labor opposition's policy. So that was a good thing that we supported.

But I've got to say that that is a government taking action to increase water bills for all South Australians. When the Leader of the Opposition says, 'Will you guarantee that the government will take no action to artificially increase the price of water?' well, let the record show—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —that the former Minister for Water has already undertaken that action. He has already increased everybody's water bills. Not only did he do that in order to allegedly fix up a problem in the north-eastern suburbs but he inadequately did that and so all the prices and all the costs that SA Water are going to have to pay to finish that project are not provided for by that direction. What he has now left this government to do is to fill a black hole in the previous government's policy to fix up this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Do you know what? I will guarantee that this Labor government will take the action that is necessary to deliver proper sewerage services to the people in the north-eastern suburbs—something that the previous minister, the now Leader of the Opposition, failed to do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta is called to order. The Treasurer is called to order. The member for Unley is called to order. The member for Hammond is called to order and warned.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister advise the house on the impact on infrastructure projects in South Australia as a consequence of the recent federal election and any other alternative views?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:34): I can. We have a new Prime Minister, a Prime Minister who is the modern father of infrastructure and spending and building in Australia. So what does that mean for us here in South Australia? What does it mean for projects like the Marion Road upgrade on Anzac Highway? What it means is that the people of Badcoe will not have to wait until 2026-27 for that work to begin. It can begin almost immediately because there is a new federal Labor government.

Most importantly, there is another project that is close and dear to my heart, the member for Gibson's heart and it used to be very close and dear to the Leader of the Opposition's heart but, alas, they have had a falling out. There has been some sort of separation—

Mr Speirs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —some sort of—what's the term I'm looking for?—capitulation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Some form of capitulation but, of course, I have said previously in this house that the people of Black had an ability to have their voices heard, in secret, anonymously, in their local polling booths. The people have spoken: the Hallett Cove Central booth, an 8.2 per cent swing to Labor; a 7.4 per cent swing in the O'Halloran Hill booth—

Mr Speirs: That's not in my electorate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm getting to your electorate, don't worry. I've got them all here, don't worry. There's no need to be alarmed, I'm getting to you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm getting to you, don't worry. I haven't forgotten you. Unlike the way you have forgotten the people around Majors Road, I will not forget you. You're on my mind all the time. I'm thinking about you constantly.

The SPEAKER: Minister, resist the urge to respond to interjections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Hallett Cove South booth, 6.9; Hallett Cove East, 6.5; the Hallett Cove booth, 6.5; the Sheidow Park South booth, 3.2; and 3.2 in the Sheidow Park booth. In Boothby, in the Seacliff booth, 7.9; a 5 per cent swing in the Brighton West booth; a 4.9 per cent swing to Labor in the Brighton booth; a 4 per cent swing to Labor in the Brighton South booth; and 1.4 in the Brighton North booth—unequivocal support.

What was the major infrastructure program that the people of Gibson and Black were talking about in the federal election? Majors Road. Again, the capitulation continues. Ignoring the views of your own constituency can be dangerous. I would ask the old member for Gibson—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —but he's not here anymore because he did exactly what the member for Black is doing and not listening to his community. Now is the time for the Leader of the Opposition to reconcile with his electorate, reconcile with them and listen to them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. I will hear the point of order from the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The question was broad and the minister is managing to stay outside the bounds of what it allowed. He was asked about infrastructure projects as a result of the federal election, alternative policies which are related to the infrastructure projects as a result of the federal election, and this has nothing to do with it. The points of view expressed by the member for Black are irrelevant and not the responsibility of the minister.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, I have your point of order. The question was exceedingly broad and provides tremendous scope.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If Prime Minister Albanese had not been sworn in as Prime Minister and Prime Minister Morrison had been successful in being re-elected, Majors Road would have been left to us alone to deal with, but we have a partner. We are looking for more partners. We are reaching out across the aisle. I want this to be a bipartisan project.

I remember seeing the video of a young, idealistic leader of the opposition in waiting who thought that Vickie had a conflict of interest, wanting to build the Majors off-ramp, even going on radio and arguing for it. How dare people cut out the people of his electorate from getting access to the Southern Expressway? Now is not the time to capitulate. Now is the time to stand up. Join us. Join us in building this new off-ramp. It's the right thing to do. Your constituents want it. The constituents of Black want it to happen. The only person trying to stop it is the Leader of the Opposition.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Mr SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that the decision to reprofile cash flows for the Torrens to Darlington project was made before the Department for Infrastructure and Transport provided its minister with the initial outcomes of its project review? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr SPEIRS: The 495-word document tabled yesterday states in its first dot point that its purpose is to provide a rationale for the reprofiling of cash flows for the project. The second dot point shows that before the preparation of the document the department had been made aware that the budget would push over \$1 billion from the previously budgeted cash flow to beyond the forward estimates. What then follows in the document is a retrospective justification for a budget decision that had already been made.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:39): I have to say I am not sure the Leader of the Opposition understands what he is asking. He is asking why is it that we have released the rationale for the decision that the department have said to us that they can't get the money out the door. The Treasurer and I have said clearly: if the project was as advertised and as projected, we would be putting the money out the door.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Getting on with it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We would be getting on with it. The problem is that the department is conducting a review of the reference design as we instructed it to when I first came to office. In fact, it was one of the first announcements we made after we came to office, after I was

sworn in. After the Premier gave me the responsibility to be transport and infrastructure minister, I was very keen to get to the bottom of what was going on with the north-south corridor.

In this reference design, as we're formulating in the budget—and the reference design review is not completed—we have easily seen that the work cannot be done in the four years stipulated by the previous government. So what the minister is asking is he is claiming that he has the final report for review of the reference design, when I have said previously that the reference design is not completed, that the work has not been finished. They are informing the government about having to reprofile because they can't get the money out the door. It is entirely appropriate; that's exactly how it should have been.

What should have happened, of course, was this work should have been done before the election by the previous government so that we wouldn't have been left with this mess. As I said yesterday, if members opposite were serious about the north-south corridor, they would turn up to actually—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —move the motions that they had put on notice in the parliament.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. I will hear the point of order from the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Well, it's entirely orderly for members to move motions on other members' behalf in the first point; it is disorderly to reflect members' presence in the chamber or not at different times in the day. The member is out of order on both counts.

The SPEAKER: I draw the minister's attention to the standing order. I understand that there was some detail there that may engage the standing orders, but I do remind the minister of the standing orders.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What the opposition is attempting to argue is that we have attempted to move money out of the budget deliberately to fund other commitments. That is just simply not true, simply not true. If members opposite had any integrity at all on this issue, they are the ones who have caused the delay, not the government. The idea—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But think of the accusation. The accusation—

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is on one warning.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is that independent public servants have breached the Public Sector Management Act and have deliberately made things up to suit us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is an appalling accusation. Wayne Buckerfield and Jon Whelan are first-class public servants who have served both governments loyally, and I note the shadow infrastructure minister nodding his head in agreement. That is true: they are great public servants who have served both parties fearlessly and independently.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Fearless and independent advice is telling the government of the day that the profile that the former government set couldn't be met. The idea that somehow—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —they would retrospectively make up advice is appalling. If members opposite want to make that accusation, go outside and make those accusations of those public servants. Go outside and do it. But they won't. They will hide in here, they will use privilege and they will attack these public servants.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have only ever used privilege appropriately, sir. There have never been any sanctions against me. In fact, as far as—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I know, the only member of parliament to have been sanctioned—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —in this parliament for contempt is the former Deputy Premier of those opposite, not by us, and in a parliament controlled by members opposite, not by us. We were the minority. So this is, quite frankly, an appalling attack on two excellent public servants. I am happy for members opposite to attack me because, quite frankly, it's funny to watch them try. It's very entertaining, especially when they don't turn up to move their own motions, which I think is a unique tactic.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The minister has completed his answer.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Well, he also defied your ruling, sir.

The SPEAKER: I'm not certain that's right but, in any case, I am going to turn to your leader.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is again to the Premier. When was the decision made to reprofile cash flows for the Torrens to Darlington project and who asked the Department for Infrastructure and Transport to, and I quote, 'provide a rationale' for reprofiling of cash flows for the Torrens to Darlington project?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:44): I have to say that I find this whole line of questioning and, while though of course not unimportant, the rationale behind it amusing because those opposite are clutching to these conspiracy theories about how the government is going to keep its election commitments. We made a commitment, in fact, back in 2013 that we would be completing the north-south corridor. We made that commitment. Then, before the recent state election, we made a commitment that we supported getting on with the job of finishing the north-south corridor, the Torrens to Darlington section—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —that had seen no progress or work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —in four years by those opposite. Do you know why it's important to get on with that? It's not just about it's better for motorists, it's not just about it's better

for freight but, at a point in time, when you have the highest unemployment rate in the nation, wouldn't it be good to get some people on the tools, getting them working on this project, increasing the number of people employed?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: But when you're not ready to go to market—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —when you're not ready to go to tender, when you're not ready to get a tender response, when you're not ready to award a contract, when you're not ready to start spending money to get going, it's simply not ready to go. Apparently, some of you have had something to do—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —with establishing a budget before. Some of you, apparently, have been a member of a Budget Cabinet Committee before.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What you might know, if you had been involved in that or, perhaps, if you hadn't been sidelined from it, like perhaps you might have been, is that each time a budget is put together you go to each agency and say, 'Are you on track with your spending commitments in both operating and investing sense? Are you on track or not?'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Do you know what the first advice that we got was, what I got from Treasury and what the infrastructure minister got from his department? They were not on track with this project. They were not ready to go to market.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They were not ready to go to tender.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: They were not then ready to award a tender and start construction work. If you haven't done the design work, you can't go to market. If you can't go to market, you can't start the project.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Do you know what the schedule said, Mr Speaker? How much money they were going to spend per year in only 18 months' time? More than \$1.2 billion in 12 months.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Release the paper.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: You have to be ready to go to market if you want to spend that much money. Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is warned for a third and final time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Table it? I will be tabling 500 pages of decisions tomorrow and you can read it for yourself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Because this is a government—

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

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Morialta is very hot under the collar. I know we are used to that in this chamber, Mr Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned for a third and final time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He's flustered, Mr Speaker. He's flustered, as usual. If you haven't done the work, if you haven't gone to tender, if you haven't awarded a tender, you can't spend money on construction. There was a period in the lead-up to the 2018 election, and we had three major projects all running simultaneously on the north-south corridor—Torrens to Torrens, Darlington and Northern Connector—all at major construction stage. We were not spending \$1.2 billion in a 12-month period on those three running at once.

If you haven't done the work on a major project, you're not ready to go to market, you're not ready to award the contract and you're not ready to spend money on that contract. The fallacy that this is about saving us money out of the forward estimates—did it ever occur to you that this is half funded by the commonwealth, that we now have to give up 50 per cent of these revenues because you didn't do the work, because you weren't ready to go to market, because you weren't ready to start construction?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: You abrogated your responsibility to the community—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and now we're paying the price.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer has completed his answer, and it may be there is no utility on the point of order. Very well.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, you are on three warnings. I know that you are familiar with the standing orders because you raise them with me frequently. The member for Davenport has the call.

MARGINALISED COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. How will the Malinauskas Labor government ensure that youth, people with disability, the LGBTIQ+ people and other marginalised community members are heard by government?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:49): Thank you so much for that question from the member for Davenport, a much-improved version of the member for Davenport that we have in this place.

Anyone who knows me—or, indeed, those opposite and their team who write the government questions for them that they give to us—would know via my social media that I love to get out and about in the community and talk with the community and hear directly from them about what matters to them and how policies, legislation and decisions made in this place actually affect them.

It's a critical responsibility of being a minister to ensure that you engage directly with members of the community. In the past two months, it's incredible how many people I have connected with, from members of the public through to commissioners and CEOs, who say how great it is to have a minister who is meeting with them face to face regularly and building relationships so that they know they will be listened to. While that seems to have been lacking, according to them, over the past four years, we even had reports of former ministers routinely being very rude and also complaints about bullying.

While big organisations and powerful people have many ways to raise their concerns, often there are marginalised groups who do not have that capability, and in a democracy we should all have an equal voice. That's why, as Minister for Human Services, I have committed to and I am establishing three ministerial advisory councils in this portfolio: one for young people, a second for people with disability and a third for the LGBTIQ+ community.

The councils will provide direct feedback and advice to me on legislative and policy matters. We will meet several times a year. How that will happen will be decided by the councils themselves, whether it's in person or online or a combination of both. I am very keen to meet face to face. There are applications on the dhs.sa.gov.au website, with closing dates of 12 June or 19 June, depending on which council they are. We are focused on ensuring that the diversity of voices is heard here in this parliament. I can feedback to our cabinet and to our caucus and provide people with input about how decisions are being made that affect them.

In addition, I have committed to continuing a sector reference group, where I will be again meeting regularly with representatives from providers and from peak bodies—another set of meetings that dropped away under the previous government, and I am committed to continuing those. This group will allow for open and transparent communication and positive construction of policy.

I thank all the organisations who are doing great work in the community to represent marginalised South Australians. To be very clear, my expectation is that every person, regardless of their circumstances, is properly heard, properly represented and properly cared for.

I am pretty sure it was former Prime Minister Tony Abbott who said something to the effect of 'No-one,' such and such, 'is the suppository of all wisdom'. Well, I'm not going to make that mistake, but I will acknowledge that no one person, party or government is the repository of all human knowledge. We must work together, listen to each other and make sure the views of all groups are represented.

To people with disability, young people and those in the LGBTIQ+ community, please head to the website and apply to be a participant in our council.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Why did the minister justify making a decision to delay the Torrens to Darlington project on a departmental report that he has not yet received? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TARZIA: A three-page briefing note that the minister tabled yesterday stated, and I quote, 'We will return to you with a report once the review is finalised.'

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:53): This is that \$9.9 billion project covering over

10 kilometres of road in Adelaide, finalising the last section of the nonstop north-south corridor. It is, without a doubt, one of the largest infrastructure programs in the state's history. After having completed the Northern Connector, the South Road Superway, Regency to Pym, Torrens to Torrens and Darlington, this is the last section.

The people who built those other projects were excluded from the tunnel projects by the former government. So all the expertise that we had to do the rest of the north-south corridor was not involved in the detailed planning and design of this project, including Mr Jon Whelan. Mr Jon Whelan, who I think is an exceptional CE—acknowledged by the shadow minister—is doing his work appropriately because we have a budget. The Treasurer is delivering his first budget tomorrow, on 2 June, to outline our government's program for the next four years.

Over the next four years a large part of that program is the north-south corridor, so the premise of the question then is that we should have nothing in the budget at all until the review is finished, or we put numbers in the budget that we are not going to realise because the review is not finished, or do we actually listen to the experts—

Mr Tarzia: Infrastructure SA.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hang your hat on Infrastructure SA as much as you like—dig up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Let's just go through some of the changes already announced—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley!

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is on three warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: At the Public Works Committee in June 2021 in terms of procurement, the former government said that they would be ready to award the stage 1 contract in mid-2023. Then they changed that in February 2022 to a request of information in April 2022, then an expression of interest in August 2022, then an RFT by November 2022 and then award the contract at December 2023—already slipped six months under their own procurement, under their own time lines.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is now changed for the final part to award the contract in the second half of 2024. It was not ready to go. If it was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —ready to go, it would be going.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The terms of the southern enabling works—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley!

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley, so close to the cliff!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: With respect to the southern enabling works, the former government told us, told Public Works, told parliament, that service relocation works would begin mid-2021 to early 2023. Then we were told that service relocation—they have added demolitions—was starting August 2021 to June 2024.

I am advised that they were not feasible, just not feasible. Then design and tunnel boring machine establishment: members opposite were trying to tell us that they would have two—not one but two—tunnel boring machines in Adelaide by January 2024. That is just ridiculous, just ridiculous. Members opposite are a laughing stock and they should reflect on their position, and perhaps—

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a point of order from the member for Morialta, which I will hear under 134.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley, so close to the abyss!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, this sort of abuse is outside the standing orders, and it is certainly outside 98.

The SPEAKER: I certainly draw the minister's attention to the standing orders, but it may be that the minister has concluded his answer.

SMOKING RATES

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house about what the government's plans are to curb the prevalence of smoking in South Australia?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:58): I thank the member for Waite and acknowledge her interest in the health care of South Australians and in preventative health. We do know that smoking is the leading cause of death/disability in Australia, responsible for 20,000 deaths annually and more than eight million deaths worldwide.

Yesterday was World No Tobacco Day, when we acknowledged the impact that tobacco has around the world and its impact upon people's health and impact upon the health system. It was also the last day of the Quit Your Way in May campaign, which was initiated by Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia encouraging South Australians to quit smoking.

I have recently been provided with the latest statistics in terms of the smoking rates in South Australia by the South Australian Health Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI), and they do paint a disturbing picture in terms of where the trajectory has been going in terms of smoking.

We know that over a long period of time there has been a significant reduction in the smoking rates, from very high rates in the 1970s and 1980s down to relatively low levels today. However, the more recent data does paint some concern for us in government. For instance, the daily smoking prevalence for people aged 15 and over—the majority adults in South Australia—was 13.9 per cent in 2013. That then reduced to 8.6 per cent in 2018, but now it has gone a bit higher and is at 9.8 per cent in 2021. It is concerning to see that increase.

For 15 to 29 year olds, it was 15 per cent back in 2012. That went down to 4.5 per cent in 2018, but that has now unfortunately gone up to 9.7 percent in 2021. So there is a disturbing feature where we are seeing an increase in smoking rates over the past few years. It is even more concerning in terms of regional areas, where we have gone from an 11.6 per cent smoking rate in 2018 up to 15.5 per cent in 2021.

This is one of the reasons why, in the past election, this government committed to and will now be delivering on a partnership with Cancer Council SA called Tackling Tobacco. This program is going to work with not-for-profit groups, community groups and people who work with disadvantaged groups across South Australia to provide training for intervening in terms of tobacco, making sure that people have access to alternative patches and other nicotine replacement therapies, to make sure that we can encourage and connect people with services that can help them quit.

I think it has been a lacking service. It was an issue that was raised with us by the Cancer Council before the election, that we did not see services like this in place. I am very excited that we will be delivering that project to make a big difference. There is one area where I am particularly concerned that there is an increasing impact as well, and that is e-cigarettes, particularly amongst children and young people, where we see that there is an increasing impact.

To see the statistics that have come out in the last few days that 350 suspensions were issued for vaping at schools this year alone is deeply concerning. We see that, while not meant to contain nicotine, they do unfortunately often contain nicotine. The latest statistics show that amongst adolescents and young adults current e-cigarette use is highest among 18 to 24 year olds at 35 per cent compared with just 9.5 percent in 2013. This is a disturbing issue that we need to take action on.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:02): My question is also to the Minister for Health. Can the minister clarify why Mount Gambier hospital's COVID ward was closed, requiring COVID-positive patients to be transferred to Adelaide?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question on this important topic. He and I have been talking frequently since the last election about the impact of services at Mount Gambier hospital, which has been under considerable pressure. Unfortunately, this is an issue that has not happened overnight but has been growing, where the pressure on that hospital has been suffering significant staffing shortages and unfilled vacancies.

I know from repeatedly visiting the hospital and speaking to the staff there, and recently at the end of last year with the now Premier as well right before the border was due to open, preparation simply was not put in place before the border opened in terms of making sure that the facilities were in place to be able to manage COVID at that site. At the very last minute, staff there had to scramble to put together a plan because up until that time the then government had been saying to the services there, 'Don't worry, everyone will be flown to Adelaide,' then that changed right before the border opened.

We are now in a situation where the staff have been doing an incredible job to try to manage with the number of COVID patients they have, but they are facing very significant staffing shortages that have been in place. For instance, I am advised at the moment that there are currently 37 FTE nursing positions that are vacant and a further 17 FTE vacancies of medical staffing.

This is something we are stepping up the recruitment to make sure that we can fill those vacancies as soon as possible. I am advised that, with extensive recruitment underway, we are expecting by later this year to have addressed that situation in terms of that lack of staffing in place. Effectively, the hospital is operating with the shortage of approximately 70 FTE at the moment, which obviously has an impact upon patient care.

In addition to that, there are currently a significant number of cases of COVID in the Limestone Coast, which is doubly affecting staffing shortages in the area as well. The furloughed staff numbers have gone from nine to 16 just overnight, which is causing significant pressure. I'm advised today that they are now in Code Red, which is lower than the Code White level, but it shows that they are at capacity in the hospital at the moment.

I have been in constant contact with the department about this issue and spoken to the chair of the hospital and spoken to the local member as well. I am keen to do everything that we possibly can to address the situation both in the short term and the long term. In the short term, we have sent down to Mount Gambier to assist a number of nursing staff to address the severe shortages of staff they have at the moment. I am advised that some senior nurses have gone down to assist in that situation at the moment.

In the long term, we are building up the services in Mount Gambier hospital, expanding the emergency department, expanding mental health care, expanding drug rehabilitation, expanding drug detox services to make sure that there is more staff and a greater variety of services at the hospital. Principally, we need to address those workforce shortages that are causing these issues.

I acknowledge the difficulties faced by the constituents of the member for Mount Gambier at the moment, particularly those people who have had to come to Adelaide for treatment. It is not something we want to have happen, and obviously it is something that impacts then on the pressure of Adelaide hospitals, which are already under dramatic pressure at the moment as well. We want to address those staff shortages as soon as possible.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:06): My question again is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister ruled out any further property acquisitions that might result from the delay to Torrens to Darlington that the minister outlined yesterday? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TARZIA: The minister said yesterday in question time:

It is important that we reconnect with these communities and make sure that they are listened to, especially with the work on the reference design, because I have to say I was not very happy with the level of consultation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:07): No, I can't rule that out because, for example, if we move the road, the northern tunnel alignment, east at the northern end, it would mean acquiring some industrial land and not acquiring as many residential properties. Whenever you do something to the north-south corridor or the alignment, it could mean a change, but it is very important to note that those people within the electorates of Elder and Badcoe who have received notifications, those acquisitions are continuing.

Nothing has changed, so we are moving ahead with the acquisitions and demolition. We are moving ahead with the service relocation and the timetables that we have announced that the Treasurer will be tabling in the parliament tomorrow. That work is important to be done. The reason that it is important to be done is so that we can actually meet a time frame. Giving people false hope has led to so many delays on past infrastructure programs that the South Australian public begin to lose confidence in their public sector.

For example, the people of Gawler, who were told by the previous government, 'No, no, this date; no, no, no, this date; no, no, no, this date.'

The SPEAKER: Minister there is a point of order from the member for Morialta. I would hear the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: This question was entirely in relation to this north-south corridor. The minister is now in the Gawler line in this debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Minister, I take you to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think it is very important that when we publicly announce a time frame that we stick to it because the disappointment that the former government have caused people and the concern that they have caused by delaying this project means that a lot of people are getting very anxious about it. Imagine if we had proceeded on the existing time frame that the former government had decided. We would have the elevated roadway coming out of the tunnels which would merge, while elevated, down to one lane—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order from the member for Morialta.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley, you can depart the chamber under 137A for the remainder of question time, which amounts to five minutes.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta on a point of order. I imagine the member for Morialta is reventilating the point of order he raised with me moments ago.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Same point of order, different argument, different information. He is now talking about 'what if' the former government's project was continued. We are asking about the future and what their plans will do to property acquisitions.

The SPEAKER: Very well, member for Morialta. Minister, I draw your attention to the question. The minister has the call and he has the question and he knows the standing orders.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just for the reassurance of the Speaker, if we leave the elevated roadway as is, that would mean no further acquisitions. But I am very concerned about having an elevated roadway come down in the middle of a road and having Adelaide traffic merge left rather than the traditional method of merging right, so it may mean an acquisition on Anzac Highway to enable a proper and safe merging of traffic.

I'm also very concerned about having traffic on elevated roadways merging to one lane—coming from three lanes to two lanes to one lane and doing that while on an elevated roadway. The advice I have from the department is that there is not an elevated roadway anywhere in Australia—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: He's not a very good driver. Remember that? How many speeding tickets—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is not an elevated roadway in Australia, I am advised, that has traffic merging while on elevated roadways and then coming down in the middle of a highway rather than the edge. That's what members opposite had planned for Anzac Highway.

The Hon. J.K. Szakacs: Sounds like a good plan.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It sounds like something stuck together with sticky tape. The former government were also planning to ban all right-hand turns on Anzac Highway coming to and from the city, which would have meant increased traffic within those suburbs, called 'rat running', to get to and from their location. Members opposite didn't think this through or weren't shown or didn't care. I don't care which one it is, but we are going to fix it. Fixing it means having experts working on it, not the former Minister for Infrastructure and Transport deciding time frames and profiling along with the former Treasurer. This is being done properly.

CHILDREN IN CARE

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How will the Malinauskas Labor government ensure the voices of children and young people in care are heard by government?

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) (15:12): I thank the member for this question, and I acknowledge her deep commitment to improving things for children at risk and also acknowledge her for opening her heart and home as a foster carer.

Building a better child protection system is complex. Ensuring the safety of children and young people requires a comprehensive whole-of-community response. First and foremost, to improve outcomes we must ensure that the voice of children and young people is at the core of everything that we do. That is why the Malinauskas government will be amplifying the voices of children and young people directly through a range of measures.

This government is absolutely committed to placing children and young people at the heart of efforts to strengthen families and improve the child protection system. This means that we will seek to ensure that we understand children's and young people's experiences, views and ideas when it comes to decisions that affect them. I am proud that this government is committing additional funding to improve advocacy as well as support for children and young people in care and leaving care.

We have already confirmed an additional \$800,000 to the CREATE Foundation over the next four years to support transition from care with a focus on pathways for young people to access study, work and housing options. As minister, I have committed to work with CREATE and others to develop

a structured mechanism for me as the minister to hear directly from children and young people in care. I was so honoured to meet with children and young people via CREATE who had a care experience prior to the election. I was so incredibly impressed by their courage and resilience, and the advice that they gave me was utterly invaluable and I take this opportunity to thank them for that advice.

We are providing funding for the Guardian for Children and Young People to undertake the role of the Child and Young Person's Visitor, a crucial role that the previous government refused to fund in an ongoing way. We also intend to continue to support the DCP youth advisory group, No Capes for Change committee, to provide opportunities for young people in care or with a care experience to have their voice amplified.

We are determined to work to address the over-representation of First Nations children in the child protection system. We are working on a range of strategies toward the Closing the Gap target to reduce its over-representation. My department is also working with SNAICC, the national representative body for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children, to ensure that the voice of Aboriginal children and young people is strengthened.

We received outstanding advice and representations of the views of young people in care from advocates such as the Guardian for Children and Young People and the two excellent children's commissioners. I thank each of them for the immense contributions that they have made to the positive changes in the areas of education, health, juvenile justice and child protection and wellbeing for the benefit of the children and young people in South Australia.

I am committed to listening to children and young people in care, or with a care experience, who represent themselves and others with pride and distinction. As mentioned, I will be doing this through a series of regular opportunities as well as regular meetings with their representative bodies to ensure that they are at the heart of everything that we do.

Grievance Debate

STATE LABOR GOVERNMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (15:17): This week, there has been some information provided by the Minister for Education in question time and, indeed, by the Premier and the Minister for Education in the media, and others from the Labor Party in social media that strongly suggests that Labor is walking away from what was a clear commitment to the people of South Australia: to provide universal access for preschool for all three year olds in South Australia from 2026.

When pressed about this matter, I heard the Premier on TV this morning saying that the plan was that the process would be commencing from 2026. I note that the Minister for Education on Twitter early this morning said that Labor was the only party that went to the election with a plan to deliver three-year-old preschool. This commitment remains and we will deliver exactly what we promised South Australians. It will commence in 2026. It is the use of the word 'commence' that the government is using, that the minister and the Premier are using, to say that their program will commence from 2026, but what will commence?

The minister, when pressed on national radio, in what was considered by many to be an utter train wreck interview on the ABC with Stacey and Nikolai, was very clear. He said that their commitment was to have a royal commission to inform the government on how they might deliver three-year-old preschool commencing in 2026.

What does this version of commencing mean? Because, when people were going to the polling booths, I am pretty sure what they thought it meant. They saw the posters that said Labor's plan for education: three-year-old universal preschool. When they read the policy document that says, inconveniently for the Labor Party I would suggest—the autism policy document describes Labor's commitment to offer three-year-old preschool to all children in South Australia from 2026. I am pretty sure that anyone would think that meant that all children in South Australia will get access to preschool for their three year olds in 2026—in 2026.

The Labor Party was asked about this in question time yesterday. The Minister for Education talked about it being staged and that there were some children—and he said this in the media as

well on the radio—who clearly might have significant benefit from that. And he is right. We identified that in our budget document last year. Our early education policy clearly identifies on page 23, for the casual reader, that we were going to review the policy settings for an additional year of preschool for developmentally delayed children.

Clearly, we have identified that there is a benefit of a second year for developmentally delayed children, as indeed there is a benefit of a second year of preschool for Aboriginal children and for children under guardianship. You know how our bona fides stack up when I say that the Liberal Party supports two years of preschool for Aboriginal children and children under guardianship? Because we delivered it. We delivered for every year of the four years of the Marshall Liberal government. In fact, it was not just a novelty of the Marshall government; the Weatherill government delivered it as well.

So it is now a nonsense when the Malinauskas Labor government suggested that they were going to start offering three-year-old preschool to some children being a delivery of their election commitment. It is clearly a nonsense because some three-year-old children have had this for years. No, what they promised was universal access to three-year-old preschool and they said in their policy document: Labor's commitment to offer three-year-old preschool to all children in South Australia from 2026. The Minister for Human Services helped the Minister for Education on the Twitter feed. She tweeted:

This is a well thought out sustainable plan, approached in a way that will build a sector for the future with seamless transition the way good reform is implemented. Great work @BBoyer MP.

That suggests clearly a seamless transition, a suggestion again that goes with the way the minister described it yesterday that it will be introduced in stages, that some children will get it in 2026, that when we get to the next election on the third Saturday of March 2026, not all children will have been given the opportunity to access three-year-old preschool that year.

We know it is an expensive policy to deliver in reality. This may well be the case to justify the royal commission (I do not want to prejudge what the royal commission will do) but even if the royal commission suggests that rather than continuing, as is currently the model, to have the overwhelming majority of preschool programs in public preschools and, as some have suggested, the best way to do it is to expand their offerings from government-provided services and government-funded services in long day care so you have the preschool program available for the three year olds in the long day-care service where they already are, that saves on the capital cost but it still costs \$100 million a year.

If Labor are serious about delivering on their election commitment that the people of South Australia voted for, then we are going to see that \$100 million a year starting in 2026 in tomorrow's budget. I suspect that we were not and what has happened is that Labor has betrayed the trust of the people of South Australia.

HOSKING, MR D.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:22): I rise today to talk about a local legend. Regional communities are often made stronger by longstanding traditions of sporting clubs that are responsible for bringing community members together in good-spirited competition, teamwork and volunteering.

A local resident in my electorate Mr Darryl Hosking, but more affectionately known as Sid, has been recognised for his involvement in the local baseball league over the last 60 years. I know Sid very well. Unfortunately, now we seem to catch up mostly at funerals and wakes. Sid has been a prominent person in my community for a long time and it was great to see him recognised by Baseball South Australia and inducted into the hall of fame two Fridays ago.

He was one of 38 who were inducted into the sporting body. However, Sid has been prominent in our community for a long period of time—48 years with SES 8 and WIN Television. You would often see him at sporting events, carrying around a camera and documenting and reporting on events as they unfolded in our community. Sid is a very humble man and his comments reflect that. He said, 'They were very mixed emotions—embarrassment, humility, surprise—all of those.'

Sid is obviously very humble about his achievements but proud of the recognition, and I guess that is summed up by his comments where he said, 'I think it is more a reward for Mount

Gambier and the baseball league than it is about myself. I keep saying baseball is a team game and I am just part of the team.'

Sid's playing career began in 1960 as a junior, and he landed at the Central Baseball Club in 1961, the same club my son played at for a couple of years. As I say, the rest is history, and Sid has now served the club for over 60 years. In total, he played over 700 games for Central and won seven premierships, one of them was when he played with his two sons, Brett and Tim. Those games rank highly in the moments that Sid holds close to his heart, while he said the division 1 title, which came at the end of 81 season, was extra special.

Throughout his playing years, Sid said that he was able to play in a number of representative teams which, of course, he was pretty proud of. He received life membership at Central in 1977 and the baseball league of Mount Gambier in 1989. He was also awarded the Australian Sports Medal for his contribution to baseball in 2000. Sid also talks glowingly of the involvement of his wife, Jill, in the sport. She is also a life member at the Central Baseball Club.

Sid also served for three stints as treasurer for the club for a total of 19 years. Once you get those roles, it is almost impossible to get rid of them: he has been president three times. Sid also joined the Mount Gambier and District Baseball League and served as president of the entire league twice. He was heavily involved in the transition of baseball going from a winter sport to a summer sport in 1980, and I think that has really invigorated baseball in Mount Gambier. He played a pivotal role in attracting the South Australian championship series to Mount Gambier in 1987. It is amazing how time repeats itself. I would like to see Mount Gambier go back to hosting more championships, as the state's second largest city and its ideal location between Victoria and South Australia.

He continues to give back to baseball in any way he can and only recently relinquished his position as a statistician, a mantle he held for 38 years. With that, I would like to congratulate Sid Hosking on his proud achievements and on being a fine community member.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon L.W.K. Bignell): Thank you, member for Mount Gambier. I note your keen interest in the Kongorong and Port MacDonnell footy clubs. On AFL memes on the weekend, I am not sure whether you saw that bloke from Hatherleigh lining up. With 20 seconds on the clock, four points down, he kicked straight to the man on the mark at Port Mac, so he probably is not going to be brought to the attention of the AFL scouts, I do not think.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:27): The failure of this government to deliver the Torrens to Darlington component of the north-south corridor is the biggest act of economic vandalism that I have seen for some time. We know that over the weekend South Australians were very disappointed to learn this government delayed the Torrens to Darlington project by an entire year. It was a delay that was in every sense of the term completely unnecessary.

What we have heard in recent times from the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport in this place is that the Torrens to Darlington project in its current design was in some way unfeasible. That is what the minister asserted in this place yesterday and today. However, all our evidence points to the contrary. We know that under the original proposal and time line of the Torrens to Darlington project, bodies like Infrastructure SA gave the project quite a positive rating, meaning that successful delivery of the project was probable, that it was within the review team's rating for governance and risk management, that it had positive contingencies.

We know from recent sources that interviewees expressed confidence in the program. In fact, many interviewees had significant experience in these sorts of projects in Australia, and even they expressed the productivity rates as conservative. We have seen reviews highly complimentary along the way of costs and design.

We know that the Torrens to Darlington arm is the final, most complex, most expensive and most crucial section of the north-south corridor. It is South Australia's biggest infrastructure project. We know that the combination of tunnels, overpasses and underpasses will create the final piece of what is the 78-kilometre nonstop traffic light free motorway between Gawler and Old Noarlunga—a thoroughfare that South Australians have been patiently waiting for.

South Australians should not be expected to tolerate these unnecessary delays, and they should certainly not be expected to shoulder the responsibility of this government's mismanagement of the biggest infrastructure project in South Australian history. The delays to this project will inevitably mean cost blowouts to this project, and the people of South Australia will end up paying. The South Australian Labor government needs to rule out any further delays to this crucial project and come clean on whether any design changes will result in more people losing their homes and their businesses and, if so, where?

In 16 years, we know that Labor failed to even initiate a business case for Torrens to Darlington. In four years, the former Liberal government completed an extensive business case, funded planning and early works to the tune of over \$200 million and secured the federal government's commitment to a fifty-fifty share of the construction cost. The Marshall Liberal government was even successful in securing \$2.26 billion to complete the final stage of Torrens to Darlington.

We know that the government pulled out the old cheeky Friday night drop to the media, dropping what was obviously a farcical release to media. I am sure they had hoped that that would be the end of it, that the people of this state would stop talking about it and that the media would stop talking about it. But, alas, on Saturday we were still talking about it, on Sunday we were still talking about it, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and we are still talking about it—and we are going to continue to talk about it. This is the biggest piece of economic vandalism that I believe I have ever seen by a government in South Australia's recent political history, with the biggest and most expensive infrastructure project in South Australian history. On the eve of the state budget, the government is doing this.

We know that millions and millions of dollars have been moved away from the biggest infrastructure project in South Australian history to prop up their election commitments. It is a scandal, nothing less than a complete scandal. We will continue to keep the house updated, and we will continue to probe this to the bottom because the people of South Australia deserve better. This government needs to get on with the job of delivering the Torrens to Darlington arm and doing so on time and on budget.

AUSTRALIAN SWIMMING CHAMPIONSHIPS

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:32): On 18 to 22 May, the 2022 Australian Swimming Championships were held at the amazing SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre, just next door to my electorate office and right in the middle of Gibson. It was here that history was made. This was enabled by the incredible work behind the scenes of Swimming Australia, the athletes, Events SA, the coaches, the SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre, YMCA, South Australian Sports Institute and event partners, including Amazon Prime.

They all worked together to deliver an event that set the stage for two world records, two Australian records, more than 600 of the best swimmers in the country in one place, a 49-strong team selected to represent Australia for the Commonwealth Games, a 39-strong team selected to represent Australia for the world championships in Budapest, approximately 9,000 visits to the event and six South Australians making the world championships and Commonwealth Games. I am sure those of you who could not attend saw the fabulous photos of our swimmers hitting the finish line and turning around to see their result that has taken so much mental preparation, physical preparation, countless hours and dedication to create.

This event also saw the retirement of SASI athlete and Marion swimming club member Travis Mahoney. This was the final event in his swimming career. Congratulations and well done, Travis, on a stellar swimming career with international success.

Importantly, 78 per cent of all waste created at the event was diverted from landfill. While this incredible event was underway, the Aquatic Centre continued to deliver swimming lessons, to teach our families to be safe around water, with 125 group fitness classes keeping our community active and connected and an exercise physiologist treating chronic conditions, lap swimming, rehabilitation lanes, steam, sauna, gym, and never forgetting the cafe for that much-needed coffee break, which made over 1,500 coffees during the event.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon L.W.K. Bignell): We have a nice little segue here. Speaking about those championships, of course held at the Matt Cowdrey Pool, we cross now live to the member for Colton, Australia's greatest ever Paralympian. It is like I am back on the sports desk.

COLTON ELECTORATE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:34): I rise today to bring the attention of the house to an issue in my electorate and one in the electorate of the member for West Torrens.

There are two sites earmarked for development changes: the Pierson Street site in Lockleys and the former MetCash site diagonally opposite in Kidman Park, both fronting Linear Park and the Torrens and both, at most, close or bordering the local collector roads of Rowells Road and Findon Road, and both modest in size in well-established areas.

I was stunned to recently receive the proposed code amendment or zone changes for the MetCash site being put forward by the Charles Sturt council in Kidman Park. I was stunned for several reasons. While just outside my electorate, the Pierson Street developer-led code change impacted my area because both these developments are so close and so similar they are intrinsically connected.

The member for West Torrens and I both fronted a community meeting to hear the objections and concerns of local residents, the primary concern being the four to six-storey height limits. From what I understand, the member for West Torrens, along with me, the West Torrens council and the Charles Sturt council, provided submissions opposing the zoning changes and outlining the concerns of our communities. I quote paragraph 4 from the Charles Sturt submission to the Lockleys code amendment consultation:

Council also wishes to raise concern regarding the 4 to 6 storey height limits proposed along Linear Park, which are considered to be inconsistent with the amenity of Linear Park. The prevailing character of the Linear Park is for single or two storey development and the proposed height limit will create a significant impact on the established character. Therefore, it is requested that the height limit is reduced.

I was stunned because this is now exactly what the Charles Sturt council is proposing on the MetCash site in Kidman Park directly opposite facing Linear Park. The draft master plan for the MetCash site, which went to a council committee, was predominantly two-storeys in height. The pictures and topographies in that document were two-storey townhouses and standalones, with one potential area of three to four storeys on a building or area facing Findon Road.

However, the formal code amendment, which has been distributed through my community, now proposes a small area backing existing housing at two storeys, the majority of the site at three storeys, and five—yes, potentially five—areas of four to five-storey buildings. I cannot reconcile this with Charles Sturt's submission to the process regarding the Lockleys site directly opposite. To add further insult, the public meeting for the MetCash site consultation is being conducted after submissions close for public feedback. How does that even work?

I have contacted local residents for their views, and I have no reason to believe that the member for West Torrens, now a minister, has changed his position in regard to the Lockleys development. I certainly remain committed to my position. I want to hear from my community on this issue as soon as possible, and I want to remind the now minister, Minister Champion, of the responsibility that he has for the Lockleys and MetCash site code change decisions and the importance of those decisions. They will shape the future of these suburbs and the Linear Park. They will set the bar for what is possible under zone changes moving forward.

I thank the member for West Torrens for his bipartisan approach on these issues to this point, and I encourage my community to make their voices heard as submissions close in just 13 days on 14 June.

Time expired.

DUNLOP, MR M.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:39): I would like to take this opportunity to talk about a local hero of my community, Mr Moose Dunlop OAM, AIMM. Moose Dunlop has given a lot of his life to serve his country, his veterans and our community. In 1962, Moose joined the Army, having won a

scholarship to the Royal Military College in Canberra to commence a military career that would span 25 years. He married his sweetheart, Minnie, in 1966, commencing a 56-year marriage that is still going strong.

During his period of service, he served in four Australian states and New Guinea in a range of appointments and ranks, from leadership positions to training and managerial or staff positions in various headquarters and units. He completed a tour of Vietnam during the war in 1969-70, seeing a lot of action as lieutenant or platoon commander, completing the last month of his deployment as the second-in-command of a rifle company in the battalion.

In 1988, Moose resigned from the Army and settled his family in SA, commencing a successful business as a registered builder for his company, Moose Constructions. He remained in the industry until 2010, when he retired from building. Moose's commitment to the service did not stop when he resigned from the military, going on to do what he could to help veterans. This is an area in which Moose's strong and thoughtful leadership has resulted in huge advances in the status and profile of the Royal Australian Regiment (RAR) in South Australia.

The status of the local association has also helped the national body to gain better recognition. In 2000, Moose became the President of the Royal Australian Regiment Association, a position he held for 12 years. Moose was faced with challenges when he assumed the presidency. The membership was in decline with 117 members, some of whom were not financial. Membership grew to over 500 after three years of his presidency.

The association has now emerged as one of the most significant ex-service organisations in South Australia. Moose set about building a better, more representative association and headed a committee of individuals who were prepared to expand their horizons for the benefit of the members. Together, they have been instrumental in shifting emphasis from the social and ceremonial aspects only to addressing the many and varied issues involving veterans and families.

Perhaps the most significant windfall to the association was the acquisition of the Burnside RSL and its opening in 2005 as the regimental home. Moose tells the story of a meeting in 2004, when the proposition was tabled for discussion and subsequent vote. The rental contract offered by the RSL was good, but this was a huge commercial step for an association that had little in the bank. Nonetheless, after his very honest assessment of the committee's risk-taking style, the vote was carried. The club is now a wonderful asset for the membership and those battalion associations who wish to avail themselves of it. In addition, it provides a steady income stream through the Friday night trading and promotes a very friendly atmosphere for members, families and serving members.

Other significant milestones that Moose has achieved have been the publication of *The Infantryman*, a monthly paper to the association members with the initial lone skilled help of Ian Ward, an ex-battalion member, and its continuing improvement; the formation of an RSL sub-branch, thus enabling the association to have a voice and vote in RSL matters; and the beautiful and significant commemorative events conducted by the RAR Association on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of Long Tan and the Last Great Hurrah at St Peter's Cathedral. The latter service was a salute to the diminishing number of scarcely known Korean War veterans.

He was also involved in the enhancement of the Regimental Prayer to a hymn, arranged beautifully into a haunting and moving version by Catherine Lambert. It was also composed under his encouragement and support. Moose was appointed as the Honorary Colonel for the South Australian Army Cadets in 2003. He held this position for seven years, having had several extensions to his term of appointment. He was well respected by the cadet officers, who used his extensive experience as a sounding board on leadership matters. He has established a rapport with the cadets who, at ceremonial occasions, approach him on unit and personal matters. He remains a great fan of cadets, realising the value of personal enhancement to the youth of Australia through such programs and challenges.

In 2009, Moose recognised that the recognition and support to veterans suffering with stress-related conditions, particularly PTSD, were not effective and could be improved. Under the auspices of the RAR Association, he set about forming an organisation that he knew from his study of other world experience would provide better outcomes for those suffering from this insidious

illness, so Trojan's Trek was born. The Trojan's Trek Foundation is now a recognised not-for-profit charity with gift-deductible status. The patron is the Governor of South Australia, the Hon. Frances Adamson AC. The program operates in South Australia and Queensland and attendance is free.

The primary work of the foundation is to assist younger male and female military veterans and first responders suffering from stress, illness, to be able to return to life with their families and in the community; 2022 is the 13th year of operation. Approximately 35 staff are involved in the program delivery in both states. The program transports participants to remote places in SA and Queensland which are free from distraction, in particular mobile devices, for a six-day period.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (REGULATORY SANDBOXING) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996, the National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) Act 2011 and the National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The government is amending the national energy legislation to introduce a regulatory sandbox framework, a regulatory sandbox framework within which participants can trial innovative concepts in the market under relaxed regulatory requirements, on a time-limited basis with appropriate safeguards in place.

Such a framework is especially important in the energy sector to facilitate the sector's timely transition to a low carbon future. The future will look very different to what we have seen previously and will require a regulatory framework that is more flexible to support the introduction of new technologies and business models that enable this transition to occur.

The government has previously shown its commitment to this future by investing in new technology, such as grid-scale storage and facilitating the growth of renewable energy generation in the state. We are continuing this leadership by incentivising the next generation of innovative energy storage. I seek leave to insert the remainder of my second reading explanation and explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

The Government is therefore supportive of the changes required to introduce this framework. The framework can provide significant benefits to consumers including better services and lower costs through innovation, as well contributing to climate change action.

The National Energy Laws (Regulatory Sandboxing) Bill 2022, seeks to implement changes to the National Electricity Law, National Gas Law and National Energy Retail Law to introduce a regulatory sandbox toolkit.

The regulatory sandbox toolkit will consist of three tools, coordinated feedback and guidance on regulatory issues, a regulatory waiver power and a new rule change process for proof-of-concept trials.

Some proof-of-concept trials may be able to rely on existing regulatory arrangements, and not need any of the sandbox tools being proposed in order to proceed. For other trials, it is possible that some might require more than one of the regulatory sandbox tools to proceed.

The existing regulatory framework does not need to be amended to facilitate the coordinated feedback and guidance sandbox tool. The Australian Energy Regulator (AER) will coordinate an innovation enquiry service, with a clear process for trial proponents to seek feedback and guidance on regulatory issues and regulatory options from the AER, as well as the Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC) or other market bodies. By establishing this service, it is expected that unnecessary delays and costs for innovative trials will be avoided. The AER will be responsible for the implementation of this service, including determining when it will be launched.

The Bill deals with the regulatory waiver power tool and the new rule change process tool.

The Bill introduces a new AER regulatory waiver power that can provide time-limited regulatory relief to eligible trials. The AER is the appropriate body for this role given their role as the Regulator of the national frameworks.

This tool could be used if an eligible trial required an exemption from a specific rule (or rules) in the National Electricity Rules, National Energy Retail Rules or the National Gas Rules.

It can also be used to provide an exemption to registration requirements, as set out in the national energy laws. This very limited power has been included due to registration requirements being identified as a potential barrier to trial projects proceeding.

Whilst the national energy laws currently include powers to provide an exemption to registration requirements, the responsible body differs between the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) and the AER. The Bill therefore provides for the AER to be the body that provides any necessary exemption from registration requirements for innovative trial projects.

The Bill provides for the AER to have regard to the innovative trial principles and any other matter required by the rules when making a decision to grant specific exemptions and waivers to facilitate the conduct of proof-of-concept trials.

The innovative trial principles are provided for in the Bill and help decisions makers to determine whether a trial project is genuinely innovative.

The AER would also be required to develop 'trial projects guidelines' in consultation with market bodies and relevant stakeholders. The exemptions and waivers that it grants to specific proof-of-concept trials would be subject to these guidelines.

The Bill also introduces a new power for the AEMC to make a trial rule. This would be used if an innovative trial required new rules or the alteration of existing rules for a limited time to be conducted.

A new rule change process is included in the Bill for the making of a trial rule.

The inclusion of this process is necessary due to the current rule making process being lengthy and representing a high barrier for the purposes of a limited trial rule.

Under this rule-making power the AEMC must comply with the existing rule making tests set out in the Laws, as well as take into account the innovative trial principles. The process will be conducted by the AEMC in under 10 weeks.

The rule-making power encompasses the National Electricity Rules, National Energy Retail Rules and the National Gas Rules.

The Bill also provides for proponents of a trial waiver or trial Rule to be made subject to associated conditions or requirements. Reporting on the trial project is an example of a condition or requirement that may be imposed. The Bill provides for the revocation of a trial waiver or trial rule should a proponent breach any conditions or requirements.

The AER also has responsibility under the Bill to monitor and enforce trial waivers, and associated conditions, and trial Rules and any requirements as set by the AEMC.

The South Australian Minister responsible for administering the relevant laws will be able to make an initial set of National Electricity Rules, National Energy Retail Rules and National Gas Rules associated with the amendments on regulatory sandboxing under provisions included in the Bill. Significant public consultation on the sets of initial rules has already been undertaken.

It is important to note that the objective of the regulatory sandbox toolkit is to encourage innovation, which has the potential to contribute to the long-term interests of consumers, rather than simply to facilitate an increased number of trials.

By introducing this reform, we are providing for a regulatory framework that is better equipped to respond to the rapid changes occurring in the energy sector and deliver benefits for customers.

I note that the Opposition previously supported the introduction of a regulatory sandboxing framework into national energy laws, and I look forward to receiving their support in progressing this Bill through the parliament.

I commend the bill to the Chamber.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *National Electricity (South Australia) Act 1996*

4—Amendment of section 2—Definitions

Certain definitions are inserted for the purposes of the measure, including *trial project*, *trial Rule* and *trial waiver*.

5—Insertion of section 7B

The innovative trial principles are inserted as section 7B:

7B—Innovative trial principles

The innovative trial principles are set out.

6—Amendment of section 15—Functions and powers of AER

An additional function is conferred on the AER relating to monitoring and investigating the conduct and outcomes of a trial project undertaken under a trial Rule or trial waiver.

7—Insertion of Part 3 Division 1D

New Division 1D is inserted into Part 3:

Division 1D—AER trial waiver functions

18ZJ—Definitions

A definition of *proponent* is inserted.

18ZK—Interpretative matters

Certain interpretative matters are provided for.

18ZL—Trial waiver

The AER may grant a trial waiver, being an exemption from section 12 of the Law or the Rules, or a provision of the Rules.

18ZM—Conditions of trial waiver

A trial waiver must be subject to any conditions required by the Rules and may be subject to any conditions the AER considers appropriate.

18ZN—Consultation on trial waiver

Consultation requirement that the AER must comply with before granting a trial waiver are provided for.

18ZO—Publication etc of trial waiver

A copy of a trial waiver must be published on the AER's website.

18ZP—Duration of trial waiver

A trial waiver has effect from the day specified in the trial waiver and for the period (not exceeding 5 years) specified in the trial waiver.

18ZQ—Extension of trial waiver

Provision is made for the AER to extend a trial waiver by a specified period.

18ZR—Compliance with trial waiver

A proponent is required to comply with the conditions of a trial waiver.

18ZS—Revocation of trial waiver

The AER is authorised to revoke a trial waiver.

18ZT—Other matters

Certain other matters relating to the granting of a trial waiver are set out.

8—Amendment of section 34—Rule making powers

The powers to make Rules in the Law are expanded to include any matter or thing related to, or necessary or expedient for, the purposes of a trial Rule, trial project or a trial waiver.

9—Amendment of section 87—Definitions

A definition of *trial Rule* is inserted. A trial Rule is included in the definition of market initiated proposed Rule. Other amendments are consequential.

10—Insertion of section 88C

New section 88C is inserted:

88C—AEMC must take into account innovative trial principles in certain cases

A requirement to take into account the innovative trial principles in making a trial Rule is provided for.

11—Insertion of section 90DA

New section 90DA is inserted:

90DA—South Australian Minister to make initial Rules relating to regulatory sandboxing

The South Australian Minister is empowered to make initial Rules relating to regulatory sandboxing. Certain requirements relating to the making of such Rules are imposed, including publication requirements.

12—Amendment of section 92—Contents of requests for Rules

In addition to the Regulations, provision is made for the Rules to prescribe requirements relating to requests for Rules.

13—Amendment of section 94—Initial consideration of request for Rule

In addition to the Regulations, provision is made for the Rules to prescribe requirements relating to requests for Rules.

The other amendments are consequential.

14—Insertion of section 96AA

New section 96AA is inserted:

96AA—Publication of final Rule determination for trial Rule

Provision is made in relation to the time within which a final Rule determination for request for a Rule that is a trial Rule must be made. Sections 96 and 96A are disapplied in relation to a request for a trial Rule.

15—Amendment of section 102—Final Rule determination

A requirement for the AEMC to give its reasons relating to a final Rule determination taking into account the innovative trial principles is inserted.

16—Amendment of section 103—Making of Rule

The AEMC is required to specify an expiry date for a trial Rule (which must be no more than 5 years after the date on which the trial Rule commences operation).

17—Insertion of sections 104A to 104D

New sections 104A to 104D are inserted:

104A—Extension of trial Rule

Provision is made for the AEMC to extend a trial Rule by a specified period.

104B—AEMC may impose requirements on proponent of trial project on making trial Rule

The AEMC must give consideration to revoking the trial Rule on the recommendation of the AER.

104C—AEMC may revoke trial Rule on recommendation of AER

Provision is made for the AEMC to impose requirements on proponent of trial project on making trial Rule.

104D—Special provision for revocation of trial Rule

Certain Divisions of the Part are disapplied in relation to the making of a Rule that revokes a trial Rule and certain requirements are imposed on such a revocation.

Part 3—Amendment of *National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) Act 2011*

18—Amendment of section 2—Definitions

Amendments that are substantially similar to the amendments to the *National Electricity Law* are made to the *National Energy Retail Law*.

19—Insertion of section 13A

13A—Innovative trial principles

20—Insertion of Part 5A

Part 5A—AER trial waiver functions

121A—Definitions

121B—Interpretative matters

121C—Trial waiver

121D—Conditions of trial waiver

121E—Consultation on trial waiver

121F—Publication etc of trial waiver

121G—Duration of trial waiver

121H—Extension of trial waiver

121I—Compliance with trial waiver

121J—Revocation of trial waiver

121K—Other matters

21—Amendment of section 204—Functions and powers of AER (including delegations)

22—Amendment of section 235—Definitions

23—Insertion of section 236A

236A—AEMC must take into account innovative trial principles in certain cases

24—Amendment of section 237—Subject matters of Rules

25—Insertion of section 238AA

238AA—South Australian Minister to make initial Rules relating to regulatory sandboxing

26—Amendment of section 246—Contents of requests for Rules

27—Amendment of section 249—Initial consideration of request for Rule

28—Insertion of section 252A

252A—Publication of final Rule determination for trial Rule

29—Amendment of section 259—Final Rule determination

30—Amendment of section 261—Making of Rule

31—Insertion of sections 262A to 262D

262A—Extension of trial Rule

262B—AEMC may impose requirements on proponent of trial project on making trial Rule

262C—AEMC may revoke trial Rule on recommendation of AER

262D—Special provision for revocation of trial Rule

Part 4—Amendment of *National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008*

32—Amendment of section 2—Definitions

Amendments that are substantially similar to the amendments to the *National Electricity Law* are made to the *National Gas Law*.

33—Insertion of Chapter 1 Part 3 Division 2A

Division 2A—Innovative trial principles

24A—Innovative trial principles

34—Amendment of section 27—Functions and powers of the AER

35—Insertion of Chapter 2 Part 1 Division 1B

Division 1B—AER trial waiver functions

30U—Definitions

30V—Interpretative matters

30W—Trial waiver

30X—Conditions of trial waiver

30Y—Consultation on trial waiver

30Z—Publication etc of trial waiver

30ZA—Duration of trial waiver

30ZB—Extension of trial waiver

30ZC—Compliance with trial waiver

30ZD—Revocation of trial waiver

30ZE—Other matters

36—Amendment of section 74—Subject matter for National Gas Rules

37—Amendment of section 290—Definitions

38—Insertion of section 293A

293A—AEMC must take into account innovative trial principles in certain cases

39—Insertion of section 294EA

294EA—South Australian Minister to make initial Rules relating to regulatory sandboxing

40—Amendment of section 298—Content of requests for a Rule 41—Amendment of section 301—Initial consideration of request for Rule

42—Insertion of section 304A

304A—Publication of final Rule determination for trial Rule

43—Amendment of section 311—Final Rule determination

44—Amendment of section 313—Making of Rule 45—Insertion of sections 314A to 314C

314A—Extension of trial Rule

314B—AEMC may impose requirements on proponent of trial project on making trial Rule

314C—AEMC may revoke trial Rule on recommendation of AER

314D—Special provision for revocation of trial Rule

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Patterson.

Mr ODENWALDER: I draw your attention to the state of the house.*A quorum having been formed:**Address in Reply***ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The SPEAKER: I inform the house that Her Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the house for the purposes of presenting the Address in Reply at 16:00 today. I ask the mover, the member for Adelaide, and the seconder, the member for Hammond, to accompany me and other members to proceed to Government House for the purposes of presenting the address.

*Sitting suspended from 15:53 to 16:34.***The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.*A quorum having been formed:*

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I inform the house that, accompanied by the mover, the member for Adelaide, and the seconder, the member for Hammond, the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech, and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to her Excellency the Governor the address adopted by the house on 31 May 2022, to which her Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

Thank you for your Address-in-Reply to the Speech with which I opened the First Session of the Fifty-Fifth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray that your deliberations will add meaning and value to the lives of our South Australian community.

Her Excellency the Honourable Francis Adamson AC

Governor of South Australia

Bills

NATIONAL GAS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MARKET TRANSPARENCY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:36): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Government is amending national energy legislation to expand gas market transparency in the eastern and northern Australian gas markets, which seeks to further facilitate the efficient trade of gas and infrastructure services, promote more effective competition, and enable market participants to respond more efficiently to changing market conditions.

Improved market transparency is intended to address a range of information gaps and asymmetries across the eastern and northern Australian gas markets. These gaps and asymmetries mean not all participants in the market have a common understanding of market prices as well as supply and demand conditions. As a result, these gaps hinder the ability of the market to respond efficiently to changing market conditions, impede effective competition and the efficient trade of gas and infrastructure services and result in inefficient decisions being made about consumption, production, the use of infrastructure services and longer-term investment.

The National Gas (South Australia) (Market Transparency) Amendment Bill 2021 seeks to amend the National Gas Law, set out in the schedule to the *National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008*, to introduce new, and expand existing, gas market transparency functions and obligations.

The Bill will confer on the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) a new function to collect, analyse and publish gas price information and reporting. This will address the currently limited publicly available information on prices payable for goods and services in the natural gas industry and address information asymmetries faced by gas users in negotiations. Information to be published will include aggregated and anonymised price information for goods and services in the natural gas industry.

To ensure the AER can successfully perform this new function, the Bill provides clear information gathering powers. Flexibility is provided in the Bill for the AER to publish an instrument which specifies the information they require to perform the gas price function and the persons responsible for providing the information.

The Bill expands the Australian Energy Market Operator's information gathering powers for the Gas Statement of Opportunities (GSOO). The GSOO provides an assessment of the adequacy (or otherwise) of the supply side of the market to meet forecast demand over a 20 year outlook period, and analyses a range of potential scenarios that may impact the gas market, including identifying longer term development needs in the gas market.

The expansion of information gathering powers directly responds to concerns about the quality of information, which is obtained through voluntary surveys, that AEMO currently has to rely upon to prepare the GSOO.

The Bill expressly provides for persons in control of information related to the natural gas to provide such information to AEMO if required to do so under the National Gas Rules. It also provides for AEMO to make GSOO

Procedures. The procedures are a form of statutory instrument for the collection of the information for the GSOO. Persons to whom the procedures apply are required to comply with them.

The Bill expands the scope of the Natural Gas Bulletin Board. The Natural Gas Bulletin Board provides market participants and other interested parties with ready access to information on the capacity and utilisation of key production, transportation and storage facilities in the east coast.

Expanding the scope of the Bulletin Board seeks to address information gaps, including opaqueness surrounding the supply and availability of gas in the eastern and northern Australian gas markets and lack of publicly available information on gas use by liquified natural gas facilities.

The information which must currently be contained on the Bulletin Board relates to natural gas services and secondary capacity. The Bill expands this scope to the natural gas industry.

In support of this expanded scope, the Bill places an obligation on persons in control of information related to the natural gas industry to provide such information to AEMO if required to do so under the National Gas Rules.

The Bill provides for the South Australian Minister to make the initial National Gas Rules that will implement the transparency reforms. Significant public consultation on the initial rules has already been undertaken. Once the initial National Gas Rules have been made, no further Rules can be made under this power.

The Australian Energy Market Commission is provided with power to make National Gas Rules on relevant gas market transparency matters going forward.

By introducing this reform, numerous benefits will accrue including lowering search and transaction costs, facilitating more efficient investment and enabling more informed and efficient decisions to be made by market participants across the supply chain.

I note that the Opposition previously supported the introduction of new and expansion of existing gas market transparency functions and obligations in the national gas law, and I look forward to receiving their support in progressing this Bill through the parliament.

I commend this Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *National Gas Law*

4—Amendment of section 2—Definitions

Certain definitions are inserted or amended for the purposes of the measure.

5—Amendment of section 10—Things done by 1 service provider to be treated as being done by all of service provider group

Amendments are made to an interpretative provision under the Law.

6—Amendment of section 27—Functions and powers of the AER

Provision is made conferring functions on the AER in relation to goods or services in the natural gas industry.

7—Substitution of heading to Chapter 2 Part 1 Division 4

The heading to Chapter 2 Part 1 Division 4 is substituted.

Division 4—Regulatory information notices, general regulatory information orders and price information orders

8—Amendment of section 45—Meaning of general regulatory information order

Provision is made that a general regulatory information order does not include an order that is made as a price information order.

9—Amendment of section 46—Meaning of regulatory information notice

Provision is made that a regulatory information notice does not include an order that is made as a price information order.

10—Insertion of section 46A

Section 46A is inserted:

46A—Meaning of price information order

New section 46A is an interpretative provision relating to price information orders.

11—Amendment of section 48—Service and making of regulatory information instruments

Amendments are made relating to price information orders.

12—Amendment of section 50—AER must consult before publishing a general regulatory information order

This amendment is consequential.

13—Substitution of section 51

Section 51 is substituted:

51—Publication requirements for orders

Provision is made for publication requirements for orders.

14—Amendment of section 53—Form and content of regulatory information instrument

Amendments are made relating to price information orders.

15—Amendment of section 54—Further provision about the information that may be described in a regulatory information instrument

These amendments are technical or consequential.

16—Amendment of section 55—Further provision about manner in which information must be provided to AER or kept

These amendments are technical.

17—Amendment of section 57—Compliance with general regulatory information order

An amendment is made relating to compliance with general regulatory information or price information orders.

18—Amendment of section 57A—Confidentiality issues

Section 57A is disapplied to price information orders.

19—Amendment of section 57B—Disclosure of information given to AER in compliance with regulatory information instrument

These amendments are technical in relation to price information orders.

20—Amendment of section 58—Exemption from compliance with general regulatory information order

This relates to amending the heading to section 58 of the Law.

21—Amendment of section 59—Assumptions where there is non-compliance with regulatory information instrument

Section 59 is disapplied to price information orders.

22—Amendment of section 63—Protection against self-incrimination

This amendment is technical in relation to price information orders.

23—Amendment of section 74—Subject matter for National Gas Rules

These amendments are technical or consequential.

24—Amendment of section 91D—Object and content of gas statement of opportunities

This amendment is technical.

25—Amendment of section 91DA—AEMO's obligation in regard to gas statement of opportunities

AEMO is conferred with functions relating to collecting, collating and deriving certain information.

26—Insertion of sections 91DB to 91DH

New sections 91DB to 91DH are inserted:

91DB—Information for the gas statement of opportunities

Provision is made in relation to persons giving AEMO information for the gas statement of opportunities.

91DC—Person cannot rely on duty of confidence to avoid compliance with obligation

This section provides that a person must not refuse to comply with the requirement in section 91DB on the ground of any duty of confidence.

91DD—Giving AEMO false or misleading information

This section provides that a person must not give GSOO information to AEMO that the person knows is false or misleading in a material particular.

91DE—Immunity of persons giving GSOO information to AEMO

Provision is made in relation to immunity of persons giving GSOO information to AEMO.

91DF—GSOO Procedures

AEMO is authorised to make GSOO Procedures.

91DG—Nature of GSOO Procedures

Provision is made about the nature of GSOO Procedures.

91DH—Compliance with GSOO Procedures

This section provides for compliance with GSOO Procedures.

27—Amendment of section 91MB—Compliance with Retail Market Procedures

Section 91MB(2) is deleted.

28—Amendment of section 218—AEMO's obligation to maintain Bulletin Board

These amendments are technical.

29—Amendment of section 219—AEMO's other functions as operator of Natural Gas Services Bulletin Board

These amendments are technical.

30—Substitution of sections 223 and 223A

Sections 223 and 223A are substituted by section 223:

223—Obligation to give information to AEMO

Provision is made for a person who has possession or control of information in relation to the natural gas industry to be required to give the information to AEMO for use in connection with the Natural Gas Services Bulletin Board.

31—Amendment of section 224—Person cannot rely on duty of confidence to avoid compliance with obligation

This amendment is consequential.

32—Amendment of section 225—Giving AEMO false and misleading information

This amendment is consequential.

33—Amendment of section 226—Immunity of persons giving information to AEMO

This amendment is consequential.

34—Insertion of section 226A

New section 226A is inserted:

226A—Provision of certain information to AER

Provision is made for the Rules to provide for certain requirements on persons subject to the operation of the Chapter to provide certain information to the AER (and other matters).

35—Amendment of section 228A—Compliance with BB procedures

Section 228A(2) is deleted.

36—Insertion of section 294FA

New section 294FA is inserted:

294FA—South Australian Minister to make initial Rules relating to enhanced market transparency

The South Australian Minister is authorised to make the initial Rules relating to enhanced market transparency.

37—Amendment of Schedule 1—Subject matter for the National Gas Rules

Certain subject matters on which National Gas Rules may be made are inserted into Schedule 1 of the Law. Other amendments to subject matters in the Schedule are consequential.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Patterson.

SUPPLY BILL 2022

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 May 2022.)

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (16:38): How nice it was to travel over to Her Excellency at Government House for some fine food and drinks, as we have just been lucky enough to have been afforded.

Picking up on what I was speaking about regarding the Supply Bill, the last two points were on the education system in MacKillop and school enrolments in the context of a declining population and transport arrangements to get students to school. As I have already highlighted, we now have a new Labor government back in power in 2022. We had a lot to do with the Liberal government in the four years that we were allowed to be in government, but that is no more.

One of the things I hope they do in regard to education relates to these two dot points: about the declining population—we obviously need our population to grow in the regions—and we also need to make sure that the transport arrangements, particularly around school buses, are sustainable and can get our children to regional schools.

Just today, I was reminded by correspondence from the Coomandook principal that we have a school bus but that there is further deterioration of resources, with school buses and amalgamations of bus routes and the problem of trying to get students to school and their parents having to travel further and further, which makes it harder on their work commitments and family commitments.

This would be no surprise, but I am going to say it to highlight it to our city members of parliament, whatever political party they belong to: it is a lot different in the country, where you cannot get onto public transport. The networks we have out in the regions are a finite resource. It is a resource that is very much needed and appreciated, and I hope that this government really does understand its commitments to look after the regions like it wishes it can do. We need a bus service that does work and that can pick up the students we need to.

We discussed some of the challenges that are impacting on our schools that need to be addressed to underpin the retention of our local schools. One of the key points highlighted was the effective bus runs or other transport methods to schools. We also discussed the need to attract workers and their families to the area, together with creating access to appropriate housing to continue to attract families to our regions.

Thinking of families and education, one of the things I think is going to be very interesting is the early learning centre. We had both political parties from our last federal election support the early learning centre for Kingston. I know that the education minister is fully aware of what the new Labor government's Kingston development can be and should be, and what it hopefully will look like. I am sure that the Kingston township will be looking forward to working with the new Minister for Education plus the promise from our federal government in supporting a new build in Kingston for an early learning centre.

Obviously, with this new early learning centre, I hope it will have childcare facilities and be able to pick up the care of children to allow both parents to work. That is one of those resources that is needed not only in Kingston but right around the regions and no doubt all around MacKillop. I can tell you that a lot of the childcare facilities we have in MacKillop are full. They are overflowing. There are a lot of children who do not have access to child care because the numbers are too great.

It is going to be very interesting because I have heard, and obviously it is noted, that the new federal Labor government is going to look at models around child care, supporting childcare facilities and children and families perhaps more than what has been in the past. I am hoping that rolls out

through our regions in South Australia and that our families are able to pick this up, and work and run with this.

I commend the Coorong District Council for their work in this area and intend to continue with the council to assist to cement pathways for appropriate access for students and schools' resourcing to ensure quality teaching and facilities. We need to underpin the sustainability of schools through quality education, supported by high-quality facilities, regional employment and housing for families.

I have spoken in this place before in relation to how the impacts of a shortage of housing are impacting on our workforce and communities. We have acknowledged the challenges of getting investment in housing into our regions. I believe we need a combined local, state and federal government and private sector response to this challenge.

As a region, we have been exploring and seeking solutions. Councils and local businesses are taking up initiatives. The Tatiara council is working on solutions while businesses are also taking up the challenge. For example, in my region, we have a major employer in JBS in Bordertown that has bought an old motel and turned the motel rooms into full-time accommodation in trying to address the accommodation shortage or living facilities in Bordertown. That is one of the solutions that has been found.

In the northern part, a new part of my electorate of MacKillop between the towns of Lameroo and Pinnaroo, a major employer has built 27 new houses for his workforce, all out on his own as a business in trying to address this shortage of housing in the regions. We know the Tatiara district council has a multipurpose caravan park accommodation for workers. I know that the councils across the electorate are seeking development initiatives and solutions to this issue. There is interest from private developers to build affordable housing.

I hope that in the next four years, through local government, state government and federal government, we recognise that the private sector has shied away—that is the nicest way to put it—from building these houses out in our regions. We know that there are huge opportunities with employment out in our regional areas but there is no point in having these jobs and asking people to live in these regions if there is nowhere to live.

One of the flaws that has been highlighted in the housing sector is that the financial system recognises the risk in building in our regions. We know that if there is a new development on the fringe or surrounding areas of Adelaide the financial sector will require a financial arrangement in the way of equity compared with the equity required out in our regions.

This is highlighted by the fact that housing developments require around 10 per cent equity to build a housing development, depending on the size and the risk, but if they go out into the regions they could require 60 per cent equity. Obviously, this is based on the fact that some towns may not always grow and some towns may move with their population because some businesses might change, go under, and there is an element of risk.

One thing that is highlighted—and I heard it just today in a grievance by the member for Mount Gambier—is that Mount Gambier is the second largest regional town outside Adelaide. It has had a population of around 20,000, moving slowly up towards 26,000, 27,000, maybe 28,000. It does not resemble anything like the secondary towns in Victoria, New South Wales or Queensland. I hope this new state government recognises the opportunities in our regions and the fact that, yes, Adelaide is important, that Adelaide has to work, but it does not have to have everything about South Australia.

The townships beyond Adelaide's boundary are very important. Adelaide depends on the regions for economic growth, exports and export dollars and jobs. It derives a huge amount of income that probably supports Adelaide in everything it stands for, but Adelaide has to recognise that it has to also look after those regions in terms of both money and people.

In terms of social housing, the current cold weather has again resulted in a statewide Code Blue, and concerns for those in need of emergency and social housing are also front of mind. I am advised that Naracoorte has one of the highest demands for social housing but some of the lowest availability. We need to work to ensure public housing is available for all those who need it.

In summing up the whole housing issue, I hope that when we address this issue we find a model of housing that not only addresses social housing but is also affordable for all regional South Australia's needs. It needs to be a build that probably does not even resemble the same sorts of builds that are designed and planned for the city of Adelaide. I will give you a classic example that happened in Bordertown in the last couple of years so that this statement and knowledge are understood.

Unity Housing went out and bought a block of land and built two houses on it. It cost around \$600,000 for the two houses, \$300,000 each. Once those houses in Bordertown were finished, their value was \$500,000. Unity Housing loses \$100,000 worth of equity once those two houses are finished. This does not stack up in anyone's business books, to build these types of houses and lose \$100,000 of equity as soon as they are finished. It tells you that the type of house that was built there may have a purpose, but I think we have to understand that the model of house has to be affordable, hold its value and also recognise what is required in the way of housing that is neat, functional and durable over the long haul.

Coming back to some of the other infrastructure in MacKillop that I hope we cover off, we have a number of roads. Although we address some of our roads in MacKillop while we were in government, there are roads like the Mallee Highway, going from Tailem Bend through to Pinnaroo into Victoria, that need a massive upgrade. It is not a road that is fit for need, particularly after the railway line was closed.

We have roads like the Rowney Road between Kingston and Bordertown. We have a road between Bordertown, Frances and Kybybolite. We have a road between Millicent and Beachport. They are like a patchwork quilt: they are undulating and not fit for trucks and so forth to reach their speed limit; they cannot because they will be thrown off these roads because they are so up and down and wavy.

Another issue is mobile telephones. I am hoping this new Labor government will recognise that what they did in the first 16 years was not participate in the federal government funds for mobile blackspots. I hope they roll out more mobile telephones because communication is very important. We are lucky enough to have Adelaide people come and enjoy our regions as holiday destinations, but they wonder why they cannot use their mobile phone. They wonder why it drops out. A classic case is Beachport during the summer holidays. The mobile telephone towers there cannot manage the summer holiday population. The phone will drop out on you because it is overcrowded, and this is the sort of thing country people put up with all the time.

Another thing I would like to say, and hopefully this Labor government will do well, is that one of the biggest projects going on in South Australia's history is the north-south corridor. I hope that it is not playing any sorts of games around this area, that it does it well and recognises any problem with that development. If it blows out to any extent, it is a huge cost to this state. The regions will suffer if that goes badly. I wish the new state government all the best and the best of outcomes for regional South Australia.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon L.W.K. Bignell): Thank you, member for MacKillop. That was an excellent contribution, although I am going to mark you down a little bit for not enough references to Glencoe. I was down at the footy club a few weeks ago, and they speak very highly of you as their local member of parliament. They reckon you are a very good footy umpire as well. We move now to the member for Hurtle Vale.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (16:50): Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker, and welcome to the chair, member for Mawson. I am very pleased to see you sitting up there. I thank you for allowing me to speak on the Supply Bill. I note that, along with the Appropriation Bill, this authorises the spending of public funds for public good. I will only make a small contribution, but I do think as a local member it is important that we speak on such matters and show that we are participating in that process and making sure that we are maintaining that accountability to our local community.

As a state, nation and a global community, we have endured an uncertain period over the last few years. It has been very unpleasant and very challenging and, while many things are improving, there are challenges that will continue. We face an economic environment of inflation,

rising interest rates and other significant challenges. Over the past few years as well, we have seen an unprecedented level of state debt accumulate and, if there was ever time to seize new opportunities and new ways of doing things, it is now.

We have that rising debt on our horizon—there is no getting around that. We should be forthcoming in talking about it, honest and open. The South Australian electorate deserves to know everything we can tell them about our spending, our reasons for undertaking that spending and the values and priorities that guide it. The debt that is ahead of us will be incurred for good and worthy reasons, but it does mean that we have to really set our minds as a government to identifying economic opportunity and boldly pursuing it.

We must find ways of doing things better and maximising the value for the public spend. Labor believes that every dollar of government spending should contribute in some way to the higher overarching purpose of building a fairer and more inclusive society, one in which prosperity is shared and opportunity is enjoyed by all.

Government spending should be about deliberately and meaningfully responding to community need, and it should be about reforming our systems and institutions to ensure that all South Australians are afforded equitable and abundant opportunities that enable them to reach their full potential during long, healthy and happy lives. Those are the beliefs that will guide our spending during this term of government. They are consistent with the vision that we articulated during the campaign—a vision that resonated quite evidently in our community.

Our election result demonstrated that our community was ready for a caring government that will create a better future for all South Australians. It was a tremendous relief, just weeks later, that people across our nation have sent that very same message resoundingly. They have tossed out a federal government that was characterised by deliberate and calculated cruelty towards so many groups of marginalised Australians. Our community will finally receive the compassion and care that they deserve from the Albanese federal Labor government.

I know I speak for all my Labor colleagues when I say that our government greatly looks forward to working in close collaboration with our federal counterparts in areas of shared responsibility and shared intention. As with many of my ministerial colleagues, I have already had conversations with federal ministers today, and I am very excited to share the vision of moving forward in a kinder and inclusive society with them. I cannot wait to bring in some changes very soon. We will absolutely work together to improve housing affordability, in particular for those on low incomes.

The Malinauskas Labor government will seek to maximise the benefits for our community of the commonwealth government's \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund. This will create new options and new opportunities for thousands of Australians who are in crisis, who are on low incomes or who are living in unacceptable conditions.

I listened to the member for MacKillop speak before, and as he was speaking I was thinking about the opportunities that we will have working together to talk about housing in his electorate. I know that he has already reached out to our office. We have made a commitment to have those discussions, and we are just now looking at a time for us to catch up next week so that we can talk about how best to not only improve the housing availability but also maximise the services within the area by providing that housing so there is somewhere for people to live while they work.

Those sorts of visions are very important. I look forward to working not just with the member for MacKillop but with other regional members. I know that my team have been out and about in the last week just to make sure that we try to bed those ideas down very quickly. This investment is able to assist in creating a development pipeline in industries that contribute to housing constructions and also in regard to maintenance. It means more jobs for our community and more opportunities for apprentices, all contributing to more South Australians in secure, suitable and stable homes.

We will work in collaboration with the Albanese Labor government to achieve better outcomes for people with disability. The minister for the NDIS is one of those people, the Hon. Bill Shorten. I spoke with him today to already start spelling out our vision, one that we have been working on collaboratively over the past three years since the 2019 federal election.

We spoke very shortly after that, and we vowed that we would make sure that both of us were in the chairs so that we were able to do something for people with disability after the 2022 elections. We are pinching ourselves today that we can actually start bringing to fruition these incredible goals we have already talked about with people with lived experience, people who have been reaching out to us for the past few years.

The NDIS is such an important piece of social infrastructure. We simply cannot afford to keep getting this wrong. It will make better and much bigger differences to people's lives once it is working properly for those who use it. We have a profound obligation to get it right, and I will work day and night to ensure that we actually do get it right.

At last, we have a state and a federal government that share a sincere and pressing commitment to the Uluru Statement from the Heart and that will work alongside one another to implement Voice, Treaty and Truth both in our state and in our nation. Another conversation I had overnight was with the Hon. Linda Burney, who is the first Aboriginal woman to be the federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and backed up by the incredible Hon. Pat Dodson. I am just excited to watch this progress over the next few years and again work with the Hon. Kyam Maher, my friend in the other house. I have spoken about him a number of times doing this incredible work here. It is about time. Time for talk is over.

We will ensure that our programs and the funding we dedicate to them are making meaningful differences where it is most needed. There are just a few areas where South Australians will enjoy the benefits of the two tiers of Labor governments I have just mentioned. There are more who believe that no-one should be left behind, and we will back up our beliefs with ambitious policy reforms that bring meaningful change to those who need it most.

We will use the power of government spending to pursue significant transformation in our industries, our environment, our economy and in our daily lives. Globally, we are on the cusp of an energy transformation. South Australia will be a pioneer—as it should be—in clean hydrogen energy production creating good jobs, secure jobs, for people in the process.

We are on the cusp of a transport transformation. We will facilitate this transformation rather than impede it. We are an ambitious, future-focused and genuinely caring government that will never shy away from the responsibility to our community or from opportunity for our state, our economy and our people. We will show these colours with every public dollar we spend. I commend the Supply Bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:59): I, too, rise to speak to the Supply Bill 2022. As a bit of background around the Supply Bill, it is introduced into parliament each year and outlines the total sum of money to be appropriated from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the state for the coming financial year for a period of time until the Appropriation Bill, or the budget bill, has passed through parliament, noting that the budget will be lodged here tomorrow. It is essentially a means to an end. That is exactly what it is—to keep the wheels of the state grinding along until the Appropriation Bill is passed.

For the 2022-23 financial year, the new government is seeking \$6,628 million for agencies to carry out their tasks until the Appropriation Bill is introduced and passed through both houses of parliament. The amount goes across all departments and agencies that receive appropriation to ensure that the government continues working during a set supply period, which generally and is now from 1 July 2022 to 31 October 2022 or until the Appropriation Bill is passed.

The amount is calculated based on four months of actual appropriation during the previous year. For some comparisons, in 2021-22 the amount was \$6,161 million. In 2020-21, the amount was \$15,336 million, which was quite an extended amount. That was all around COVID measures. In 2019-20, the amount was \$5,515 million. It is interesting to note that the Supply Bill does not cover funding for new projects. As I said earlier, it keeps the functions of government and public sector offices running until the Appropriation Bill comes into effect.

I fully salute democracy, but it was disappointing to end up on the opposition benches after only having one term in government. I know there were some tough times. We dealt with COVID, and I know we managed COVID better than a lot of other states would have managed it anywhere in the world, notwithstanding it had its difficulties. It did cause major difficulties. It caused a lot of

upset to people. It still does, with a lot of people still being hospitalised and still catching the new variants of COVID, Omicron, etc.

It was certainly highlighted in my border community, which I previously represented before the election, on the Pinnaroo-Murrayville border. I salute what we did as the previous Marshall Liberal government in keeping the people of South Australia safe, pumping money into the economy to keep people going. Obviously, some things did not suit some people and people suffered, but we did not see 280 days of lockdown as happened in Melbourne under the Labor government over there.

What I was really proud about in the last four years of administration by the Marshall Liberal government was the money we pumped into the regions. We did work on over 4,800 kilometres of roads. We literally poured billions into schools (I think it was \$1.5 billion) for the upgrade of schools to bring year 7 into high school. I think that was a great boon for this state, led by former Minister Gardner, the member for Morialta, because it gets us onstream with the rest of the nation.

One reason, apart from the fact it was sensible to go through that process, with a lot more travelling society certainly pre COVID, and I suppose a lot of internal travelling during COVID in the time before the last two years when COVID was impacting so heavily, some families toured the country and educated their children in different states. It is quite a culture shock when you have the one state where children are in a primary school instead of a high school. Obviously, there are area schools that it does not really affect, like my old school at Coomandook, but it is great that we have streamlined that process.

With health funding, we poured hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars into emergency departments across the state, and we did the build at Murray Bridge, a \$7 million build complemented with a \$3 million upgrade of operating theatres as well, to give a great, better service, with emergency access, for my community and for surrounding communities.

Throughout Adelaide, there were upgrades right across the board, from Flinders through to Modbury, including the works we have been doing at the Repat while in government—the Repatriation General Hospital that was closed by the former Labor administration. It was so good to go out there this morning with the veterans minister, the Hon. Geoff Brock, meeting veterans and different agencies that work for veterans for their betterment and seeing some of the projects that are happening there.

Looking at the multisports stadium that has been built—especially in light of returned veterans with injuries—and the games have been played there, such as wheelchair sports, the Invictus Games and that so on, I am so proud that we, at least, decided to look after our veteran community.

What I am also really proud of is what we delivered into local constituencies. In the seat of Hammond, which I have been proud to have the privilege to represent for four terms and now into my fifth term, over \$2 million of state government spending came in. That has been complemented with at least \$1 billion of private spending going into different projects and, obviously, one of the biggest ones is the Thomas Foods build on the Mannum Road from Murray Bridge.

Sometimes you have to find a silver lining out of a disaster, and the silver lining out of the disaster that was the fire that happened on 3 January 2018, when the plant burnt down at Murray Bridge, was the opportunity for Darren Thomas and his team to have a look at what they could do into the future in getting the greenfield site for the food processing industry.

It took a long time to line up all the ducks, and I am proud to be part of a government that stood by Thomas's and contributed \$14 million to community infrastructure funding alongside \$10 million of federal money from the Morrison government with the assistance of Tony Pasin, the re-elected member for Barker, putting \$24 million towards that community infrastructure. That has provided the road train turnoff into Thomas Foods, the 2.2-kilometre roadway—it is a public roadway because we paid for it—and also the ability to assist in connecting water supplies, power supplies and gas supplies. This plant, when fully operational, will employ 2,000 people and there will be 4½ thousand jobs augmented behind that, so 6½ thousand jobs are coming off this one project.

Alongside that, in Tintinara, in the member for MacKillop's electorate, is the Thomas Foods Feedlot, which is being doubled in size. It will not be far off completion because they have to have

cattle coming out of there after at least 100 days' feed for the meatworks that will come into a scaled operation probably in November/December this year. At the moment, just the beef line is being built, so there will be at least 350 jobs plus directly involved in that.

It was great to take members of my team out there to see a build that will be the most modern food processing facility in the world when it is finished. Some of the technology going in there is just amazing: a lot of robotic work, cold rooms and storage rooms 10 storeys high. There will be a lot of work for technicians, and obviously a lot of work for people on the floors, where they will have the latest technology to make processing of beef and lamb very efficient.

This goes alongside a whole lot of private sector spending, including on chicken sheds that are at least \$1 million per build, Costa Mushrooms and their \$90 million upgrade and the \$50 million build of a packing plant out at Parilla for Zerella Fresh, which used to be in my electorate, and I know the member for MacKillop spoke about them. It goes on and on and on.

As has been said, there is certainly pressure on housing in Murray Bridge. No longer can you see a house price of, say, \$280,000 and try to negotiate it down. You have to literally add probably somewhere around \$30,000 or \$40,000 to make sure you can acquire the property. That is across regional areas across the state, and it is great to see populations coming there. It is an issue, but we are dealing with it. People are investing and hundreds of houses are going in. There is also an issue with the supply of the hardware to build the houses, whether it is reo rod or whether it is just simple things like taps in bathrooms. Everything is in short supply, and I know, for instance, some things have doubled in price.

Going through some of the over \$200 million worth of funding that has come into Hammond since March 2018, when we came into power, there was the restoration of the facade of the Milang butter factory that cost \$20,000. We put \$400,000 into a major upgrade at Bremerton Wines and \$300,000 into Lake Breeze Wines. We put \$3 million into the Eastern Fleurieu School Langhorne Creek upgrade, which was a much-needed upgrade to get new classrooms, and \$197,500 to the Callington Recreation Community Centre.

The government invested \$4.55 million into the Monarto Safari Park, which went alongside over \$11 million of federal money, and I was very proud to stand alongside Tony Pasin, the member for Barker, to open that in recent weeks. We put \$36 million into the Old Murray Bridge upgrade, and that has just started. There has been a little bit of angst in the community about the bridge being reduced to one lane. I made a very frank comment to the local media. I said, 'Well, you either have one lane or you don't have a bridge open. It's pretty simple stuff.' But it does work; I try to go over it every time I have the other option coming from Coomandook to go around the Swanport Bridge, and I think the longest I have waited for the lane to open is four minutes.

I have already indicated that we have put \$14 million into Thomas Foods, and that will be several hundred million by the time they finish the project. We invested \$7.5 million into the Gifford Hill racecourse. We have already talked about the Soldiers Memorial Hospital emergency department. There was another proud moment locally as \$20 million went into the Murray Bridge High School and some magnificent classrooms for year 7s and 8s. We also put \$5 million into the Murray Bridge North Primary School upgrade, and that is not far away.

The government also invested \$360,000 into the Murray Bridge Regional Rowing Centre and \$1 million into the Murray Bridge swimming pool upgrade. We put \$5 million into the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass Planning Study and \$5 million into the Murray Bridge to South-East Links Business Case, which includes looking at the study of the duplication of the Swanport Bridge. That is a much-needed project. It is not just about the bridge: it is about works further south around Tailem Bend, over the railway bridge there. The Beston foods Jervois plant upgrade at \$2½ million assisted with their lactoferrin plant, which is the high value-add product coming out of milk.

The Tailem Bend netball courts received just short of \$100,000. We put a new CFS station at Tailem Bend, which was just over \$1 million. The Karoonda swimming pool was a project that kept on going, sadly, but we got there and had it built for \$1.6 million. If the government are going out there to open it, I would not mind being involved because that was one heck of a thing to get across the line. There were a lot of barriers put in place along the way. The Karoonda District Football Club upgrade was \$258,000 and the Lameroo swimming pool regeneration cost \$850,000.

We put \$2 million into the Zerella Fresh/Parilla potatoes packing facility. Another one is the Browns Well Highway and Ngarkat Highway upgrade, linking Loxton through Pinnaroo down to Bordertown. It cost \$42 million to get those back to 110 km/h, and I worked with the members for Chaffey and MacKillop on that project.

The redevelopment of the Kalimna Hostel at Strathalbyn at a cost of \$3 million has been budgeted for, and I will certainly be following up on that with the new government. It very much needed to be used for the Strathalbyn community and their healthcare needs. There is also the Strathalbyn and District Aged Care Facility upgrade of \$16 million. That was a fantastic upgrade at Strathalbyn, with 24 memory-unit beds that have gone in and 12 other aged-care beds. It is a magnificent facility. I have not had the chance to go in there yet.

The Mannum Community College new STEM building, CAD lab and senior school upgrade cost \$3.9 million. There is the Strathalbyn campus of the Eastern Fleurieu School upgrade at \$1.8 million and the new underground electricity line into the town of Bowhill at a cost of \$350,000. There were other projects as well.

While we are talking about Bowhill, Bowhill Engineering is based there and they employ somewhere north of 40 people, I think. It is just by the river, a beautiful place, and that undergrounding assisted both the town and the company—their lives and their processes—to get better productivity. They built half of the overpasses that are at Darlington, on the north-south connector project.

While I am finishing up on the north-south connector project, I am stunned to hear the interesting commentary from the Minister for Transport, the member for West Torrens, in regard to the plan being tipped over so that \$1.1 billion can be pushed back past the forward estimates. We were well on track with that hard piece, the piece we were left with to look after on the north-south connector, where the tunnels were involved, the close to \$10 billion, which we instigated the initial work on, and now for some magical reason, even though the same department said, 'Yes, this can happen. This can all happen,' all of a sudden it is saying, 'Oh no, it can't.' I think there has been a bit of pressure applied by the new Minister for Transport.

It is interesting to note that the executive left—it looks like she was sacked—the other day. We will be watching that project with interest because we need to get that connector done. There is so much work we need to do across the state with regional roads. We need to look at \$3 billion to do the duplication for the Dukes Highway, \$3 billion for the Sturt Highway and we have to look at projects like the duplication of the Port Augusta Highway as well. Let's work towards making it safer and more efficient. That is the other thing with the north-south connector: it has to be built far more quickly than what has been progressed by the Labor government to get those efficiency gains.

I fully support the passing of the Supply Bill and we will look with interest when the budget is brought down tomorrow in this house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (17:19): I rise to indicate my support for the Supply Bill presently before the house. I would like to take this opportunity to discuss what we look forward to achieving following our election commitments to the people of South Australia.

Mr Acting Speaker, please allow me to start small and start locally. The Malinauskas government has committed to a new self-cleaning toilet block at Ballara Park Reserve. The reserve is co-located with a kindergarten and, as such, has high use by young families. Those of you who have cared for very young children will know that when a child needs a toilet, they pretty much need it now. This work will be in addition to the upgrade of the park by the Marion council and the recently elected Albanese Labor government.

The election of a Malinauskas state government and Albanese federal government also enables the funding delivery for the upgrade of the Warradale Park Tennis Club. This funding will support the Warradale Park Tennis Club to improve its venue facilities as well as ensuring the clubrooms meet occupational health and safety requirements. The club will be in a great position to continue to meet the needs of its members and its guests, grow the club, and maintain and foster close community ties.

An important aspect of the Warradale Park Tennis Club is that it is not exclusively for the use of tennis players and their families but also welcomes other community groups to utilise its facilities. The upgrade project will also enable the club to be sustainable in the future by enabling it to increase its revenue base by hiring out the proposed all weather multiuse first floor, which I might add has beautiful views across Warradale and to the Hills.

A much larger project to be delivered in partnership with the federal Labor government is the on/off ramp at Majors Road, a project that the previous Liberal government was paralysed by. Congestion on Brighton Road has long been a concern for the residents of Gibson, an issue which the previous government was unable to deliver a solution for. The on/off ramp is a critical piece of infrastructure that the member for Davenport, our federal member for Kingston, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, and I are pleased to support. The ramp will make an enormous difference to the residents of the southern suburbs.

A key priority for this government is to deliver greater capacity in our healthcare system. The Flinders Medical Centre services the people of Gibson, so the joint commitment between our state government and a federal Labor government for a significant upgrade is most welcome. The much-needed \$400 million expansion includes:

- 136 beds;
- an upgrade and expansion of mental health facilities at the Margaret Tobin Centre;
- a brand-new eye surgery clinic;
- expanded medical imaging services; and
- an expanded intensive care unit.

This extra capacity of beds and additional nurses and doctors will help to reduce ambulance ramping, which goes hand in hand with our commitment for a long overdue upgrade to the Marion ambulance station.

Another hot issue, which has been raised with me time and time again throughout my campaign and during my first months as the member for Gibson including at a planning meeting I attended just last Wednesday night, is planning. Adelaide is consistently ranked among the best places in the world to live, but without a bold vision and strong planning laws in place, we risk losing the character of our streets and neighbourhoods.

Good planning and urban development are about finding a balance between growth and livability. When a three-storey apartment block is built over your back fence with windows overlooking your yard, and it means you no longer feel comfortable enjoying the garden you spent years cultivating, then it has gone too far. When the beautiful old gums are cut down and you have lost your lovely vista and the possums and black cockatoos are forced to find a new home, it has gone too far.

This government will repair the damage caused by the previous Liberal government's failed implementation of the new Planning and Design Code. We will commission an implementation review of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act and the Planning and Design Code to ensure planning decisions encourage a more livable and sustainable long-term growth strategy for greater Adelaide and our regions.

It will address key concerns identified in our consultations with industry groups and local communities, including protecting the character and heritage of our local communities; ensuring greater tree canopy coverage and green open space; providing certainty to business, industry and communities by implementing appropriate design standards; and improving the e-planning system and processes.

The poorly managed rollout of the Planning and Design Code by the Marshall Liberal government cut short public consultation with residents, business, industry and local government. As a result, the character of our established suburbs is being erased with an increase in urban infill as poor designs infiltrate our streets. On-street parking increases and the loss of green space creates heat spots in our neighbourhood. I have heard over and over the safety concerns of residents about

the increase of on-street parking. I have literally felt the temperature differences in the streets and driveways as I have doorknocked areas of Gibson with high levels of urban infill.

This Labor government will ensure future developments provide a minimum of one off-street car park for every dwelling and two car parks for dwellings with two or more bedrooms. The pressure of urban infill impacts our streets and our neighbourhoods, making urban infill synonymous with congestion and inconvenience. We need urban infill to meet the demands of our growing population, but development must not compete with community; it must serve our community.

In addition, this Labor government will work with the Green Adelaide Board to prioritise projects that actively green our neighbourhoods. This will support biodiversity as well as quality of life for families who should not have to travel to enjoy the outdoors. We will ensure we have Australian best practice for tree loss regulation and a targeted plan for tree planting. From small projects in our local parks to upgrading our sporting facilities, to reducing congestion on Brighton Road, as well as thoughtful planning, I look forward to the upcoming budget and seeing this Malinauskas government improve the lives of South Australians, in particular the people of Gibson. I commend the bill to the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon L.W.K. Bignell): There seems a bit of repetition today. We are once again going from the member for Gibson to the member for Colton. Take it away.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (17:27): You know what they say: when you are onto a good thing you do not break it. I rise today to support the second reading of the Supply Bill. The passing of the Supply Bill through this house is a reasonably uncontroversial convention of our parliament. To pass this bill provides, in essence, stopgap funding for the operation of government and the delivery of public services prior to the Appropriation Bill making its way to and through this place. If approved by the parliament, over \$6.6 billion will be provided to this end.

To be honest, I have always found this process slightly unnerving no matter which side of the chamber I have sat on. For the lack of a better comparison, we are essentially providing a blank cheque to government to continue business as usual before the formalised budget and Appropriation Bill pass this place. Passing \$6.6 billion to be expended with less than a page of detail still seems like a little bit of an oddity.

It must be said, though, that our process and convention in this manner stand somewhat superior to other jurisdictions. You only have to look across to the US federal government. What at times seems like every six to 12 months, they face another government shutdown, when non-essential government workers are furloughed, leaving those workers and their families without an income and ensuring name-calling, finger-pointing and gridlocking Congress.

Let there be no doubt that we are in a strong economic position, particularly compared with where we were when Labor was last in power. The state has recorded near-record job numbers, with the highest number of South Australians employed in our state's history during this last term of government.

The state has also recorded near-record levels of unemployment; strong economic growth, and even nation-leading economic growth, something that was unimaginable in the early 2000s; record levels of trade; and nation-leading business confidence. According to the NAB business survey, we still have retained that position; however, we did drop 11 points in the most recent survey monthly results post the election—something that we would be keeping a very close eye on as we move forward. All this change, this economic transformation, was achieved despite a worldwide pandemic and some of the most difficult and uncertain times that our state has faced in its history.

I have reflected in this place previously on the resilience of my local community over that period, and I am incredibly proud of the way my community handled the COVID period, supporting each other and building resilience in our local clubs and our service organisations. While at times, when we look back on it now, it does seem like a little bit of a blur, I honestly think we will look back and be proud of how we performed as a state compared with other jurisdictions.

In the time leading up to the election, the former Treasurer was at pains to make it clear that a return to more normalised spending was going to be necessary moving forward. It is clear from the most recent Mid-Year Budget Review that the former Treasurer projected a quick pathway back to

surplus for the state government accounts, winding back the spending that had been necessary to carry the economy through COVID. In the 2022-23 Mid-Year Budget Review a modest \$102 million surplus was forecast; for the coming 2023-24 financial year, a \$666 million surplus; and, in 2024-25, a \$537 million surplus.

These positions improved on the final advice that was provided to the Treasurer in March 2022, just prior to the state election, with the coming 2022-23 financial year revised up to near \$140 million surplus; 2023-24 up \$43 million to a \$709 million surplus; and the then final out year of 2024-25, retaining a forecast of a \$537 million surplus. There is a reason that these surpluses were projected, that is, to ensure that we were in the best possible position to control our debt position moving forward. Our commitments through the election process were modest for a reason.

It has been said in this place already, and it is clear to the people of South Australia, that the Labor Party made approximately \$3.1 billion worth of new spending commitments prior to the state election. This is no small number. If we reflect on the past two years of the pandemic, I do not think anyone would argue that the approach taken was in line with the advice from key economic institutions, both in this country and more broadly.

The stimulus was required, it saved jobs and livelihoods and allowed our state to rebound better than nearly any other jurisdiction in the world. There was a push to expand balance sheets and to underpin spending of productive infrastructure that benefited the economy. It kept a sector that was largely able to operate due to its nature up and running, and it benefited our whole community.

I also reflect on the number of instances where members now on the other side called for more spending over that two-year period. Unfortunately, the outcome of the election was a change in government. With that, we will see if those projected surpluses remain in the forward years, if perhaps infrastructure projects are pushed out to free up committed state funding—perhaps—if significant cuts appear, how achievable will these be and will they be met?

We know that last time the Labor Party were in government we frequently had budgets set for departments that were never met, never realised. There was always a difference between the budget and the actuals. They certainly do not have a strong record in this area. As they say in the classics, times are changing, and it is certainly that way in regard to economic conditions we are facing here in Australia and more broadly around the world.

The significance of the \$3.1 billion of new funding commitments from the Labor Party in the face of these significant economic headwinds is important to reflect on. Inflation is now rearing its head after many years when it had not needed to be a consideration. With a significant jump recently to 4.7 per cent in our state and 5.1 per cent nationally, and with commentators signalling that this may be around for quite some time to come, the time to consider the impact of that is now, not in the next budget.

Each and every South Australian will feel the pinch. Inflation at its most basic means that we pay more for everyday things. Services become more expensive and no sector is immune. South Australian families are already feeling the pinch, whether that is the price of petrol to get the kids to soccer practice, electricity for cooking and getting dinner on the table, or bread and milk—just the absolute basics and necessities are going up under this government.

Will some of the money in the Supply Bill that is being put to the government to expend be put towards cost-of-living help for everyday South Australians? We do not know yet. As I have already mentioned, we pass the Supply Bill in good faith and without knowledge. I welcome the fact that the Treasurer, in his words, made a policy decision to keep government fees and charges increases to approximately 2 per cent this year. This was backed up again by the Premier in a recent speech confirming the policy decision of the Labor Party to keep fees and charges increases at near half the level of inflation.

I will, however, provide a contrast that on this side of the house our record on reducing costs for everyday South Australians in the suburbs has gone beyond minimising increases. We returned the remission to the ESL saving the average family in South Australia \$184; sports vouchers were doubled and the program expanded to cover more sports; and the CTP reductions on cars—all these

are examples of real-world savings, assisting with the cost of living, and reductions for South Australian families.

Inflation is also going to put pressure on this state budget and those moving forward, and it will do so on two fronts: the first is that the goods used by government in the delivery of services and the day-to-day running of government are going to be more expensive; secondly, there is going to be increased pressure on public sector wages. The Treasurer at this point says he has things in hand—we will wait and see. 'Temper your expectation' is the message that is being sent out, but it is all hunky-dory for now.

There is also a third front where pressure will be put on the budget, but to this point the Labor Party has refused to acknowledge that it is a real thing. Labor's election costings were cast, I assume, in a period before the last election. As I mentioned, no sector is ever immune from inflation. The cost of infrastructure—say, the Majors Road off-ramp as an example, or perhaps the north-south corridor—these projects get more expensive as time passes in the current environment. To ignore that fact is economically ignorant. Every South Australian is aware and every South Australian business is aware, but we have the South Australian Labor Party asserting that somehow they are immune from inflation.

In one of the most bizarre budget drops I think I have seen in recent times, it was made clear that the Treasurer had just learnt that there was no money tree at the back of Treasury. I think that in itself should send a shiver down the back of South Australians because it goes to the narrative and the fact that we are back to the same old Labor in South Australia.

Given that this is the Supply Bill and one of my first substantive contributions as the state's new shadow treasurer, I thought I would take a second to reflect on why the economy being strong is so important for all of us. It is about kids, our kids, and it is about jobs, but primarily it is about opportunity. A strong economy creates opportunity and for the first time in years we have a groundswell of interesting, high-paying jobs being created in South Australia, and that is a legacy of the former government that we will be very proud of for some time to come. Lot Fourteen is a totem to that change and that success.

There are so many of us in here who are mothers or fathers. All we want is the best for our kids. Not every one of them is going to want to stay at home for their whole lives. They will of course want to venture out, explore new things, further themselves and follow their passions, but there is one thing that remains true: we want South Australia to be a place where those opportunities that they seek are still here, so whether they choose to return or never to leave, those opportunities are here in South Australia as we move forward.

To do that, we need to have a low cost of living and a low cost of doing business in South Australia because fundamentally those are the things that make us a livable city—and we are. We are the third most livable city in the world and the most livable city in Australia at the moment. We have to keep that momentum going. It is decisions like pushing out projects and committing more than we have that potentially put a stop to those things, that potentially inhibit growth for our state and that potentially scare off investors who were happy to come and invest their capital in South Australia. Decisions of government have real-world consequences. We are always mindful of what those mean not just from an economic perspective but for South Australian families practically.

I want to end my contribution tonight—I know everyone is keen potentially to wind down on this lovely Wednesday evening the day before the budget—by making a statement that I think has always rung true in politics and in life more generally as well: I believe that the people of South Australia can smell excuses and tricky business a mile away. I fundamentally believe that. No amount of shouting, of conflating, of behaviour unbecoming to this house will sway public opinion. It never has and it never will.

I thank my colleagues for giving me the opportunity to serve in the shadow cabinet. I look forward to the work that will be done over the next four years as we go from providing critique of what the current government are implementing and shifting, as we get closer to the coming election, to providing a new, exciting, fresh and youthful vision for what we see South Australia becoming into the future. With those words, I return to the beginning and add my support to the Supply Bill 2022 passing.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:42): I also rise to speak on the Supply Bill. Throughout my campaign, I promised my community that I would be a fierce voice for them in this place, and I am glad to report that I have hit the ground running. Constituents of King were determined to ensure we prioritised health and put access to services back on the map in the north-east. They were passionate about seeing the Adelaide 500 on our streets for all the economic benefits it brings, and they mobilised to stop cuts to vital public services like public transport and to save Modbury Service SA.

Not only did I get out and listen to the stories of those impacted by such important matters, I fought alongside them to bring about the community wins they were so desperate to see realised. I am now here and proud to be standing alongside members who share my drive to continue delivering on our promises of a better future for our state because we want to ensure we do better and do not return to business as usual as we recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. I look forward to what we will achieve as a united team over our term.

What is at the front of all our minds in my neighbourhood is the desire to see more beds in hospitals in the north and north-east, bringing care closer to home for the many people in my community and easing pressure on our EDs. We understand why it is important and are committed to investing in the Lyell McEwin and Modbury Hospital.

At Modbury, we are committed to fully funding and opening 48 permanent extra subacute beds, saving Woodleigh House by rebuilding and expanding the facility, taking mental health beds to a total of 44, as well as establishing for the first time in the north-east a cancer centre in Modbury Hospital so people can get the treatment they need closer to home.

When it comes to the Lyell Mac, I am pleased to share that we have built on our pledge. Just this week, I was excited to join the Premier, the Treasurer, the Minister for Health, the member for Florey and the member for Playford at the Lyell McEwin Hospital to share that we are doubling the number of extra beds pledged from 24 to 48. These extra beds will enable patients to be admitted, moved into a bed more quickly and provided the care needed in an appropriate environment.

I am also proud of the local commitments we have made to my community. In One Tree Hill, we plan to invest in the much-loved Magill recreation park to help address the significant levels of flooding the oval has been experiencing, create two new soccer pitches, a car park and improve entry and exit points to Magill Road—all factors that have been important for both the users of Magill and the local school just across the road.

We also intend to upgrade the equally valued Tilley Recreation Park, which will support not only locals who use the space but the Tea Tree Gully City Soccer Club, Golden Grove Little Athletics, Tea Tree Players Theatre, Golden Grove Boxing Club, Golden Grove Tennis Club and Road Runners Softball Club just to name a few. I am particularly excited to help see a space created for a community dog park at Tilley, something that was positively received many times on the doors when out and about in my community.

I know how much sports and recreation mean to my community and that is why we are very excited to get started with delivering these upgrades. I am equally proud of our focus on public transport, roads and intersections in our community. We have committed to delivering a suite of upgrades in Salisbury Heights and surrounds to local roads and intersections, improving traffic flow and making our commutes safer.

We are also committed to installing 20 bus shelters across the neighbourhood. I was not content with merely helping to save our stops; I wanted to build on the standard of public transport we have in the north and the north-east. I have already engaged with my neighbourhood to identify locations that are most in need of stops and look forward to working with my colleagues to progress the matter further.

As we all know, road safety can often be of particular concern around schools. I know too well traffic safety concerns surrounding Salisbury East High, particularly with the transfer of year 7 students into the school. That is why we will be working to deliver an effective and safe traffic management solution to improve traffic congestion on Smith Road and Gloucester Avenue, road safety for students, parents, staff and local residents, and parking conditions for the school community.

We are also committed to backing the selfless volunteers from my community who put themselves on the line to keep others in our community safe during and after extraordinary weather conditions. I am talking about the lovely people at Salisbury State Emergency Service, and I am thrilled to know that a Malinauskas Labour government has committed to helping them upgrade their information and communications technology systems.

We all recall the significant hailstorm we had last October, but did you know that our community was one of the hardest hit? I understand that Salisbury SES had over 750 callouts of the total 1,200 made within a 48-hour period, which is an extraordinary ask to meet. Just this week, my community was hit hard again by extreme weather, with Salisbury SES once again heeding the call. They worked through the day and into the night to help address the many incidents reported.

I actually visited them this week with the Minister for Emergency Services, the member for Cheltenham, to thank them personally for all they do for our community and to thank neighbouring SES members who came to aid their efforts. By committing to this necessary upgrade, we build capacity for the Salisbury SES to increase safety for their volunteers and the broader community they serve.

We are also preparing the next generation with a bold ambition for the future. We know that 25 per cent of Australian 19 year olds are not completing high school and that 20 per cent will never receive a minimum qualification of a certificate III in vocational training. These completion and educational attainment rates are leaving us to fall behind the most advanced nations.

While under previous state Labor governments we increased school completion from 50 to 75 per cent, we have remained stuck around 72 to 75 per cent since 2016. We have a plan to improve that so we are not falling behind other nations but instead are up-front and setting the pace.

With our plan to build five new tech colleges around the state, we are working to ensure that we prepare every child with the skills and education they need to become self-sufficient adults. By working with local high schools so that young people can still complete their SACE, these technical colleges will also equip students with trade qualifications so they can go straight into work should they choose. I have already been out and about engaging with interested members of the community about this investment, and I am so excited with the direction it is taking.

Come this December, we will have the Adelaide 500 back on the streets of Adelaide. Of course, this commitment was very much appreciated among my constituency, who loved the race but, like so many South Australians, they were impacted by the former Marshall Liberal government's decision to terminate the race with no replacement. In fact, it left some constituents in my electorate wondering if they would even have work still, so significant was the impact the axing would have on local jobs and businesses in our state.

I am glad to see it coming back because I know how important this event is to our economy and, more importantly, to the people in this state who are supported by the race. Whether it be taking photos of the action, helping to set up and pack down or, for those working in our hospitality and the hotel sector, the Adelaide 500 provided security that the work would be there, supporting some people who relied on the event to get through the quieter months.

With the tender process to open this week, it builds hope for the many people who relied on the event after its now nearly three-year absence. This process marks another step in our journey to bringing back the race to the streets of Adelaide, alongside the economic activity and jobs the race brings to our state. I am absolutely revved for this December.

All these commitments were made because they were clear priorities for my local community. I am determined to see them implemented because I know my community wants health taken seriously, better education pathways for our children and the Adelaide 500 returned to the streets of Adelaide. I intend to be a strong voice for my local community, and I am glad to fulfil my role in a Malinauskas Labor government that is not only taking the concerns of my electorate seriously but working hard to deliver on its commitments for the betterment of our state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Basham.

Parliamentary Committees

COVID-19 DIRECTION ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informs the House of Assembly that, pursuant to section 20(2) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the following members have been appointed to the COVID-19 Direction Accountability and Oversight Committee: the Hon. E.S. Bourke, the Hon. R.A. Simms and the Hon. S.G. Wade.

At 17:53 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 June 2022 at 11:00.